

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral
 312 Signers' Hall
 474-7964 FYSENAT

A G E N D A
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #77
 Monday, February 9, 1998
 1:30 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.
 Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - John Craven	5 Min.
		A. Roll Call	
		B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #75 & #76	
		C. Adoption of Agenda	
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions	5 Min.
		A. Motions Approved: none	
		B. Motions Pending: none	
1:40	III	A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow	10 Min.
		B. Remarks by Provost J. Keating	5 Min.
		C. Remarks by John French --	5 Min.
		Status of faculty collective bargaining agreement	
2:00	IV	Governance Reports	
		A. ASUAF - J. Richardson	5 Min.
		B. Staff Council - P. Long	5 Min.
		C. President's Report - J. Craven	10 Min.
		(Attachment 77/1)	
		D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz	10 Min.
		(Attachment 77/2)	
2:30	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Min.
2:35		***BREAK***	10 Min.
2:45	VI	Old Business	
		A. Motion to approve the Certificate in	5 Min.
		Microcomputer Support Specialist, submitted	
		by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 77/3)	
		B. Motion to Approve the AAS in Microcomputer	5 Min.
		Support Specialist, submitted by Curricular	
		Affairs (Attachment 77/4)	
2:55	VII	New Business	
		A. Motion to approve the Ph.D. program in	5 Min.
		Marine Biology., submitted by the Graduate &	
		Professional Curricular Affairs Committee	
		(Attachment 77/5)	
		B. Motion to approve a policy statement on	5 Min.
		Stacked Courses, submitted by the Ad Hoc	
		Committee on Stacked Courses (Attachment 77/6)	
		C. Motion on Course Level Definitions, submitted	5 Min.
		by Curricular Affairs and the Graduate &	
		Professional Curricular Affairs Committees	
		(Attachment 77/7)	
		D. Motion to modify the date of Freshman Low	5 Min.
		Grade notification, submitted by Curricular	
		Affairs Committee (Attachment 77/8)	

- | | | | |
|------|------|--|---------|
| | E. | Resolution of support for union negotiation,
submitted by Ad Hoc Committee on Senate/
Union Relations (Attachment 77/9) | 5 Min. |
| | F. | Motion Regarding the UAF Academic Calendar,
submitted by Administrative Committee
(Attachment 77/10) | 5 Min. |
| | G. | Motion to approve amendment to the Faculty
Alliance Constitution, submitted by Administrative
Committee (Attachment 77/11) | 5 Min. |
| | H. | Motion to affirm the Faculty Alliance motion
on the Presidential Search process, submitted
by the Administrative Committee
(Attachment 77/12) | 5 Min. |
| 3:35 | VIII | Committee Reports | 20 Min. |
| | A. | Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath
(Attachment 77/13) | |
| | B. | Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak
(Attachment 77/14) | |
| | C. | Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen
(Attachment 77/15) | |
| | D. | Core Review - J. Brown (Attachment 77/16) | |
| | E. | Curriculum Review - J. French | |
| | F. | Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Handout) | |
| | G. | Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley
(Attachment 77/17) | |
| | H. | Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement -
D. Porter | |
| | I. | Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs | |
| | J. | Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal (Handout) | |
| | K. | Service Committee - K. Nance | |
| | L. | Ad Hoc Committees - J. Craven (Attachment 77/18) | |
| 3:55 | IX | Discussion Items | |
| | A. | RIP Discussion (Attachment 77/19) | 5 Min. |
| 4:00 | X | Members' Comments/Questions | 5 Min. |
| 4:05 | XI | Adjournment | |

ATTACHMENT 77/1
UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
FEBRUARY 9, 1998

Report by John Craven, Senate President

Welcome to the 77th meeting of UAF's Faculty Senate. It will be our pleasure at this meeting to hear from our own Senator John French, who will say a few words in public about the tentative agreement between United Academics and the University of Alaska. The ad hoc committee on Union-Governance Issues has also submitted a motion for your consideration. Senator French will tell you that it is no less important today than it was prior to the signing of the tentative agreement.

Since our last meeting and the beginning of the new year, we have been informed of President Komisar's resignation effective this summer. The decision on January 14th by the Board of Regents that they and only they would comprise the search committee for the new president has cause the UA faculty to issue several motions in opposition to the idea. The issue is shared governance and the faculty's place in it. Copies of the motions passed to this date by

United Academics, the UAA Faculty Senate and the Faculty Alliance are included in your meeting packet. Your Administrative Committee has also drafted a motion for your consideration at this meeting. After I write this but before you may read it, the Faculty Alliance will have met with the Regents in Anchorage on February 5th for discussions on the issue of faculty participation in the search. Please note that Regents President Kelly has worked very hard to keep the lines of communication open, and other regents have been in contact with members of the Alliance as well. Regents and Alliance members will have received copies of the articles in *Academe* (September-October 1997 issue) on shared governance and the selection of university presidents before our meeting. We will report on the outcome of the discussions at this Senate meeting. Meanwhile, how are each of you and the UAF Faculty Senate going to respond to the BOR's request for information?

You will also notice a motion concerning the UAF academic calendar. I find that this yearly dance with the UAF Coordinating Committee is not working; there is simply insufficient appreciation of UAF rules established by the UAF Senate, even by some senate members on the committee. It is not a simple story, but I believe there is only one way to fix it.

We are just past the halfway point in the academic year and many committees are now reporting motions resulting from discussions in their prior meetings. As the time available for committees to begin consideration of new issues is decreasing rapidly, you are urged to set clear schedules for the completion of work in progress. For example, former senator Richard Seifert worked hard to create the Faculty Seminar Series last year and he asked the Senate to establish a permanent committee to keep it going. We have seen nothing from the appropriate committee and it is now nearly too late to organize any such activity this academic year. There are several items remaining on the administrative committee's agenda, such as the administration's request that the Senate lead the effort on out-of-class learning as part of outcomes assessment. While the bulk of the work will be done in the next academic year, decisions have to be made in this semester. For example, you heard several senators state that this is the administration's job, not the business of the Senate. This has to be decided. A letter is being sent by me to ASUAF Steve Nuss asking the Student Senate's help in defining out-of-class learning experiences of value to the assessment.

Another task is related to my effort to get on the governance web page all Senate (and earlier Assembly) motions that have led to rule making. The Chancellor has provided two weeks of additional funding in the present fiscal year for the governance office to do this. The purpose is to make these rules more readily accessible to all faculty, students, and administrators as they go about their business, to ease the burden on the governance office when questions arise, and to reduce the ability of individuals to say that they didn't know about a rule. I am urging the Administrative Committee to review this material as it becomes available and write the appropriate introductions and supporting statements to make it more useful.

Lastly, you are the elected leaders of the UAF faculty and should be more aware that most of potential leadership in the Senate for next year, yourselves included. Be thinking about this personally or in terms of others in this Senate who may need a little encouragement to enter into the leadership. I can promise you it is personally rewarding, but I will not deceive you by saying it is not without its added hours in the day (and night and weekends). You will also have an opportunity to work closely with your peers from

the UAA Faculty Senate and the UAS Faculty Council. Like you, they care about UA.

ATTACHMENT 77/2
UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
FEBRUARY 9, 1998

President-Elect Comments - Madeline Schatz

As I sit and write these comments I have not yet read the fine print of the new negotiated contract, but I am extremely grateful to those members of the UA faculty who expended so much energy and time working for their colleagues in the name of equity. Sometimes I think we take each other for granted and I would like it to be known, publicly, that I am very cognizant of the amount of effort it took to reach a tentative agreement. Thank you Larry Weiss, John French, Don Lynch and all the others.

