

MINUTES
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #77
 MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1998
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

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

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Finney, B.
 Johnson, T.
 Lin, C.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Castellini, M.
 Cooney, T.
 Chukwu, G.
 Ducharme, J.
 Gabrielli, R.
 Gregory, G.
 Keating, J.
 Layral, S.
 Massey, P.
 Mcfadden, I.
 Sfraga, M.
 Stricks, J.
 Wadlow, J.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Nuss, S. - President, ASUAF (J. Richardson)
 Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA
 Tremarello, A - University Registrar

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Long, P. - President, UAFSC
 Eichholz, M. - GSO

B. The minutes to Meeting #75 & #76 (November 10 and December 8, 1997) were approved as distributed via e-mail.

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

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

- A. Motions approved: none
 B. Motions pending: none

III A. Remarks from Chancellor Wadlow -

Chancellor Wadlow spoke on the upcoming workshops she will be hosting at the end of the week. The meetings will include deans, directors, and governance leaders. This is a way of communicating and addressing issues. The workshops also provide additional input into the decision making process. About 40 people will attend over the two days. Among the general issues they will deal with is accreditation. Four additional reports will be due in April. The Provost will provide an update on the status of these reports. There will be two break out sessions. One issue will include how to go about unit accreditation. Another general issue will be on communicating Goals 2000. Dana Thomas will discuss specific achievements on outcomes assessment. This is required in all accreditations. Work is being done on Core curriculum and some departmental assessments.

Financial matters will be another issue discussed at the workshops. In particular, how to pay the anticipated bills for FY99. Cost savings will be looked at. They will focus on the record of 1996-97 RIP replacement funds and how they were used and review the positions permanently gone. They will look at positions that are high priority but were not recruited permanently. The one-year funds received from the BOR from the annual maintenance budget will also be looked at. Need to look ahead at FY99. A breakout session will ask participants how to use RIP replacement funds. The goal would be to use 100% of the funds, but they need to look at goals for 50-75%. Dorothy Jones will review shrinking goals of EEO.

Enrollment issues will include a report from Laura Milner. This will be a student report on the student loan program. Charlie Dexter, Carla Kirts, and Sue Wilken will highlight enrollment trends.

The other systemwide committees will give reports. Ralph Gabrielli and Maynard Perkins will give a report. John Craven and Paul Reichardt will give an update on their committee work.

Participants will brainstorm on legislative strategy and the increased participation of rural sites in legislative action and enrollment. Other brainstorming reports may include: development, small grants program, scholarships, ideas for partnerships, and ideas for supervisory training.

The Brooks Building estimates are completed and include what money and specific work items are needed to rejuvenate the building. The cost is over \$5 million. They did a thorough job of looking at the building. They will make a report to the Board.

Jerry McBeath asked Wadlow if she had the authority to spend 100% of the RIP savings. Wadlow indicated that she did have authority to use the savings, as long as the bills are paid.

B. Remarks from Provost, Jack Keating -

Provost Keating spoke on two items. The first item was the current undergraduate research competition for \$25,000 to buy equipment or present papers at meetings.

The School of Education will have a review by the TORAK committee. This will precede their visit before the Department of Education. UAF education faculty will meet with UAA and UAS faculty in Anchorage this weekend.

There was some discussion on how to identify faculty who teach by distance delivery. There is a need to make money available to provide courses and provide a BA degree in rural sites.

Two committees are being formed, one on Human Resources and one on Information Technology.

C. Remarks by John French - Status of the faculty collective bargaining agreement.

A little over a week ago the United Academics and the University administration reached a tentative agreement. The Representative Assembly of United Academics vote to forward the agreement to the members. Ballots will be send out and next week there will be meetings on each campus. Ballots will be due back by March 2nd.

The contract is a complex document which is a series of compromises. There are many things that some will like and others will dislike. There are a lot of interrelationships between various parts. John strongly encouraged member to read the whole document. It's very important that everyone give it serious and through deliberation.

IV Governance Reports

A. ASUAF - J. Richardson

The Senate President Jean Richardson gave the ASUAF report. ASUAF continues to focus on legislative issues. They have collected POMs on Con Bunde's bill and faxed 25 POMs this morning to Juneau. ASUAF is sending six students to the Board of Regents meeting in Juneau. Legislative Affairs members will lobby along with Jean and Steve Nuss.

