

Faculty Affairs Committee  
Meeting 12:30-2:00ish PM  
305 O'Neill Building  
notes by Sine Anahita

**Present:** Mark Hermann; Jak Maier; Josh Greenberg; Gordon Williams; Debu Misra; Maureen Hogan; and Sine Anahita

**Excused:** Andy Anger; Jeff May; Jak Maier; Ataur Chowdhury; Courtney Carothers

**Call in info:** 1-866-832-7806, PIN: 1109306

We welcomed Dean Mark Hermann to the Faculty Affairs Committee. Mark replaces Paul Layer who has accepted an interim position at Statewide. Mark stated that he welcomed his appointment as the ex-officio administrative member to the FAC.

The agenda was approved. The minutes from the December meeting were approved with slight corrections and revisions. The minutes from the November meeting were approved with no corrections.

### **Old Business**

Jak suggested that we streamline the old business part of the agenda by marking some items as complete. Jak also discussed how some items seem to be moving rather slowly through Faculty Senate, or not moving at all.

#### ***Grade appeal policy***

CAC has requested time to discuss the proposed revisions to the grade appeal policy but did not have time at their last meeting(s) to do so. At the last Faculty Senate meeting, senators were asked to make comments on the proposed revisions by email to Sine and/or anyone else on the FAC, but no comments were received. The FAC is ready to move the revised policy forward; Jak will ask AdCom to move the proposed revised policy on to Faculty Senate.

#### ***Shared governance***

We discussed how invigorating shared governance will be an ongoing framework that has shaped much of the work of FAC this year and will continue in the future. We are moving this as a specific item off old business.

#### ***Relationships with administration/faculty/departments***

We decided to combine this discussion with ongoing discussions about shared governance. We are moving this as a specific item off old business.

#### ***Ownership rights of course materials***

Carol Gering was our guest at the last FAC meeting to discuss intellectual property rights as related to eLearning. Over winter break, another incident arose when a dean and eLearning

attempted to claim rights over the intellectual property of an adjunct instructor who was developing a course through the EPIC workshop series. The instructor received notification that the university was claiming intellectual property rights 11 weeks after she had begun to develop the course. The issue was resolved this time only when the dean agreed to strike out the intellectual property claim language from the instructor's appointment letter. We discussed how the issue of who owns course materials will continue to be an issue, especially for adjunct faculty who are vulnerable and exploited. Mark gave us an administrative perspective that was helpful: SOM pays \$7500 for course development [SA notes: more than twice what CLA pays] and \$2500 as a bonus if the instructor obtains Quality Matters certification. He noted that with this kind of investment, colleges cannot afford for instructors to walk and to take the course materials with them. Mark notes that most of these courses, with care given to annual updating, have a significant shelf life. We pretty much agreed that this makes sense for those types of courses. We also talked about the importance of collaboration among faculty, and agreed that sharing course materials with colleagues is an important value that helps junior and other colleagues. This may be an ongoing issue, but we will move it off old business, at least for now.

**Comment [S1]:** Actually, our online courses occur pretty equally at all levels.

### ***Program Review Subcommittee***

Gordon said the PRS has not yet met due to the winter holidays. He hopes to convene a meeting soon. Gordon's goal, shared by the FAC, is to fix the process. Mark noted that as Dean of SOM, he asked that the School of Management's entire programs/departments be reviewed at the same time, and not piecemeal, e.g. the BA one year, the BS the next. Gordon stated that this was one of the many problems with the process, with the result that math has been under continuous program review for the last several years. We then had a very spirited conversation about additional problems with the current program review process and determined that FAC taking on this issue is another way we can invigorate shared governance at the campus and statewide levels. Mark noted that everything that involves the provost could change when the next provost is appointed. And depending on whether that person has the requisite experience, everything might be in flux for the foreseeable future until the new provost has gained sufficient experience to make decisions. [SA note: another avenue for faculty to assert an invigoration of shared governance?]

### ***Blue Book revisions***

We discussed our eagerness to move forward on the revision process. At AdComm, Jak will ask that a convening chair be appointed.

### ***Faculty 180***

We discussed the importance of moving this forward; At AdComm, Jak will ask that a convening chair be appointed.

### **New Business**

#### ***eLearning "additional message section" FYI***

Sine discussed how eLearning and some deans for some courses have been adding what Geoff Bacon of Labor Relations termed an "additional message section." This fall, UNAC had successfully worked with Geoff to remove the option for an "additional message section" from

union-approved appointment templates. However, Sociology adjunct instructors who were teaching eLearning classes received appointment letters with the old “additional message section” included. The appointment letters thus had many problems that included potential FERPA violations, unwarranted surveillance of faculty, contradiction of faculty academic freedom, and contradiction of Faculty Senate policy on grading. Carol Gering, Chris Lott (Associate Director of eLearning), Geoff Bacon, and Dean Todd Sherman took Sine’s concerns seriously and worked together to create a workable compromise. The “additional message section” was cleaned up so that it no longer violates established Faculty Senate policy, union contracts, academic freedom, and/or FERPA and moved from the appointment letter (contract) to a letter that the faculty must sign. Sine noted how this process is another example of how faculty can successfully advocate for adjunct instructors.

***Items to bring to AdComm***

Grade Appeal Policy revisions—please move to Faculty Senate agenda  
Blue Book revisions—please appoint convening chair  
Faculty 180—please appoint convening chair

***Next meeting time***

We discussed the desire to move our regular meeting time up so that we meet before AdComm does so that our issues are current. Josh was thanked for finding a good meeting room that has the technological equipment we need to be able to connect with Courtney and others through two-way audio/visual.

***Additional member comments***

Sine shared concerns that the deletion of the Sociology BA and BS will be on the March BoR agenda. She has met with the Provost and the Dean of CLA to advocate for restructuring Sociology, but there has been no visible movement forward. She suggested working with Curricular Affairs Committee to salvage Sociology and to keep the problem of program deletion visible. There was spirited discussion about the potential success of this strategy.

Throughout the meeting we discussed the issue of faculty shared governance and the BoR and President Johnsen. Some of the members of the FAC and others have been working to bring a bill to the legislature to establish a faculty regent position. Mark stressed how it was extremely important that there be a faculty member at the BoR table. He noted that often the BoR benefits by having quick access to student perspectives, from the student regent, and that having a faculty at the table will provide real-time access to the employees that directly provide the education to its students and research to Alaska and the Nation. This will be beneficial to the Board members as well as the faculty, staff and students of the three Universities. Gordon noted that an alternative strategy would be for the university to have an ombuds who would facilitate the relationship among faculty and Statewide university leadership. But that person would not have a vote, so would it be effective? Question: difference between Faculty Alliance Chair and Ombuds? Gordon suggested that the FA chair’s role is to synthesize Faculty Senates’ actions, while the ombuds would “turn over rocks” and would have more capacity to move around the state gathering faculty views to present to the BoR.

**Comment [S2]:** I think we should cast this in a more positive light . With Faculty on the Board everyone wins including the board members as they get quicker access to more and better information.

Jak and Sine shared the news about some of the DEVE faculty would be left out of the UNAC/UAFT merger, but that there is a plan afoot to bring them in. Faculty Affairs Committee can be instrumental in urging faculty to vote for One Union.