This Thursday John Craven, Kara Nance and I will attend a meeting with the Board of Regents to discuss the "possibility" of the inclusion of faculty members on the search committee for the new president of the University of Alaska system. It has been through great effort that the Faculty Alliance (representatives from the senate/assembly of each MAU) was invited to attend this meeting. At first it seemed that some of the regents were dead set against any faculty representation on said committee and that there would be no give at all in that attitude. It may still be the case that the BOR will not, by majority vote, allow faculty representation, but through the efforts of President Kelley we will have an opportunity to present our best arguments to the BOR as a whole this week. Please let us know if you have any arguments which you want brought forth at this event.

Since this is the spring semester the time for "re-birth" of the Faculty Senate is at hand. On May 4 I will relieve the ever vigilant John Craven from his duties as president of this august body, and some lucky person out there in the audience will relieve me of the position of president-elect. Please consider running for this office. You will learn more about the workings of the university and its people than you ever thought existed. You will find that the administration are humans too. You will find that your colleagues in other areas actually do care about the business of running a university. AND....you will approach your term as president with the confidence that you have learned much in one year. Please, the time is upon us. Step up and be counted.

ATTACHMENT 77/3
UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
FEBRUARY 9, 1998
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Certificate program in Microcomputer Support Specialist.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents¹ Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #28 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

Executive Summary
Certificate, Microcomputer Support Specialist
33 credits

As computers become indispensable in our daily lives, agencies and businesses are discovering that providing ongoing support for computer users is an absolute necessity. The critical need for well-trained professionals with the requisite technical computer knowledge and people support skills is becoming every more apparent. Thus, the objective of this Certificate program is to provide the essential elements of both technical knowledge and interpersonal skills for a new cadre of microcomputer support specialists who can fill permanent staff positions, like the new State of Alaska Microcomputer/Network Technician I and II, or develop private microcomputer support enterprises throughout Alaska.

As one of the programs approved last year for funding through the President's Reallocation Fund, this program meets the criteria for being collaborative statewide, focused on vocational/technical training, and utilizing alternative modes of delivery. The group of faculty and staff who compose the committee making this project proposal come from all three MAUs. Microcomputer support represents an area of vocational/technical expertise that is increasingly desired and needed within the state but which is not currently satisfied by any University of Alaska program. And, there is a direct relationship between the requirements of the courses and the expected skills and knowledge the student will need on the job; the program will be competency based, individualized, and available at a distance through a variety of delivery modes.

The program staff developed a questionnaire regarding microcomputer classes that was sent to 1247 people in state government, educational institutions, libraries, military bases, private corporations and businesses including Native corporations: 257 responses were received for a response rate of 21%. About 78% of the respondents indicated there was a need for a program leading to a certificate as a microcomputer support specialist, and 84% said it would be helpful to have a person trained in this area working for their organization; 58% said, if they were in a position to hire staff, they would seek to hire someone with such a certificate. Finally 56% said they themselves would be interested in obtaining a microcomputer specialist certificate.

A great number of students have already inquired about this program, having heard by word of mouth, apparently, of its imminent availability. Extended campus directors, faculty in this area, and others have told us that many potential students are waiting to enroll. Therefore, it is anticipated that a sufficient number of students will enroll in the program. In fact, the opposite problem of having too many students too quickly may materialize.

Students will be required, at minimum, to complete a 9 credit core to earn the Certificate. If they have prior experience and/or can demonstrate their competencies in the required subject area, all the remaining credits may be waived; however, many will need to take

all 33 credits of course work. Courses are being redesigned for distance delivery during the Fall 1997 and Spring 1998 semesters; and equivalencies across all three MAUs have been determined. The Certificate will not be available for matriculation until all approvals have been achieved hopefully by the Fall 1998 semester.

ATTACHMENT 77/4
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the A.A.S. in Microcomputer Support Specialist.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #29 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

Executive Summary
 A.A.S., Microcomputer Support Specialist
 60 credits

As computers become indispensable in our daily lives, agencies and businesses are discovering that providing ongoing support for computer users is an absolute necessity. The critical need for well-trained professionals with the requisite technical computer knowledge and people support skills is becoming every more apparent. Thus, the objective of this A.A.S. program is to build on the Certificate for Microcomputer Support Specialist and provide additional skill development in the major area as well as associate level general education requirements. Completion of this A.A.S. degree is not a preparation for a computer science baccalaureate degree.

As one of the programs approved last year for funding through the President's Reallocation Fund, this program meets the criteria for being collaborative statewide, focused on vocational/technical training, and utilizing alternative modes of delivery. The group of faculty and staff who compose the committee making this project proposal come from all three MAUs. Microcomputer support represents an area of vocational/technical expertise that is increasingly desired and needed within the state but which is not currently satisfied by any University of Alaska program. And, there is a direct relationship between the requirements of the courses and the expected skills and knowledge the student will need on the job; the program will be competency based, individualized, and available at a distance through a variety of delivery modes.

The program staff developed a questionnaire regarding microcomputer classes that was sent to 1247 people in state government, educational institutions, libraries, military bases, private corporations and businesses including Native corporations:

257 responses were received for a response rate of 21%. About 78% of the respondents indicated there was a need for a program leading to a certificate as a microcomputer support specialist, and 84% said it would be helpful to have a person trained in this area working for their organization; 58% said, if they were in a position to hire staff, they would seek to hire someone with such a certificate. Finally 56% said they themselves would be interested in obtaining a microcomputer specialist certificate.

A great number of students have already inquired about this program, having heard by word of mouth, apparently, of its imminent availability. Extended campus directors, faculty in this area, and others have told us that many potential students are waiting to enroll. Therefore, it is anticipated that a sufficient number of students will enroll in the program. In fact, the opposite problem of having too many students too quickly may materialize.

The A.A.S. will require general education and computer courses beyond the Certificate to total 60 credits. Courses are currently being redesigned for distance delivery during the Fall 1997 and Spring 1998 semesters; and equivalencies across all three MAUs have been determined. The A.A.S. degree will not be available for matriculation until all approvals have been achieved hopefully by the Fall 1998 semester.

ATTACHMENT 77/5

UAF FACULTY SENATE #77

FEBRUARY 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Ph.D. program in Marine Biology.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents¹ Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #44 on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers¹ Hall.

Executive Summary

Ph.D. Degree Program in Marine Biology

We propose a Ph.D. degree program in Marine Biology, to be housed within the Graduate Program in Marine Sciences and Limnology (GPMSL) and the School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences (SFOS). Our goals are to attract students with excellent qualifications; offer them unique opportunities to conduct research in the Arctic, Bering Sea, and Gulf of Alaska regions; help them to develop expertise in research through courses and mentorship; facilitate their authorship of important contributions to Marine Biology, increase SFOS capability to address significant problems of Alaska's marine life; and educate professionals who are especially well-qualified to address these problems. The Strategic Plan: UAF 2000 states that the university should "become the world's leader in arctic research and graduate education." Assuming that this will remain an important UAF goal into the next century, a new Marine Biology Ph.D.

program will contribute by attracting outstanding students, who will conduct high-quality research in the Arctic and elsewhere.

The doctoral degree program will educate students using both course work and a research-based thesis. The program is flexibly designed and modeled after the successful GPMSL doctoral program in Oceanography. Like all biological fields, Marine Biology requires collaborative research in many different areas in order to understand the demands placed upon the organism and how it has adapted to the environment. It can include studies in modern methods of molecular biology as well as classical methods of physiology or genetics. Courses offered by the other UAF graduate programs, in addition to a wide range of courses within SFOS, will enable Marine Biology Ph.D. students to attain both breadth and depth of knowledge. The opportunities for collaboration with researchers in Oceanography and Fisheries within SFOS, and with faculty from the Biology and Wildlife Department, the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, and other UAF departments and institutes will be especially valuable to Marine Biology students.

The strong, extramurally-funded Marine Biology research programs of GPMSL faculty are crucial to the success of the Marine Biology Ph.D. program. SFOS has several outstanding research facilities for marine biological research which provide opportunities to conduct research at a wide range of sites along Alaska's coastline. These include the Seward Marine Center; the Kasitsna Bay Laboratory, located near Seldovia; the Juneau Center for Fisheries and Ocean Sciences; and the Fisheries Industrial Technology Center in Kodiak. Marine Biology Ph.D. students will also have the opportunity to use the Seward SeaLife Center, which is being built by a private foundation and will open in the Spring of 1998. The SeaLife center will have state-of-the-art research facilities for captive studies of marine mammals and sea birds and will also support field research in the nearby fjords.