A student survey is in progress. It focuses on awareness of the university budget process and tuition. One question will be on a student's academic department being hurt by cuts. ASUAF is also collecting signatures for ads.

The Senate is looking at a bill on mathematics reform and the use of calculators in advanced courses. They will ask for a departmental policy.

B. Staff Council - P. Long

No report was available.

C. President's Comments - J. Craven

John submitted his comments with the agenda. Selected comments include: Madeline Schatz will give a report on the meeting with the Board of Regents last week. Included in the agenda is a motion on academic calendar. This motion is proposed to solve the log jam and disarray of the academic calendar. Committees need to complete work on issues at hand. John mentioned the President-Elect position. Joe Hayes has been in contact asking about the faculty voice on issues. Kara Nance asked about email address for the legislators. These are available on the Legislative web site and will be distributed to Senate members.

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

A report was attached to the agenda. Madeline also expressed her

gratitude to the negotiation committee and appreciation to John French for his work. In addition Madeline submitted a report on the Faculty Alliance/Board of Regents meeting as a handout. The handout is Madeline's summary of what went on at the meeting. The Alliance came away from the meeting with a new collegiality with the Board of Regents. What went on at the meetings was a moving together of the faculty and the Board of Regents. Regent Thomas and Regent Croft are very strong supporters of faculty involvement. The Board now wants to have members of the Faculty Alliance join them a least once a year for a meeting to have a face-to-face discussion. After heavy lobbying by members of the Faculty Alliance, faculty ended up with representation on the entire search process. Madeline also feels that the presidential search firm hired is excellent.

McBeath asked about the evaluation process of the search. President Kelley will be in discussion with John Craven about membership on the committee so that he can take it to the Board next week. At the Board of Regents' meeting they will get very specific on the level of contribution on the committee.

Linda Curda asked who would select faculty to be part of the process. John Craven indicated that it would come from the Faculty Alliance. Linda requested that an extended site faculty be a member. This has been taken care of.

BOARD OF REGENTS RETREAT

Thursday, 2/7/98 and Friday, 2/8/98

The UA Faculty Alliance participation in the UA Board of Regents meeting began on Thursday morning, February 7. We were invited to participate in a dialog with the board regarding the Presidential Search committee after two previous audio conferences between the Alliance and a few members of the board. All members of the Alliance were present at the morning meeting except for Janet Dye from Juneau, who was unable to re-arrange her schedule.

Several members of our group began the session by making introductions, framing the problem from our point of view, stating the history of the presidential search process and summarizing our position. Some of the Regents made comments regarding the fact that we should continue with the direction of rapport in which we seemed to be going. Statements were also made at that time that there was a feeling by at least a few Regents that the faculty wish to do away with the Statewide Administration. One board member then stated that he believed strongly that the faculty is the central point of the university and that a presidential search could not be conducted without us, the staff, and the community. We heard other comments, also, regarding negative e-mail which they had been receiving. Other Regents commented that the decision to constitute themselves as the search committee with no other sitting members was made to include everyone equally. We were reminded that the Alaska State Constitution mandates that the Board of Regents (and them only) hire the president. This mandate does not extend that right to the faculty. One board member mentioned that this mandate would have the tendency to make faculty members feel excluded.

The Alliance members were given a great deal of time to respond, in kind, to the Board members. We worked very hard to convince them of several things: 1) that we understand the constitutional mandate, 2) that negative e-mail which they might be receiving does not necessarily represent the views of all faculty, 3) that we were not trying to take away their power but trying to create a collegial process with face-to-face interchange of ideas in the selection of

the new university president, and 4) that the exclusion of faculty from this committee sends a negative message to us.

At the end of this morning session, which lasted almost three hours, the Regents were standing firm in their resolve to not include the faculty in the process until the final stages of the search.

Some of the Alliance members retired to another conference room to re-group and strategize. Bob Kuhner came up with a proposal/ compromise for the Regents which involved faculty in the process at two crucial stages. The proposal suggested that six faculty join the Regents in the discussion of the final job description (after all groups have had input and the Presidential Search firm had been chosen). And, that when the search firm had chosen the top 15 - 20 candidates that the Board would again invite six faculty members to participate in the prioritizing of those candidates with equal weight in prioritization to the Regents.

