

MINUTES  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #61  
 MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1996  
 WOOD CENTER BALLROOM

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

A. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alexander, B.  
 Bandopadhyay, S.  
 Bischak, D. (Abramowicz, K.)  
 Biswas, N.  
 Braddock, J.  
 Carlson, R.  
 Craven, J.  
 Curda, L. (Bye, D.)  
 Hebert, M.  
 Heyne, E.  
 Illingworth, R.  
 Jennings, M.  
 Juday, G.  
 Layer, P.  
 Lynch, D.  
 McBeath, G. (Naske, C.)  
 McFadden, T.  
 McLean-Nelson, D.  
 Morgan, J. (Allen, J.)  
 Nance, K.  
 Perkins, M.  
 Pippenger, M.  
 RaLonde, R.  
 Reynolds, J.  
 Schatz, M.  
 Summerville, S.  
 Swazo, N.  
 Thomas, D.  
 Wade, C.  
 Walworth, J.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Beget, J.  
 Creed, J.  
 Gerlach, C.  
 Hallsten, D.  
 Kelley, J.  
 Seifert, R.  
 Weingartner, T.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ducharme, J.  
 Gabrielli, R.  
 Gregory, G.  
 Keating, J.  
 Layral, S.  
 Wadlow, J.

NON-VOTING MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hayes, J. - President, ASUAF (A. Wells) 1 graduate student  
 Scholle, M - President, UAFSC  
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA  
 Tremarello, A - Director, A&R

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

Alexander, V. - Dean, SFOS

B. The minutes to Meeting #60 (December 4, 1995) 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:

1. Motion to adopt a policy statement on "Consensual Sexual (Amorous) Relations between Faculty and Students."
2. Motion on American Sign Language
3. Motion to adopt a Student Leadership Honors recognition policy
4. Motion to adopt new class schedule.

B. Motions Pending: none



Remarks by Provost Jack Keating:

Of importance to all faculty include the various policies before the Board of Regents. The policies on structure will go to the Board of Regents at their February meeting. The most important set of policies are the Faculty Policies. The first draft has been out for review since November. Comments were due in January to formalize a 2nd draft for the Board of Regents February meeting. The 2nd draft is not significantly different. One issue of concern to UAF, instructors being on tenure-track, is now out of the 2nd draft. There will be a period of about three months for comments before they are sent to the Board of Regents in June.

The second point is what is happening on the salary raises. The raise procedure will be discussed over this semester. Raises will be retroactive to January 1, 1996. The Provost has established a central committee, asking all the Deans and Directors for names. This committee's main task is to make sure there is communication between the units and to help with equity issues. On the salary raises there are two strands. For a full year it would be 1% given for equity, retention, and promotion. Funding for promotions will not be out of this year's amount. It will be half a percent this year

## B. Staff Council - M. Scholle

Eric indicated that Marie was the newly elected chair of the Statewide System Governance Council.

Marie indicated at the December Staff Council meeting Mr. Meyer came to discuss how the University fits into the Knowles administration. The discussion was less than successful and prompted a three-page letter from the staff to Governor Knowles. Recently, Marie has been notified that she has a meeting with the Lt. Governor on February 15th. Marie hopes to also have representatives from the faculty and students to meet with the Lt. Governor and to discuss with her some of the issues that are important to the University. Governance representatives will also be talking with various legislators including the House Finance Committee members. They will be lobbying hard for issues pertaining to the University as a whole. This year all the Staff Alliance representatives from all the MAUs will be meeting in Juneau and will have a big face-to-face meeting. They will be lobbying the legislature as UA, not UAF, not UAA, not UAS. They will be bringing the concerns of the entire university, so will be there on a forceful front. The Staff Alliance will be meeting with the Faculty Alliance and the Student Network for a convocation with Chancellor Lind to discuss the issues and strategies so that when we go to the legislature everybody will be on the same page.

## C. President's Report - E. Heyne

Eric's report was attached to the Senate agenda. He recently attended the AAHE meeting where he was immersed in the nationwide perspective on issues that UAF is going through. He hopes to be a resource, to help faculty understand the changes, and provide a sounding board for discussion.

Eric also indicated that the Student Recreation Center Board needs a faculty representative. If you are interested or know someone who is willing to serve, please let us know. This voice on the SRC Board is the faculty opportunity to provide input. We also need nominations for President-Elect at our next meeting.

## D. Faculty Alliance Report - D. Lynch

Don highlighted his written reports on the Faculty Alliance, Provost Council, and Systems Governance meetings. These were distributed as a Senate Handout as follows.

Report on Faculty Alliance meeting of January 26, 1996--The Faculty Alliance, composed of three representatives from each Campus Senate, considered comments which had been submitted regarding Academic Policies. The Alliance discussed these comments, particularly the Quinby report, J. McBeath's letter, and the letter by McNutt, Jeffries, Lingle, and Lummerzheim to Akosofu. In general, the comments propose a five year rather than three year intense post tenure review and object to denying research faculty tenure. There is also concern over the provision that Chancellors in making tenure and retention decisions may use other relevant sources of information.

The Juneau and Anchorage Senates are considering taking Senate positions on the new Academic Policies. The Alliance will meet in Juneau February 14 in conjunction with the Regents and will attempt to meet important legislators. The issue of which legislators to meet was left open.

Report on Provost Councils' meeting of January 10, 1996 - Information on faculty salaries has been provided to Deans who are to check the data for accuracy and add time in grade. These are to be used for determine salary equity under the guidance of faculty committees to be formed within each unit. The Provost will form an overall Faculty review group for the Campus. Faculty reviews for raises should consider the members entire career plus one year. Deans need to watch workload assignments rather carefully and contracts should come with a workload statement.