Five students transferred to the Interdisciplinary Studies Ph.D. program in 1995 to pursue studies in Marine Biology, with major advisors and a "home base" in GPMSL. Four of these students have completed the program and moved on to professional positions; one is still in progress. Four additional students, now enrolled in either Oceanography, have expressed interest in transferring to the Marine Biology Ph.D. program if it becomes available. SFOS and GPMSL have the faculty, the courses, the facilities, and the experience to offer an excellent Ph.D. program in Marine Biology without additional cost to the university.

ATTACHMENT 77/6
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY AD HOC COMMITTEE ON STACKED COURSES

MOTION

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the following policy on Stacked and Cross-listed courses to be included in the UAF Catalog under the Course Numbers section of the Course Descriptions (p. 133 of current UAF Catalog) and to amend the 600-699--Graduate courses paragraph as follows:

"A few well-qualified undergraduates may be admitted to graduate courses with APPROVAL OF THE INSTRUCTOR. [[the permission of the

head of the department in which the course is offered. Admission to graduate courses cross-listed with undergraduate courses requires graduate standing or permission of the instructor.]] A STUDENT MAY NOT APPLY SUCH A COURSE TO BOTH A BACCALAUREATE AND A GRADUATE DEGREE."

Stacked and Cross-listed Courses

The same course is sometimes offered by more than one discipline. Such offerings are referred to as "cross-listed" courses and are designated in the class listings by "cross-listed with _____".

Courses are also sometimes offered simultaneously at different levels (100/200 or 400/600, for example) with higher level credit requiring additional effort and possibly higher order prerequisites from the student. Such courses are referred to as "Stacked" courses and are designated in the class listings by "Stacked with _____". In the case of 400/600 level stacked courses, graduate standing or permission of the instructor is required for graduate enrollment and a higher level of effort and performance is required on the part of students earning graduate credit.

Courses simultaneously stacked and cross-listed will be designated in the class listing as "stacked with _____ and cross-listed with _____".

In all cases, the course syllabus (not the catalog) must stipulate the course content and requirements for each level and/or discipline. The catalog should indicate if there is a difference in content.

Note: this proposal extends, modifies and partially rescinds Senate policy concerning double listing of 400/600 courses enacted on Feb. 14, 1994 during Meeting # 47.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: As more departments add 400/600 courses, a clearer catalog description of this method of combining offerings is needed, as is a better way of designating them than the "same as _____" used in the current UAF catalog. Similar comments pertain to other stacked offerings. Students need to understand the nature of these courses and the difference between levels of credit deriving from them.

This proposal will eliminate the prohibition against undergraduates (or anyone else not already enrolled in a graduate program) taking 400/600 courses for graduate credit which is embodied in policy enacted by the Senate in meeting #47. There seems to be little logic in treating these graduate offerings differently from all others and it is often desirable to encourage exceptionally well-qualified undergraduates to expand their horizons by taking graduate courses.

It should be noted that the additional effort required for higher level credit must be clearly spelled out in the course syllabus. This reduces the opportunity for later conflicts by providing students with a clear

understanding of the differences in requirements and grading. This will be given serious consideration in the approval process for such courses.

ATTACHMENT 77/7
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS &
 GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft course definitions submitted by the UA Faculty Alliance and moves to make the following recommendations:

CAPS = Insertion
 [[]] = Deletion

DRAFT

A. Course Numbering System

Each course offered by the University is identified by the department designator and a three-digit course number. The designator commonly abbreviates the name of a discipline or department (for example, ENGL for English). In general, the first numeral of the three-digit course number indicates the course level and the year in which the course is ordinarily taken. For example, ENGL 111 is a 100-level course and is ordinarily taken by first-year (freshman) students, and ENGL 318 is a 300-level course taken by third-year (junior) students.

B. Course Level Expectations

Students are expected to demonstrate learning skills commensurate with the appropriate course level, and are expected to meet, prior to registering, prerequisites for all courses as listed with the course descriptions. Prerequisites indicate the preparation and/or background necessary to undertake academic study. If a student has not taken and passed the necessary prerequisites, but feels confident of performing the course work, the student may request permission from the instructor of the course to enroll in the class. An instructor withdrawal may be initiated for those students who enroll without either prerequisites or[[f]] instructor permission. Courses numbered 001-049 are career development courses intended to fulfill special needs of students or the community and are not designed as preparation for 100-level college work. They are offered for Continuing Education Units (CEU) or for non-credit. Courses numbered 050-099 usually cover basic or developmental material and are intended to help prepare students to enter 100-level college courses. They are applicable to some vocational certificates. The 100-level courses generally require learning basic concepts. The 200-, [[level]] 300-, and 400-level courses require increasing sophistication in the ability to extract, summarize, evaluate, and apply relevant class material. The 500-level courses are specifically designed for professional development at the post-baccalaureate level, while the 600-level courses for advanced degrees demand rigorous analysis, synthesis, and research skills.

C. Non-degree and Preparatory Courses

001-049: Career development or community interest courses.

Courses are intended to fulfill special needs of students or the community and are not designed as preparation for 100-level college work. Career development courses are offered for Continuing Education Units (CEU). One CEU is granted for satisfactory completion of 10 contact hours of classroom instruction or for 20 contact hours of laboratory or clinical instruction. Community interest courses ARE not offered for credit. THEY ARE not applicable to any degree requirements (even by petition)

050-099. Remedial or Preparatory Courses.

Courses applicable to some vocational certificates but not to any associate degrees, baccalaureate degrees, master's degrees, or professional certificates. These are developmental courses that provide supplemental preparation for introductory college courses.

D. Academic Credit Courses

Lower Division Courses

100-199: Freshman-level courses.

These courses are applicable to ALL certificates, associate, and baccalaureate degrees. They introduce a field of knowledge and/or develop basic skills. These are usually foundation or survey courses.

200-299: Sophomore-level courses.

These courses are applicable to ALL certificates, associate, and baccalaureate degrees. They provide more depth than 100-level courses and/or build upon 100-level courses. These courses may connect foundation or survey courses with advanced work in a given field, require previous college experience, or develop advanced skills.

Upper Division Courses

As a general guideline upper division courses require at least junior standing or equivalent experience in addition to any stated prerequisites. The student is expected to have adequate preparations and background to complete courses at this level. [[Freshman and sophomore students are required to obtain special permission to take any upper division courses.]] Upper-division courses may not be used as prerequisites for lower-division courses.

300-399: Junior-level courses.

These courses are applicable to [[associate and]] baccalaureate degrees, and may BE APPLICABLE TO SOME ASSOCIATE DEGREES. THEY MAY also be applied to graduation requirements for some master's degrees with prior approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee. [[They may not be applied to both a baccalaureate and a master's degree.]] These courses build upon previous course work and require familiarity with the concepts, methods and vocabulary of the discipline.

400-499: Senior-level courses.

These courses are applicable to the baccalaureate degree and may be applicable to some associates degrees. They may also be applied to graduation requirements for some master's degrees with prior approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee. They may not be applied to both a baccalaureate and a master's degree. These courses require the ability to analyze, synthesize, compare and contrast, research, create, innovate, develop, elaborate, transform, and/or apply course material to solving complex problems. These courses [[are]] generally [[supported by]] REQUIRE a substantial [[body of]] BACKGROUND OF STUDY IN lower-level courses.

600-699: Graduate-level courses.