Other Alliance members stayed with the Regents while they discussed their vision for the direction and structure of the University of Alaska. They wanted the public to know that they are not confused about their vision and that this vision must be put on paper in a concise, understandable way to be handed to candidates for the position of President of UA. It was decided that they would list what it is that they know about their vision and then state it in writing. The following documents were chosen to be the major documents and ideas upon which a final vision statement would be built:

- Purposes, Principles and Priorities
- Bargaining Principles
- Regent Croft's motion on the Wadlow and Komisar reports
- UA Mission Statement
- Rural/Extended site mission statement
- Structure of the Administration ("in a state of becoming")
- Faculty, staff and student morale
- Legislative program for increased funding for the physical plant and deferred maintenance
- External funding
- Land Grant mission
- Program evaluation ("as important to the Board of Regents as looking for administrative cost reductions")

The BOR then turned to the discussion of the qualifications and characteristics which they wanted to have in the new UA President. It was decided that experience in an academic setting was not necessary. The successful candidate could have other life experiences which would be equal to that experience. They decided to accept academic OR business management background. The quality of strength seemed to be a common thread in each regent's requirements for a new president.

Much discussion ensued over a couple of drafts which had been collated from previous board discussions regarding qualifications and characteristics. Further revising of these documents was made at this time, and the revised documents will be brought before the BOR at their meeting in a couple of weeks.

At 5 pm President Kelly asked the board if they would mind staying for another half-hour to discuss the composition of the search committee. He seemed to be quite impressed that two of us on the Alliance had sat through the entire day's proceedings and wanted to get back to the discussion of this subject. The BOR agreed to stay and the idea of the "constitutional mandate" immediately surfaced again. President Kelly put forth a proposal for an evaluation

committee which would be based on geographical representation and include 1-2 students, 3-4 faculty, 1 staff and 1-2 alumni. Their job would be to review the job description and provide comments thereon, to review the web and written input and provide comments thereon, to review the applications and provide comments, and to assist in or take responsibility for the visits of the finalists to the campuses.

Barbara Harville and I, the two remaining Alliance members at this late hour, proposed Bob Kuhner's ideas for faculty involvement in the creation of the final job description and voting rights in the prioritization of final candidates (realizing, of course, that the BOR has final veto power over any candidates and could pull in any candidates culled from a previous group). Regent Croft put forth a third proposal which would create a separate evaluation/advisory committee which would participate fully in the search process. This committee would consist of 3 board members, 4 faculty, 1 staff member, 1 alumnus, and 2 members from the public sector.

The Board decided that no decision would be made on the acceptance or rejection of these proposals until the next day after the selection of the Presidential Search Firm. Barb and I stayed on to lobby and then returned to our respective abodes for the evening.

On Day 2, two Search Consultant firms were interviewed via video conference. The firm of Heidrick and Struggles were chosen to represent us. Barbara and I, who attended the second day's activities, agreed wholeheartedly in the decision. We feel that Betty Hasler of Heidrick and Struggles is fully capable of leading the search for candidates. She was fully sensitive to the needs of the university, believes that faculty should participate in the search at all stages and suggested to the BOR that they augment themselves as a search committee by elected faculty representatives. These faculty would then be charged with reporting back to the faculty at large. She believes that our time-table of having a new president in place by September is an aggressive one and stated that her organization has a firm commitment to making sure that faculty are still on campus when finalists come for interviews.

The BOR asked Barbara and me our opinions on the two firms before going into a short executive session for discussion and then coming back for the vote.

After the selection was made President Kelly, once again introduced the discussion of the composition of the Search Committee. Several board members did not want to make any decisions until they had met with the search consultant. They were reminded that the search consultant was in favor of faculty participation. A motion was made to include faculty in the process and to postpone the decision on the exact make-up of the "committee" until meeting with the search consultant. The motion passed. Faculty, staff, student, alumnus and community representation will be included in the process.

Madeline Schatz

V Public Comments/Questions -

1. Paul Massey, co-chair of the United Way addressed the Senate. He expressed his concern about the downsizing of the university and the lack of concern by the executive branch.

United Way is in the process of wrapping up their campaign. Over the past five years there has been a dramatic drop in contributions from the university. They are looking for ideas to help the cause.

Tara Maginnis stated her lack of faith in large organizations. She feels that it's better to give to smaller groups. Massey indicated that individuals can designate their contributions to specific agencies. McBeath indicated that you need to get more faculty involved in the solicitation. The more people involved the better. Porter indicated that one thing that has happened is we have retired the faculty who have the extra money to contribute. Vera Alexander indicated that their unit no longer has the staff necessary to get the word out.

