

Faculty Affairs Committee
Meeting 10-11-17 1:00-2:10ish PM
535 Duckering
notes by Sine Anahita

Present: Andy Anger; Paul Layer; Jeff May; Josh Greenberg; Jak Maier; Gordon Williams;
Ataur Chowdhury; Sine Anahita

Guest: Emily Perryman

Absent and excused: Maureen Hogan, Courtney Carothers, Debu Misra

Absent: Troy Bouffard

1. agenda was approved
2. meetings from the last meeting were approved with changes
3. Old Business

grade appeal process

AdComm requested that the draft revisions be sent back to FAC for further discussion. AdComm suggested that Jim Arkell, the current chair of the ad hoc committee, be invited to join the discussion, but he was unavailable today. By email he sent some suggestions for changes to the policy to include 1) faculty response received at the beginning of the process; 2) grade appeals committee to have the authority to extend deadlines; 3) separate meetings with student and faculty as committee determines. Discussion centered around the differences between Faculty Senate policy and current practice; and around alignment with UA regulations and BoR policy, especially around the issue of whether there should be separate meetings with faculty and student.

Sine had communicated with the UA Office of General Counsel about the revisions to request clarification to ensure that Faculty Senate policy aligns with UA regulations and BoR policies. Rachel Plumlee has agreed to meet with FAC members to assist with the alignment, especially around issues related to due process and discrimination. The FAC discussed whether there should be a single hearing/meeting or whether the review committee should meet with faculty and student separately. Arguments were made for both. A sub-committee was formed to meet with Rachel: Jeff May; Gordon Williams; Jak Maier; Sine Anahita; Ataur Chowdhury. Jim Arkell will also be invited. Sine to coordinate the scheduling of the meeting.

shared governance

Spirited discussion about shared governance. Key phrases include: has Faculty Senate become just a mechanism to rubberstamp admin decisions? Has there been a breakdown in trust? Faculty feel powerless when the admin enacts decisions that are opposed to Faculty Senate decisions, e.g. program deletions. Would it help if Faculty Senate received information with more time devoted to discussion and decision-making? SP had little Faculty Senate involvement, no response from admin when Faculty Senate objected. The School of Education decision, for example, was over the objections of Faculty Senate who predicted the very trouble with

accreditation that ultimately ensued. What avenues can we pursue to reinvigorate shared governance? Resolutions are useless in this climate. UAF has always been top down, and faculty have always felt disempowered. We noted that although control over the budget is a management right, control over curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty. Paul asked how faculty can reestablish faculty authority, e.g. control curriculum by not rubberstamping. Reclaim faculty prerogatives. Sometimes Faculty Senate spins around and gets caught up in small relatively minor things as opposed to big issues. Faculty Senate is thus inefficient. Faculty Senate is just rearranging the deck chairs while the fundamental character of the university is being restructured. Are Faculty 180 and the Blue Book revisions important, or are they minor, even trivial. There is no mechanism by which Faculty Senate can police itself, its committees, or admin refusals to follow Faculty Senate policy. There is no enforcement mechanism. Significant mission drift in committees. We will engage in further discussion about shared governance next time. Everyone is to bring ideas about the scope and shape of the problem, and possible ways that FAC can help reinvigorate shared governance.

Relations administration/faculty/department

Problem with admin creating a course that seems to have bypassed regular review and faculty involvement. Will talk more about this issue next time.

Ownership of course material, especially online classes

Who owns course material? Article 14 in UNAC CBA grants faculty the rights to their intellectual property, e.g. course materials. Spirited discussion about Article 14, specifically the difference between university-sponsored work and university-supported work. UAFT CBA may be different. Clarification may be needed on this issue.

4. New Business
Program review process: We ran out of time so will discuss this next meeting.
5. Next meeting 11/9/17