These courses are for post-baccalaureate study towards advanced degrees with approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee. A few well qualified undergraduates may be admitted to graduate courses with APPROVAL OF THE INSTRUCTOR. [[appropriate approval in the department in which the course is offered. Admission to graduate courses cross-listed with undergraduate courses requires graduate standing or permission of the instructor.]] THESE COURSES MAY BE USED TO MEET GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR BACCALAUREATE DEGREES UPON APPROVAL OF THE DEPARTMENT IN WHICH THE COURSE IS OFFERED. A STUDENT MAY NOT APPLY SUCH A COURSE [[These courses may not be applied]] to both a baccalaureate and a graduate degree.

D. Professional Development Courses.

500-599: Professional development courses.

These courses are intended as post-baccalaureate education for various professional groups who desire to continue their education at a level distinct from graduate-level education. Courses are neither graduate nor undergraduate in nature. [[They are not applicable to any grading system.]] These 500-level courses shall not be stacked with any credit courses numbered 050-499 or 600-699. NO [[The]] 500-level (special topics and independent study) courses shall [[not]] apply toward any UNIVERSITY degree, UNIVERSITY certification or UNIVERSITY credential program, and are not interchangeable with 600-level courses for graduate degree programs. Courses may be graded Pass/No Pass or, if the course includes an evaluation component, by letter grading. The measurement of student effort is indicated by professional development credits. One credit requires at least 12.5 classroom contact hours, two credits at least 25 classroom contact hours, three credits at least 37.5 classroom contact hours, etc. These courses will be provided on a self-support basis.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: Curricular Affairs and the Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs reviewed the entire text of the motion and made several recommendations, by section.

Upper division courses--The committee recommended that the third sentence be deleted. In the opinion of the committee, this language is unduly restrictive of student choice, as currently UAF lower-division students do take

upper division courses without "special" permission.

300-399: Junior-level courses.--The committee recommended that the phrase marked for deletion (also be applied to graduation requirements for some master's degrees with prior approval of the student's Graduate Study Committee) be retained. This should be reinstated in the text and transformed into a sentence: "They may also be applied to graduation requirements....." The reasoning of the committee was that under current UAF policy, graduate students are allowed to apply a junior-level course to degree requirements, with the approval of their committee.

400-499: Senior-level courses.--The committee recommended the retention of the phrase marked deletion: (and may be applicable to some associates degrees). The committee also found this proposal to be unusually restrictive. Under current UAF policy, students may use senior-level courses to meet associate degree requirements.

500-599: Professional development courses.--The committee recommended the deletion of the third sentence. In the opinion of the committee, this statement is unnecessary. The committee also recommended changes to the fifth sentence. The argument for this change was to improve clarity.

600-699: Graduate-level courses.--Change suggested by the UAF Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs Committee.

ATTACHMENT 77/8
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to modify the date of Freshman Low Grade notification to the 6th Friday following the first day of classes.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 1998

RATIONALE: The present policy, which provides for reporting of low grades at the end of the 4th week of classes, was set to coincide with the last day to withdraw. At that time, the deadline for freshman withdrawals was the end of the 6th week of classes. In an action during the 1996-97 academic year, however, the senate changed the withdrawal deadline to the 9th Friday after classes begin, without changing the date for freshman low grade notification.

ATTACHMENT 77/9
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998

SUBMITTED BY AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SENATE/UNION RELATIONS

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF UNITED ACADEMICS ONGOING
NEGOTIATIONS
1/22/98

- Whereas United Academics is a democratic organization founded to protect the professional integrity of the faculty;
- Whereas United Academics is an organization with a profound interest in maintaining effective faculty governance throughout the University system;
- Whereas United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate both strongly support academic freedom;
- Whereas both the UAF Faculty Senate and United Academics are democratically run organizations acting on behalf of the faculty for complementary interests;
- Whereas United Academics takes an active part in constructively critiquing and advising the administration of the University of Alaska on a wide variety of matters of interest to faculty members;
- Whereas United Academics seeks to support student and staff constituencies in matters of mutual interest;
- Whereas both United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate share an intense interest in current and future funding of the University, the consequences to academic programs of that funding, and the application of those resources to the living and working conditions of the faculty and their families;
- Whereas both United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate recognize the critical central role of faculty governance in assuring academic quality;
- Whereas the issue of declining faculty morale is of great concern to both United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate;
- Whereas there is an emerging and highly successful working relationship between United Academics and the UAF Faculty Senate in areas of mutual concern;
- Whereas United Academics has been engaged for well over a year in a good faith effort to negotiate contract with the administration of the University of Alaska;
- Therefore be it resolved that the UAF Faculty Senate shares the United Academics position protecting the faculty's rights and responsibilities in curricular review, assurance of the quality of academic programs, and granting of degrees at the University;
- Furthermore be it resolved that the UAF Faculty Senate supports the efforts of United Academics to successfully negotiate a fair, equitable, and timely collective bargaining agreement with the administration of the University of Alaska.

ATTACHMENT 77/10

UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves that drafting of the UAF academic calendar be the responsibility of the Senate's administrative committee, based upon information supplied by the Office of the Registrar. The draft calendar would then be approved by the UAF Faculty Senate, the UAF Staff Council, and ASUAF, with the UAF Coordinating Committee responsible for coordinating the three reviews and submitting the completed calendar to the chancellor. The final draft submitted to the Chancellor cannot violate relevant UAF rules regarding the number of days instruction and related rules unless the UAF Faculty Senate provides a needed one-time dispensation required by extraordinary circumstances.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The UAF Governance Coordinating Committee has failed to abide by certain UAF rules regarding the calendar or to ask the Senate for revisions to the rules. Neither has it submitted its drafts to the three governance groups for their concurrence. Recent policies by the Board of Regents have made it increasingly difficult to maintain our high level of student contact hours and still satisfy the Regents' demand that we specify the exact day being added to the calendar to make up for the loss of instruction on Civil Rights Day.

ATTACHMENT 77/11
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTION
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the proposed amendments to the Faculty Alliance Constitution.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

(()) = deletions
 CAPS = additions

University of Alaska
 FACULTY ALLIANCE

Constitution
 Proposed Revisions

ARTICLE I. INTENT

It is the intent of the Board of Regents: 1) that the faculty shall share in the governance of the university, 2) that shared governance is an integral part of the business of the university, and 3) that participators in shared governance are empowered by the Board of Regents to carry out their governance responsibilities to the best of their abilities without interference or fear of reprisal.

ARTICLE II. NAME

The Board of Regents hereby establishes a mechanism for faculty system governance consisting of an Alliance, hereinafter "Alliance."

ARTICLE III. AUTHORITY, PURPOSES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Authority

The Alliance receives its authority by policy 03.01.01 of the University of Alaska Board of Regents which derives its authority from the Constitution and statutes of the State of Alaska. The Alliance shall carry out its functions subject to the authority of the Board of Regents and the President of the University.

B. Purposes

1. Representation

To provide official representation for the faculty of the University of Alaska in matters which affect the general welfare of the University and its educational purposes and effectiveness.

2. Consultation

To provide consultation to the President of the University and the Board of Regents ((on academic matters and faculty welfare issues)).

3. Communication

To serve as an instrument by which information which is of interest and concern to the university system faculty may be freely collected, disseminated, coordinated, and discussed.

C. Responsibilities

The Alliance recognizes the faculty of the individual academic major administrative units as having the primary responsibility and authority for recommending the establishment of degree requirements; implementing the degree requirements; establishing the curriculum, the subject matter and methods for instruction; determining when established degree requirements are met; and recommending to the President of the Board of Regents the granting of degrees thus achieved. The Alliance shall have AN advisory and coordinating role in academic affairs; no action of the Alliance shall abridge individual academic major administrative unit's authority in academic matters OR BARGAINING UNIT AUTHORITY REGARDING SUBJECTS OF MANDATORY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

When issues have statewide impact, the responsibilities of the Alliance may include, but are not limited to: 1) coordination on

matters relating to academic affairs such as academic program review; the addition, deletion or merging of academic programs; curriculum; subject matter and methods of instruction, those aspects of student life relating to the educational process such as degree requirements, grading policy, course coordination and transfer, student probation and suspension, standards of admission and scholastic standards; and faculty welfare issues, including, but not limited to compensation, benefits, appointments, reappointments and termination, workload, promotions, the granting of tenure, dismissal, ethics, and 2) other matters relating to the general welfare of the university, its educational purposes and effectiveness.