Paul Massey indicated that the University has been at the top of the list of donors. They are about even with the School District. Aleyska is probably the top donor because of their matching funds.

2. Iolaire Mcfadden, is a graduating senior in May and a member of the ASUAF Senate. He is also a member of the technology board and wanted to offer a suggestion to improve the students' access to information. He would like to see UAF course syllabus for each professor on line. This would be very valuable to new students and continuing students to know what a professor taught, how they graded, and what the requirements would be. This would also help in the transfer credit process. A syllabus is needed to assist in the transfer process.

Over the years there would be an extensive data base that students could look at. A single source would be very good. Many faculty currently have their syllabus on line, but a new student would not know where to find it. The cost would be relatively low and would not be difficult to get them on disk. It would be beneficial to the student population. If a good proposal was submitted he would be supportive of using technology fees to support this project. Overall, the biggest impact would be to UAF. UAF is currently rated 56 out of 100 as far as technology on campus by Yahoo. Something like this would prove that we are in the forefront and we are making the effort to increase our technology more than numbers of computers.

3. Godwin Chukwu, head of the Department of Petroleum Engineering. Concern has been raised related to the functions of the heads of departments. He has discussed this with other department heads. In 1993 when he was on the Senate a recommendation was made to Paul Reichardt, who was the acting Provost, to organized a workshop between the heads of department and the deans and directors. This was to generate a free flow of information between the two levels. Chukwu feels there is a need for the Provost's office to get the deans and department head together so that the heads can understand their limits, bounds and duties. There is a need to organize something that will help the two levels understand their function in a good atmosphere.

Keating said he would bring this before the Provost Council but it may be necessary to run this by the Labor Relations Board. It will be necessary to review this within the union contract.

VI Old Business

A. Motion to approve the Certificate in Microcomputer Support Specialist, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Ron Gatterdam indicated that he favored the motion. The motion passed without objection.

MOTION
 =====

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

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

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

B. Motion to Approve the AAS in Microcomputer Support Specialist, submitted by Curricular Affairs

This motion passed without objection.

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.

VII New Business

A. Motion to approve the Ph.D. program in Marine Biology., submitted by the Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs Committee

Michael Whalen indicated that for years they have been offering an interdisciplinary Marine Biology program. There was no objection to the motion. The motion passed.

MOTION
 =====

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

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

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

B. Motion to approve a policy statement on Stacked Courses, submitted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Stacked Courses

John Craven indicated that the committee met and approved the statement on stacked courses. Maynard asked about the use of

400/600 level courses. John indicated that you can not take a 400 level course and use it for an undergraduate degree, and then take it at the 600 level and use it for a graduate degree. The motion passed without objection.

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.

C. Motion on Course Level Definitions, submitted by Curricular Affairs and the Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs Committees

Jerry McBeath and Michael Whalen indicated they had made some recommendations for changes that are imbedded into the motion.

There was some discussion on 300-level courses used by both a baccalaureate and master's degree. The proposed course definitions deletes that reference. The current practice allows the use of 300-level courses and should not be deleted. There was an amendment to remove the deletion. There was no objection. Madeline asked about repeatable courses that can be used at both the undergraduate and graduate level. A statement will be added to the rationale. The motion passed as amended.

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 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-, 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.

The prohibition on courses being used for both baccalaureate and advanced degrees is not to be applied to courses listed in a catalog as repeatable.

D. Motion to modify the date of Freshman Low Grade notification, submitted by Curricular Affairs Committee.

Jerry McBeath noted that this was brought to the attention of the committee by the Registrar. Last year we made a series of changes to the schedule of deadlines and did not correspondingly change the low grade report date. This cleans up the action of last year. There was no objection to the motion. The motion passed.

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.

E. Resolution of support for union negotiation, submitted by Ad Hoc Committee on Senate/Union Relations.

This resolution came to the committee from the union. The committee looked at it and made some modifications to it. Ron Gatterdam indicated that it was done prior to the tentative contract and questions the needed for the resolution. John French said that since they are prior to ratification it is still a valid resolution and is important. There was no objection to the motion. The motion passed.

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.