Representatives shall promote maximum dissemination of information to the local faculty senates and before voting in the Alliance.

ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

A. Membership

The membership of the Alliance shall consist of three faculty each from the University of Alaska Anchorage, University of Alaska Fairbanks and University of Alaska Southeast.

If issues require special knowledge, one or more of the three votes from each campus may be designated to alternate faculty members.

B. Selection

Representatives to the Alliance shall be selected in such a manner as prescribed by the UAA Faculty Senate, the UAF Faculty Senate and the UAS Faculty Council, hereinafter "local faculty governance groups".

C. Term of service

The term of service shall be one year.

D. Recall of members

Any member may be recalled by the local faculty governance group by which the member was chosen. The method of recall shall be determined by the local faculty governance group. That local faculty governance group shall select a replacement to complete the term of office.

E. Official Spokesperson

1. Election

The official spokesperson of the Alliance is the Alliance Chair. The Chair shall be elected by and from the voting membership by a majority vote, with at least one vote from each MAU required.

2. Duties

The Alliance Chair shall a) preside over all meetings of the Alliance and b) represent the Alliance, except that the Chair is required to present majority and minority opinions regardless of personal opinion. The chair may delegate these duties to

another Alliance member.

F. Task Forces

The Alliance may establish task forces independently or in response to requests of the Board of Regents or the President of the University to consider complex system wide issues relating primarily to academic matters or faculty welfare issues.

Issues and suggestions of the task force, from whatever source, shall be referred to local faculty senates and council before action occurs at the Alliance level.

ARTICLE V. MEETINGS

A. Regular and special meetings

The Alliance shall have ((four)) A MINIMUM OF EIGHT regular meetings during the academic year. At least once per semester, the Alliance shall meet with the President of the University to identify system issues and plan for the coming year. Special Alliance meetings may be called by the Board of Regents, the President of the University, the Chair of the Alliance, or on petition of one-third of the membership of the Alliance.

B. Voting

Voting shall be by simple majority of the full voting membership to include at least one member from each MAU, except for amendments to the Alliance constitution or bylaws. Amendments to membership rights require a unanimous vote.

Representatives may defer voting pending action by local faculty senates and council on the issue.

ARTICLE VI. QUORUM

A minimum of a simple majority of the voting membership to include at least one member from each MAU shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VII. PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

The parliamentary authority shall be the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE VIII. CONSTITUTIONS AND BYLAWS, AMENDMENTS, APPROVAL

A. Constitutions and bylaws

The constitution and bylaws, once passed by the Alliance, shall be transmitted to the President of the University for approval and to the Board of Regents for action. Copies of the Alliance constitution and bylaws shall be maintained in the system governance office.

B. Amendments; distribution prior to voting

Amendments to the constitution and bylaws shall be sent to

Alliance members and to the local faculty senates and council at least 30 days prior to the Alliance meeting at which they will be considered. Amendments to the constitution require seven Alliance member votes.

ARTICLE IX. REVIEW AND TRANSMITTAL OF PROPOSALS

A. Review

Submission of administrative proposals and issues affecting the statewide university system faculty shall be in accordance with University Regulation 03.01.01. Those administrative proposals submitted in the summer months shall be acted upon by the local faculty senates and council, and the Alliance by October 15. Proposals relating to faculty requiring immediate implementation for compliance with state or federal law shall be submitted to the Faculty Alliance for review, and may be implemented prior to Alliance action but do not represent official action until the local senates and council are involved in the actions.

B. Transmittal to the President

The system governance executive officer shall submit the original proposal in writing, together with faculty governance input, including majority and minority viewpoints, to the President of the University for information or action.

C. Transmittal to the Board of Regents

The Chair of the Alliance shall present Alliance views. The Chair shall present the minority viewpoint to the Board of Regents if requested by the minority in writing to the Chair before the meeting.

ARTICLE X. ACTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF REGENTS

A. Action by the President

The President of the University shall, in writing, approve, disapprove, or modify an Alliance action, and notify the Chair and the system governance executive officer within forty-five (45) days of receiving notification of the action by the system governance executive officer.

B. Modifications by the President

The President of the University may modify an Alliance action if the modification does not effectively contravene or nullify the purpose or principle involved in the action.

C. Disapproval's

The President of the University shall inform the Alliance of the reasons for any disapproval or modification within one month of disapproving or modifying an Alliance action.

D. Board of Regents notification and action

Alliance actions which are modified or disapproved by the President of the University, together with the statement of reasons, shall be placed on the next Board of Regents' meeting agenda for the information of the Board if requested by the Alliance. At the request of either the President of the

University or the Alliance, the Alliance action which has been modified or disapproved shall be brought before the Board for action. The decision of the Board of Regents is final.

ARTICLE XI. HANDBOOK

The Alliance shall annually submit a directory of Alliance members, a description of the Alliance and how it works, and the annual Alliance calendar to the system governance executive officer for inclusion in the governance handbook. This handbook shall be distributed to the Board of Regents and to the shared governance groups.

ARTICLE XII. REPORTS

The Alliance shall ((annually)) prepare ((a)) reports of activities TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS PRIOR TO EACH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS. ((This)) THESE reports shall be submitted to the system governance executive officer for compilation into ((a)) single ((annual)) reports of governance activities for submission to the President of the University and the Board of Regents. The system governance executive officer shall maintain Alliance ELECTRONIC communications ((via vax, the vax bulletin board)) and prepare system governance news for inclusion in ((vax)) ELECTRONIC and printed newsletters.

ATTACHMENT 77/12
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

MOTION:
 =====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to affirm the Faculty Alliance motion passed on January 22. It is imperative that there be faculty representation on a systemwide Presidential search committee.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

MOTION:
 =====

"The Faculty Alliance of the University of Alaska, by unanimous vote, expresses its astonishment and deep regret that the University of Alaska's Board of Regents intent to proceed on its own to screen, interview, and select the University's next president while offering only token participation to the University's faculty. Should this decision stand in the form implied by the Board's motion of 14 January, 1998, it will do harm to the morale of the academic institution, demean its reputation, and make more difficult the work of the new president of the Regents' institution as he or she struggles to gain the respect of its faculty and become president of the University of Alaska. These are not the attributes of leadership we expect of the Board of Regents and the procedure would call into question the academic standards of any person who would accept the position as president. We urge you to consider that a successful

search cannot be defined merely by the attributes of the individual who accepts the position. Of at least as great relevance to a successful search is a process that unites the university community in a common purpose, resulting in a president with broad-based support among the various university constituencies. In the end, a successful search is one in which the process ultimately forges a stronger and more resilient institution. In the end, a successful search is one in which the process is fully integrated with the principles of shared governance. This action is effective January 22, 1998."

Rationale:

- A. It is the general practice of most colleges and universities to form presidential search committees out of representatives from their diverse constituent groups: faculty, staff, administrators, students, community representatives, and members of the board. The president of our University will be working with all of these groups and their collective assessment should be allowed to narrow the pool of candidates to those whom all or most of these groups could work with comfortably and profitably in the years to come.

Further, most prospective candidates expect to deal with search committees of this type. What message is sent to the candidates when the Board is its own search committee? (1) It does not trust or respect the judgment of its own personnel. (2) It and it alone will be making many of the decisions which this person will be executing. (3) It will be micro-managing the operations of the University.

- B. The Board may find that its search procedure discourages and alienates able candidates, who are looking for a cooperative and supportive environment. This is especially true when they will be faced with the fiscal and organizational challenges of this university.
- C. Finally, this action of the Board harms the morale of the University's faculty. To be excluded in this way from the presidential search speaks eloquently to the University community of the Board's evaluation of faculty. The Board's action says they, not we, are the university. It is the Board's vision, not our shared vision that will determine the University's shape in the years to come.

The UAA Faculty Senate motion:

Motion

=====

The UAA Faculty Senate urges the Board of Regents to reconsider their action limiting the presidential search committee to Board of Regents members. Members of the faculty, students and community should be included in the voting membership of the search committee.

The following motion was passed at the last meeting of the

Representative Assembly of United Academics.

Motion:

=====

The Representative Assembly of United Academics urges the Regents to have substantial faculty involvement in the Presidential search committee in accord with established American Association of University Professors Policy Statement. Lack of significant faculty involvement impairs the legitimacy of the Presidential search process.

ATTACHMENT 77/13
UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
FEBRUARY 9, 1998
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF THE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 19,
1998

The chair called the meeting to order at 3:00 in Wood Center B.

A quorum of members was present (all committee members except Sukumar Bandopadhyay, Sonya Arnold, and Maynard Perkins). Joining the committee for the discussion of the computer support specialist degree and certificate programs were Jim Stricks, Steve Cysewski, (by audio) Tim Fullam, and Ran Palcic. Present for the discussion on academic disqualification was DeAnn Hallsten. Faculty senate president John Craven attended most of the meeting.

The committee discussed and took action on seven items:

1/2 programs in microcomputer support.

Jim Stricks introduced the proposals and gave a brief history of the nature of the requests and demand for them. Questions arose in three areas. First, the chair asked about the relationship between state of Alaska job descriptions and the academic programs: would students be qualified for jobs by their degrees from the university. Proposers explained that there is a high demand for computer support specialists, but that current job descriptions do not list these degrees as requirements.

Ron Gatterdam expressed a concern about language in the executive summary to the effect that the program would require examination of academic policies--faculty workload, resident credit, and credit for prior learning. He also questioned the last sentence in the first paragraph of the executive summary, "For some, this may become a stepping stone to more advanced work in computer science at the baccalaureate level."

Both Jim Stricks and Steve Cysewski assured committee members that the issues of academic policy focus on accreditation concerns; because they are not essential to the request for program approval, they agreed to remove them from the executive summary. They also agreed that there is no linkage between the proposed computer support specialist programs and the existing computer science programs, and promised to change the language of the sentence to reflect this.

After discussion, the committee took two actions. It voted unanimously to "approve the certificate program in microcomputer support specialist," and in a second vote, also unanimous, approved "the A.A.S. in microcomputer support specialist."

3. freshman grade notification

Registrar Ann Tremarello brought this issue to the attention of the committee. The present policy, which provides for reporting of low grades at the end of the 4th week of classes, was set to coincide with the last day to withdraw. At that time, the deadline for freshman withdrawals was the end of the 6th week of classes. In an action during the 1996-97 academic year, however, the senate changed the withdrawal deadline to the 9th Friday after classes begin, without changing the date for freshman low grade notification.

Ann Tremarello moved, seconded by Carol Barnhardt to move the date of freshman low grade notification to the 6th Friday following the first day of classes. This motion, after discussion, passed unanimously.

4. Academic disqualification

Paul Reichardt and John Craven explained current problems with academic disqualification actions. Currently deans disqualify students twice yearly, after the spring semester (an action which is not regarded as problematical, except by students involved) and after the fall semester. This second disqualification notification jeopardizes students on financial aid, in dorms, and at work in campus jobs; it also occurs after they have spent money on airplane tickets, in the expectation they would be able to continue their studies.

The committee discussed the need for a second disqualification action, and could find no recent university policy requiring it. The consensus of the committee was that a new policy on academic disqualification was necessary. Because the issue is not pressing now, the chair appointed a subcommittee to develop a policy proposal. Sitting on the committee are Ann Tremarello, Wanda Martin, and Paul Reichardt. They will be assisted by DeAnn Hallsten. The subcommittee will report to CAC no later than its March meeting.

5. Whether "D" grades should be disallowed in the minor.

Ron Gatterdam brought this issue to the committee for consideration. One of his constituents had asked why UAF has a policy requiring that "Ds" be disallowed in the major but not in the minor.

After general discussion, revealing that there might be a different structure to requirements in majors and minors, justifying tighter standards for the former, the committee agreed to let the question rest until a need to answer it emerged.

6. Use of core curriculum courses to satisfy major and minor requirements.

This question had been mentioned at previous meetings, but not discussed at length. Committee members asked whether information about the core given to undergraduates was consistent. Ann Tremarello and Gayle Gregory pointed to different sections of the catalog which describe core courses as foundation requirements for majors and as general education requirements for degree programs. No committee member proposed further consideration of this item.

7. The committee's December motion on course-level definitions.

John Craven raised several questions concerning the committee's action, and asked whether the committee wished to reconsider or refine its previous actions. After general discussion, the consensus of committee members was that the CAC motion on course-level definitions reflected UAF practice and did not need to be amended.

Jane Weber asked what time the committee would meet during the rest of the semester. There seemed to be general agreement that the Monday, two weeks after the senate meeting, at 3:00 p.m., would be a good time to meet. The chair scheduled the next committee meeting for February 23rd at 3:00 p.m. The first item on the agenda will be the 1998-98 academic calendar, which appears to have been developed contrary to UAF regulations.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m. Submitted by Jerry McBeath.

ATTACHMENT 77/14
UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
FEBRUARY 9, 1998
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY & SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Faculty and Scholarly Affairs Committee
Minutes, meeting 1/21/98

Present: Rich Boone, Burns Cooper, Ray Gavlak, Terry Johnson, Hans Nielsen, Bob White, John Yarie

The meeting was devoted to discussion of the motion on faculty receiving graduate degrees from UAF, returned to committee at the last Senate meeting. A second issue, on assigning credit hours more accurately to faculty responsible for them, was put off until a later meeting.

We began with six issues suggested by John Craven to summarize the Senate's concerns on the issue. They were:

1. What about faculty members presently in such programs? Should they be "grandfathered"?
2. When is it to be effective? Immediately except for grandfathered?
3. Why is it limited to only tenured and tenure-track faculty?
4. What about getting a degree in another department or college at UAF?
5. What about within an interdisciplinary program?
6. The rationale was not deemed sufficient.

We discussed most of these issues, more or less in the order given.

1. Yes--to keep from breaking promises already made, we should grandfather people already in degree programs by the effective date of the motion. For questionable cases, the affected person should first go to his/her dean or director, who can ask the provost for a ruling. Iber opposes that ruling, he or she could appeal it to a Faculty Senate committee constituted for that purpose. [Added note--would the Faculty Appeals and Oversight committee be appropriate for this? --BC]

2. Not discussed at length.

3. There was extensive discussion on this point. The conclusions we finally reached were that tenured/tenure-track faculty and research faculty should be included, while instructors and adjuncts, especially part-timers, should not. If part of the rationale for the motion is that faculty should not be granting degrees to themselves, then tenure-track faculty are clearly included. Though research faculty are not tenured, they are equivalent to regular faculty in

other ways:

They are full-time, they are presumed to have Ph.D.s or the equivalent before starting the job, and most importantly, they supervise graduate students and sometimes teach as affiliates to academic departments. Thus they are involved in the degree-granting process. Bob White also argued that regular grad students might feel like "second-class students" if they were competing with faculty members. Adjunct faculty, however, have little or no academic authority and may be teaching as a secondary interest to another career in which they may need to pursue a degree.