F. Motion Regarding the UAF Academic Calendar, submitted by Administrative Committee.

John Craven indicated that it would make sense to put the formation of the calendar into the hands of those who make the rules on academic policy. Jerry McBeath asked about the coordinating committee. John indicated that it is the fourth arm of governance. It is made up of members of ASUAF, the Staff Council and the Faculty Senate and has committees who's membership is made up of faculty, staff, and students. It coordinates the issues and activities that need the attention of the three governance groups. There was no objection to the motion. The motion passed.

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.

G. Motion to approve amendment to the Faculty Alliance Constitution, submitted by Administrative Committee.

John Craven indicated that these were minor changes to the Faculty Alliance Constitution. There was no objection to the motion. The motion passed.

MOTION
=====

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

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

H. Motion to affirm the Faculty Alliance motion on the Presidential Search process, submitted by the Administrative Committee.

Madeline Schatz indicated that this motion was forwarded to the Board of Regents at the recent meeting. It would be nice to have Faculty Senate support of what the Faculty Alliance sent. There was no objection to the motion. The motion passed.

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.

VIII Committee Reports

- A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath

A report was attached to the agenda. Ann Tremarello indicated that there was a correction in the last paragraph. It should read the 1998-99 academic calendar.

B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak

A report was attached to the agenda. They hope to have a motion on faculty seeking degrees from UAF at the next Senate meeting. Jerry McBeath asked how many faculty this policy would affect. Ray Gavlak guessed it was about three.

C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen

A report was attached to the agenda.

D. Core Review - J. Brown

A report was attached to the agenda.

E. Curriculum Review - J. French

The committee has nothing to report. There was discussion on the social science designator approved for an Accounting and BA course. The committee reviewed these requests twice and approved them. The Provost upheld the committee's decision.

F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber

The following report was distributed as a handout.

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES MEETING
February 3, 1998

In attendance: Susan Blalock, Jerah Chadwick, Cindy Hardy, JoJo Ducharme (for Rose Kairaiuak), Ron Illingworth, Marjorie Illingworth (for Ruth Lister), Wanda Martin, Mark Oswood, Greg Owens, Jane Weber

The Developmental Studies committee discussed the following items:

Establishing a developmental science class: This discussion took up the bulk of the hour. Mark reported that about a third of the students in his 100-level Biology classes are returning students who have difficulty with math and science concepts. Before we can develop a class, however, he feels that we need rigorous proof of what in a student's records predict success. Several people on the committee have data that may be helpful. Wanda reported that when the ACT was renormed, she got data for biology, which she has on disk. Greg reported that to determine eligibility for the SSSP class, besides the SSSP eligibility criteria, he looked at transcripts and test scores for low reading/math/science scores. Marjorie has been asked by Ruth to look at success and failure rates for AA students. Some of this data may support a developmental science class.

Mark suggested two ways to go about setting up a course. One would be to design and offer a course based on what we know anecdotally that students need, then do tracking from there. The other way is to build a statistical case for the course to support our request for funding. Marjorie reported that Ruth would like to offer a 3-credit non-lab science course at the Downtown Center. Perhaps we could use this as a pilot course. Ron suggested listing a course as a DEVQ through CRA. Another option would be to list this as Biology 193. The due date for Special Topics courses is February 19. We agreed

to write up a special topics course proposal -a DEVQ course at the Downtown Center (Marjorie will talk to Ruth about this).

We also discussed the development of an Emerging Scholars program, a year-long or semester-long series of developmental courses to prepare a student for entry into the core classes. Ron reported that this is done at other colleges, so that students who are underprepared must take the Emerging Scholars year before they can enroll as regular freshman. JoJo agreed that the name used in such a program is important, both for students and for the rest of the university community. We decided to look further into such a program.

There was no discussion of Outcomes Assessment at this meeting. Wanda gave us all a handout on ACT's assessment instrument CAAP. We will discuss this at the next meeting.

The next meeting was set for February 24 at 1:15 p.m.

G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley

A report was attached to the agenda.

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

No report was available. Tom Robinson indicated they were working on a motion.

I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs

No report was available.

J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal

Scott indicated that in terms of communicating with members of the legislature, you can call 452-4448 to leave a message for your legislators. On Friday Scott send in 400 signatures of people concerned about the university budget. The committee will be sending out a letter to faculty with the email addresses of the legislators and who is on the Finance Committee. There are four issues that concern us. The first is HB 202. The bill was presented by Con Bunde and is not expected to go beyond the subcommittee level. However, we need to be concerned about the introduction of this bill. Another bill is on deferred maintenance. This bill came out very favorable for the university. If the United Academic contract is ratified and goes through it will have to go to the legislature for approval. The big issue is the Finance Committee and funding. The Finance Committee will try to come in at the Governor's figure for the budget. Keating indicated that we should ask for new money to fund raises.