4&5. This was the most controversial issue. Terry Johnson pointed out that, for example, people in his field (marine management) often have a Master's degree as a terminal degree, but may want to pursue a degree in a different but peripherally related field, such as business. This is similar to the problem with extension agents discussed at the full Senate meeting. It would be difficult for extension faculty to go out of state for these degrees. The counter-arguments, expressed by Hans Nielsen, Rich Boone, and Bob White, were that a) such faculty are still technically granting themselves degrees, since degrees are granted by the whole faculty and b) it would be difficult if not impossible to ensure that they were not using state funds and time to pursue a personal benefit, especially if they didn't take leave without pay to do it. Several people argued that there is a definite difference between taking courses to enhance one's performance in one's own field, which is to be encouraged and perhaps expected, and pursuing a degree, presumably outside one's primary field. Bob White also pointed out that some people are already going to Outside universities on their own time and expense, and may feel unfairly treated if others are allowed to get around this requirement. Consensus: No--degrees in other departments or colleges would still be too problematic.

6. Ray Gavlak agreed to write a new motion and rationale on the basis of this discussion.

submitted by Burns Cooper

ATTACHMENT 77/15
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

Report of the Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs
 Committee

The GPCAC met on 12/10/97, 12/17/97, and 1/23/98. Meetings during December 1997 dealt with reviewing applications for numerous new/trial course requests, course changes, program changes, and one new program. A full listing of the changes approved is available in the GPCAC minutes for those meetings. The most significant of these resulted in a motion for the senate to approve a new Ph.D. program in marine biology.

The committee in conjunction with the ad hoc committee on stacking and cross-listing discussed the issue of terminology and requirements for stacked and cross-listed courses. These discussions resulted in a motion to clarify the language used for these course listings in the UAF Catalog.

The committee reviewed the graduate course definitions in the draft

course definitions submitted by the UA Faculty Alliance and made minor corrections to the definition of 600 level courses.

John Craven completed a review of the issue of final semester registration for graduate students and the committee agreed with his recommendation that no further action should be taken to change university policy regarding this matter.

Submitted by: Michael Whalen

ATTACHMENT 77/16
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY CORE REVIEW

CORE REVIEW COMMITTEE, Meeting notes: 17 Dec 1997

Agenda item #1: Approval of "O" and "W" applications

The Committee unanimously accepted the recommendations from Renee Manfredi and Jin Brown.

Agenda item #2: Approval of undergraduate CORE course changes

The Committee unanimously accepted all changes.

Agenda item #3: Recommendation for budget support for assessment work (information requested by Dana Thomas)

The Committee could make no sound recommendation in that it lacks sufficient information. The "ballpark figure" for CORE assessment we guessed to be \$25 - 30 thousand. We would invite Professor Thomas to come guess with us.

Agenda item #4: Assessment Matters

* Perspectives on the Human Condition:

The Committee has in hand assessment plans for all CORE Perspectives areas EXCEPT foreign languages. All areas are proceeding to gather data and work out any problems with assessment plans in Spring semester, 1998.

* Library Science has implemented a plan for assessment and begun (Fall 1997) to gather data. Their process will be ongoing.

* Communications:

The Department of English is implementing their assessment plan for Engl 211 and 213. Portfolio data will continue be gathered in Spring and analysis will begin at the end of Spring semester. The Department of Communication has been gathering and analyzing data (both quantitative and qualitative) for three semesters. Information gathered has been used to modify (improve) the CORE Comm courses. Assessment is an embedded process and will continue.

* TVC: The Committee has empowered the Chair to contact the Dean and Director of TVC to invite them into the mandated assessment process. It was noted that the assessment of courses offered by TVC should be synonymous with assessment procedures for the same courses offered at UAF so that no added effort need be expended nor costs incurred.

* Rural Sites/Distance Delivery: Professor Thomas has said that the mandate is for ALL credit offerings so we must see how these areas can be assessed. The Committee again suggested that the Chair contact the Dean and

Director.

- * Math/Natural Sciences: The Committee understands that the Dean has already been working with the Sciences to anticipate an assessment plan. We will invite Dean Reichardt and Professor Lando to meet with the Committee early in the Spring semester.

The Committee's timetable for assessment plans remains on target with the exception of Foreign Languages, and the Department Head has assigned the assessment plan to one of his faculty. The target for on-campus assessment is to have the entire CORE with assessment plans completed by the end of Spring semester, 1998. A "first round" of assessment findings on CORE Perspectives courses will be reported to the University at the end of Spring semester.

Agenda item #5: Enforcement of prerequisites for CORE "O" and "W" enrollments.

Having written the Registrar (18 November) with no response, the Chair was requested to speak personally with the Registrar about how quickly the Committee might expect registration to set BANNER to restrict these prerequisites. I ask Ann and she suggested that it would not be possible until Fall. I reiterated that CORE Review considers this to be a very important matter, particularly in regard to the mandated assessment of CORE Curriculum and that we would like the matter to receive a high priority.

Agenda item #6: Petitions to the CORE

Following our usual procedure, the Chair assigned approval/denial status to each petition and opened the discussion of this meeting's petitions. For the first time, the Committee reversed the Chair on one petition. A precedent was established in regard to MATH 161. The Committee granted CORE approval of 161 as meeting the CORE Math requirement, citing the confusion created by the catalog regarding credit for this course in relation to MATH 107. The Chair was instructed to invite a representative of the Department of Mathematics to address the Committee in regard to these courses.

CORE Review Meeting, 21 January 1998

Agenda Item #1 Review of status of ongoing work.

- * Status of Assessment of CORE Curriculum
 - + "O" and "W" assessment for Spring, 1998
 - All sample classes notified prior to end of Fall semester, 1997. First data to be gathered this (Spring 98) semester.
 - + Perspectives on the Human Condition
 - Assessment plans in hand for all saving Foreign Languages. All courses to be gathering (or continue gathering) data Spring 98.
- * Communications
 - Assessment plans in place and data being gathered Spring 98. (English has data from Fall 97; Communication has data from Fall 96 onward).
- + Natural Sciences
 - Dean Reichardt coming on 4 Feb to discuss plans for assessment. Schedule calls for assessment plan by end of Spring 98 and data gathering Fall 98.
- + Mathematics
 - Professor Lando coming on 4 February to discuss plans for assessment. Schedule calls for assessment plan by end of Spring 98 and data gathering Fall 98.

- + TVC, Rural Sites, Distance Delivery
Committee has instructed Chair to invite Dean Gabrielli, Director Lister, and Director Stricks to CORE to discuss the assessment of those areas. The Committee will request that Professor Thomas, Chair of Outcome Assessments, also attend that meeting.

Agenda Item #2 Petitions

The Committee adjudicated four petitions. It was noted that the petitioning of CORE courses is still declining. We hope that our procedures over the past three semesters are responsible for the drop in numbers.

Agenda Item #3 Meeting Times for Spring 98

CORE Curriculum Review will meet every two weeks with the exception of Spring Break. Meetings will be on Wednesdays at 1:00 in Library Conference Room 341.

Agenda Item #4 Other

* Committee suggested the Chair contact the Provost in regard to our concern with restricting upper level "O" and "W" courses THRU BANNER to students who have successfully completed the prerequisites.

Dean Hedahl suggested the Chair attend Friday's instructional working group.

* Committee members asked the Chair to request the Registrar for an alteration to future Course Schedule booklets. We believe that some confusion and subsequent petitioning could be avoided if each semester the "O" and "W" courses were marked as such and CORE Sciences marked as "breadth" or "depth."

* The Committee would also like a status report from Curricular Affairs in regard to changes in the University petitioning process.

Jin Brown, Chair
CORE Curriculum Review Committee

ATTACHMENT 77/17
UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
FEBRUARY 9, 1998
SUBMITTED BY FACULTY APPEALS & OVERSIGHT

FACULTY APPEALS AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE - John Kelley, Chair

The fourth meeting of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee was held on December 12, 1997 in the Chancellor's conference room. The following members were present:

PRESENT: Godwin Chukwu, CNRDM/SME; Ted Cooney, SFOS; Fred Dyen, CRA; Meriam Karlsson, CHRDM/SALRM; John Kelley, SFOS (Chair); Richard Seifert, ACE; James Ruppert, CLA; Fred Sorensen, ACE; David Verbyla, CNRDM/SALRM

ABSENT: Greg Goering, CNRDM/SOM; *Roy Bird, CLA; Richard Stolzberg, CSEM; Barbara Wilson, CRA; CNRDM/SOM (99) (vacant); CNRDM/SME (98) (vacant); CSEM (99) (vacant-Engineering or Math)

* Representative elected at special election held November 1997

1. REVIEW OF THE GRADE APPEALS POLICY

Several members of this committee have served on grade appeals panels during the fall semester. Concerns regarding clarification of the policy were expressed about the present Grade Appeals Policy. A recommendation (Fred Dyen) was made to invite Don Foley, Dir. Judicial Services/Assoc. Dean Student Services, to review the present policy with the committee based on his extensive experience.

Dr. Foley felt that the present policy was much improved from previous policies. However, there appeared to be several issues for future consideration.

1. There appears to be a divided faculty on the UAF campus as to what powers the committee should have, e.g. ., advisory only, decision-making.

2. There are no "teeth" in the policy.

3. Timeliness in assembling a panel is a problem. Attempts to get eight panelists together within "ten working days" has been a problem for both the panelists and appellant. For example, spring semester students may not have their appeal heard until the fall semester.

4. Each Dean seems to have their own prescription as to how to proceed with an appeal. For example, there is a need to resolve who is responsible for document distribution.

5. The system presently provides for a prehearing to assess arbitrary/capricious grading. In practice, the prehearing and hearing usually are held at the same time.

Fred Sorensen asked if video conference hearings have been used. Don Foley stated that they had been used.

The committee asked if it would be beneficial to review the policy. Don Foley stated that there had not been one appeal that met the time constraint. It would be more realistic to schedule a month from the receipt of an appeal request to hold the hearing. If further time was required the policy has a section for deadline adjustment for cause (Section III A.6).

Dr. Ruppert asked what happens to the appeal committee decision ("teeth" issue). Dr. Foley emphasized that the instructor makes the final decision. In the case of missing faculty, then the university must institute a tedious search procedure to resolve the issue.

The appeals policy is being rewritten for the faculty Senate. The contact person for this task is Dr. Sukumar Bandopadhyay. Fred Dyen felt that it was wrong for our committee to have only advisory status. Dr. Foley advised that whatever we draft we should review Board of Regents Policy, Chapter 3--Student Dispute Resolution.

The committee requested that before further action on appeals policy is taken up additional information is needed. The committee requested that Sheri Layral pull together all relevant university action regarding grade appeal policy and an official statement regarding the charge to this committee.

2. RESOLUTION OF COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The committee still seeks resolution to unfilled positions. However, progress has been made to obtain enough members to represent the units and carry on the work of the committee.

3. APPEALS ACTIONS BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Several members have participated in appeals hearings. The committee requested that Don Foley keep track of the hearings to

provide information for our report to the Senate in the spring.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

None

5. NEXT MEETING

A firm date was not set for the next meeting. Many of the members of this committee will be absent until the beginning of the next semester. A date will be set in mid-January.

Report of the fifth meeting of the Faculty Appeals and Oversight Committee.

PRESENT: Roy Bird, CLA; Godwin Chukwu, CNRDM/SME; Fred Dyen, CRA; Meriam Karlsson, CNRDM; John Kelley, SFOS; James Ruppert, CLA; Richard Seifert, ACE; Richard Stolzberg, CSEM; David Verbyla, CNRDM; Barbara Wilson, CRA.

ABSENT: Ted Cooney, SFOS; Greg Goering, CNRDM/SOM.

1. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP-

The present committee consists of 16 positions representing the units. After reorganization of the college units a certain amount of confusion resulted in how to allocate representatives with the result that three positions are vacant (CNRDM/SOM, CHRDM/SME, and CSEM) and in need of resolution. Previous requests to the units to discuss or provide representation have not been successful.

Fred Dyen suggested that we also need to consider the desirability of keeping the committee relatively small and efficient while still retaining equitable representation. Meriam Karlsson felt that this issue ought to be presented to the Senate. Roy Bird felt that since reorganization we need to reevaluate present status. Other committee members suggested that we are primarily dealing with individual appeal cases and can operate fairly and work with what we have under the present mandate.

Richard Seifert made a MOTION that we need to have the membership problem resolved by the Faculty Senate. Fred Dyen made a friendly amendment to suggest that the Senate have the Appeals and Oversight Committee representation mirror that of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The motion including the amendment was approved.

2. OLD BUSINESS-

Dr. Chukwu stated that there is a need to clarify the appeals process in light of this committee's and union's responsibilities. Richard Seifert reminded the committee that past experience has shown that the Senate was most effective in addressing academic matters but not money related matters. The union was more effective in treating the latter.

3. NEW BUSINESS-

Fred Dyen asked what progress has occurred following Dr. Foley's visit with this committee in December. This committee requested information from the governance office: (1) all relevant university action regarding grade appeal policy and (2) an official

statement regarding the charge to the committee.

ATTACHMENT 77/18
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 SUBMITTED BY AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SENATE/UNION RELATIONS

Ad Hoc Committee on Senate/Union Relations - Ron Gatterdam, Chair

1. The Senate/Union ad hoc committee reports that it is working on a second draft of a questionnaire which will be sent to 10 to 20 selected institutions of higher education concerning the roles of governance, union, and administration. It is also in the process of selecting those institutions. The intent is that, based on the responses, approximately 5 institutions will be selected from which to obtain further in depth information (most likely by phone).
2. The committee recommends that the Senate pass the resolution of support for efforts to negotiate a union agreement.

ATTACHMENT 77/19
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #77
 FEBRUARY 9, 1998

23 December 1997

Faculty Discussion on RIP 2
 Senate Meeting #75
 November 10, 1997

The following brief notes were taken by John Craven during the round-table discussion and were later improved by Madeline Schatz. No other comments have been received from members of the Senate. They are being distributed with the revisions as background material for our February 1998 Senate meeting.

Select an example (for replacing RIPed faculty) used last year that the Provost believes was successful in answering his request, and use that example as the basis for submitting all forms in this year's RIP- replacement activities.

We, the faculty, have not seen a list of replacements for the RIP-1 positions, which complicates our ability to address issues related to RIP 2. For example, which positions have been filled (permanent and adjunct) and which are still in the act of being replaced? Which positions did not get replaced? We request an administrative report to the faculty on the details of RIP 1.

The process used last year was divisive at the college level. For example, some faculty members were making the decisions about other departments and then sending the results on to the dean. Members of a department have every right to be made aware of all recommendations to the dean

The savings were not calculated correctly as startup funds were not

included in the cost of hiring new faculty.

There was no method by which the faculty could independently address a dean's recommendations to the provost; the only faculty contribution was within the early bidding process. There was no opportunity necessarily provided for the faculty to review (or even know of) a dean's proposed or final recommendations.

Denigration of faculty participation. Faculty participation was an illusion. What is the use of participating in such a process.

RIP was not meant to be strictly a management tool. It was conceived originally as a collaborative instrument, but that is not the way UA is using it. (This view point is simply not agreed to by the administration. It was first raised by a faculty member at UAS who is familiar with some of the ideas discussed by the legislature.)

UA is ahead of Chancellor Wadlow's RSO committee in that we are already out-sourcing the instructional work load to adjuncts.

Should put new full-time faculty in positions where RIPs occurred.

We can talk until blue, but to be heard we must demand to be part of the replacement decision process.

The result of the present process is that some programs will go away. But, who is making those decisions and who should be making those decisions?

The same process will be repeated if nothing happens. Requires action demanding faculty input at the chancellor's level. The Administrative Committee must draft a resolution to this affect and bring it to the December meeting.

What planning exists for faculty replacements in order to guide the procedure? Include the need for planning in the resolution.

What few are being replaced in Cooperative Extension can't be replaced before some future date.

Distance delivery is being used increasingly for local programs; more out-sourcing. Greater impact on rural students.