Linda Curda asked about petitions of support of the university. Scott indicated that what is really needed is email and phone calls from individuals.

The following report was distributed as a handout.

The Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee had its first meeting of the semester on February 2 to discuss plans for the spring. Present were Scott Deal (chair), John Craven, Peter Schweitzer, Dan

Cole-McCullough, Eduard Zilberkant, and Ravonna Martin. Reports were given on the following items:

Board of Regents and Legislator's meeting, December 17 in Anchorage. This was one of several round table discussions that took place last year in an effort to improve the lines of communication between the University and the State Legislature. Those present from the Interior Delegation were Mike Miller, Gary Wilken, John Davies, Pete Kelly, and Gene Therriault. President Komisar presented the Wadlow report on the redesign of the System Office and campus-based administrative cost savings. Marshall Lind (UA-Southeast) presented a report on savings proposals for Extended Sites, with a goal of 4 million dollars in savings over 3 years, to be dispersed between three MAU's. The Legislators presented the report from the Deferred Maintenance Task Force, with recommendations to be proposed in this session (see attachment). Under the proposal, the University would receive 188 million in repair dollars and a portion of 304 million in building replacement dollars over the next 6 years.

House Bill 302, the "Fair Share Bill", is still receiving attention in the legislature. Under the provisions of this bill, funding to MAU's would be based on enrollment. This bill was proposed by Representative Con Bunde of Anchorage in November. It could potentially send 20 million dollars annually from UAF to UAA. Sources say it is not expected to make it through subcommittees, yet it is a subject that has been made an issue by the legislature.

If ratified, the United Academics contract will come under legislative work due to the salary increase. This pay increase could possibly come from the CPR instead of the University's annual budget.

The committee is going to spend the spring semester keeping the Senate and faculty at large aware of the progress of bills important to the university via the email system. The committee is also beginning work on the flow of dollars and expenditures at UAF. We are seeking a faculty member from business or economics to assist with this task. According to Representative Tom Brice, this year is unusually slow in the area of public opinion messages coming from voters. He urges us all to get on the phone and email system to our senators and representatives on issues regarding the university.

K. Service Committee - K. Nance

They are working very closely with the Outreach Working Group on the creation of a video. Jake Poole, the Alumni Director is now the chair and is very active in increasing visibility nationwide. He has targeted seven cities with large alumni block. They include Boston, Washington, DC, Seattle, Atlanta, San Antonio, Portland, and New York. Alumni in these areas are very interested in speaking with people from UAF. If faculty are in those areas he will arrange meetings with the alumni groups or individuals. These alumni can be very helpful in writing letters of support.

L. Ad Hoc Committees -

The Ad Hoc Committee on Stacked Courses had a motion before the Senate and has been disbanded.

A report from the Senate/Union Relations Committee was attached to the agenda.

Kara Nance indicated that the Faculty Alliance proposed the development of a Faculty Development Steering Committee. It has three members from each MAU. They have forwarded their recommendations for a long-term commitment on faculty development to the SAC. There is money available for statewide faculty development. They are asking for a person who could coordinate things and actively support/write grants. The UAF members of the committee are Kara, Maynard Perkins and Dana Thomas.

Linda Curda asked how this fits into the work of the Senate committee on Faculty Development. Kara indicated that this was a statewide committee and welcomed ideas from the UAF committee and faculty.

IX Discussion Items
A. RIP Discussion

Notes on the last discussion on the RIP were included in the agenda. John Craven is working on a list of names. There are a large number of job descriptions out there. Madeline had a draft which included a list of 1996-97 positions filled or being recruited, permanent cuts, and high priority positions/potential permanent cuts unless funded through more reallocation including 1997-98 RIP. This list will be discussed at the Chancellor's Workshop. Linda Curda wants some clarification on what the RIP II process will be this year.

X Members' Comments/Questions

Carol Barnhardt thanked all the faculty for sending their course syllabus. Linda Curda would like to see the Senate come up with a little more clarity of what a syllabus includes.

XI Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

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

Submitted by Sheri Layral, Faculty Senate Secretary.