Presentation by BANNER representatives suggest the Student Information System which includes faculty workloads, may be operational within two years. Cliff Lando is UAF's representative on these matters and comments should be directed to him. To make this system really cost effective will require that each faculty



B. Motion to approve the deletion of the MEd. in College Student Personnel Administration, submitted by Graduate Curricular Affairs

Robert Carlson indicated that this request was submitted by the school because it has not been offered recently and they wanted to get it off the books. The motion passed without opposition.

MOTION PASSED  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the deletion of the MEd. in College Student Personnel Administration.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal on file in the Governance Office, 312 Signers' Hall.

\*\*\*\*\*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY FOR THE BOARD OF REGENTS

Program/Degree:

MEd. - College Student Personnel Administration

Identification of Program

This program is designed to train educators to be able to function in student service positions in higher education. This training would include specifically: history, philosophy, and contemporary issues in higher education; management concepts; principles of educational psychology, measurement, and research, and supervised laboratory experiences in college student personnel agencies.

Reasons for Requesting Deletion of Program

This program has not been available for several years and has no students enrolled. The people who developed this program sequence are no longer at the university, and there is no intent to revive the degree sequence.

\*\*\*\*\*

C. Motion to amend the guidelines for Faculty Role in the Evaluation of Administrators, submitted by Faculty Appeals & Oversight

Eric indicated that he had talked with Diane Bischak who was not able to attend the Senate meeting. This motion attempts to get the Executive Dean listed in the evaluation of administrators in the right place. Eric felt that the Senate should defer this until we get the final Regents' decision on what these positions will be called. The Executive Dean presumably will not be evaluated for a few years, there is no hurry. The Senate moved to table the motion.

MOTION TABLED  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the guidelines for Faculty Role in the Evaluation of Administrators endorsed at the Faculty

Senate Meeting #23 on December 17, 1990 as indicated below

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: These amendments delete from the list of administrators to be evaluated those administrative positions that no longer exist and add existing administrative positions.

\*\*\*\*\*

[[ ]] = Deletion  
CAPS = Addition

GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY ROLE IN THE  
EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

1. All faculty in a given administrative unit will have the opportunity to provide anonymous written input into the evaluation of their EXECUTIVE DEAN, dean or director, associate dean or director, deputy director, and department head. In small units, interviews with individual faculty members may also be appropriate.

2. A representative sample of faculty will be asked to provide written input into the evaluation of the [[Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Research]] PROVOST. The Faculty Senate and its leadership will be included in this sample, as well as any ad hoc groups and individuals who have worked closely with the administrators during the time covered by the evaluation.

3. In each evaluation cycle, a uniform procedure will be used in all academic units to obtain faculty input.

4. The procedure for evaluation of the Chancellor is codified in Board of Regents' policy. The Faculty Senate urges the Regents and the President to consult with faculty as a crucial part of this evaluation.

5. The administrative characteristics that faculty will have the opportunity to comment upon will include at least the following:

Administrative Tasks

- Building and maintaining excellence
- Resource allocation

Leadership

- Maintenance of strong faculty morale
- Problem resolution
- Delegation of duties to appropriate colleagues
- Building a team
- Providing a means to involve department heads and other faculty in decisionmaking
- Skills as a mediator between faculty and administration/community/legislature
- General leadership abilities

Academic Contributions

General Comments

\*\*\*\*\*



D. Motions to amend Grade Appeals Policy, submitted by Curricular Affairs

Dana Thomas indicated there were two motions, one from Curricular Affairs and one by Faculty Appeals & Oversight. Dana addressed the Curricular Affairs motion and indicated that it was largely a housekeeping issue. They wanted to address the faculty member being the department head or dean. They also had not dealt with the NB grade. So these changes take care of issues that arose. Maynard Perkins submitted an amendment to the definition of Department Head to include Campus Directors for courses whose faculty members are under the College of Rural Alaska. The amendment passed with one nay. The motion then passed unani mousl y.

MOTI ON PASSED (unani mous)
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the UAF Grade Appeals Policy as indi cated below

EFFECTI VE: I mmedi atel y

RATI ONALE: The existi ng appeals policy defines the letter grades A, B, C, D, F and Pass as being subject to appeal, while the I and NB are explicitl y exempted. However, as the NB is a permanent grade, it too must be subject to appeal. It is recommended that Paragraph II. A. be revised.

The policy does not provide a course of action for the case in which an instructor whose grade is being appealed is no longer an employee of the university but who is willing to participate in the appeals procedure. It is recommended that Paragraph III. A. 5. c. be inserted.

It appears that grade appeals commi ttees are not al ways making certain that the student's request for a review is valid. The commi ttee recommends that the first sentence of Paragraph III. B. 4. c be revised.

The present policy does not identify a clear course of action for cases in which the instructor is either the dean or the department head. It is recommended that the present Paragraphs III. B. 3-6 be renumbered III. B. 4-7, and that a new Paragraph III. B. 3 be inserted.

\*\*\*\*\*

[[ ]] = Del eti ons
CAPS = Addi ti ons

GRADE APPEALS POLI CY

I. I ntroducti on

The Uni versity of Alaska is commi tted to the ideal of academi c freedom and so recognizes that the assi gnment of grades is a faculty responsi bility. Therefore, the Uni versity admi ni strati on shall not influence or affect an assi gned grade or the review of an assi gned grade.

The fol lowi ng procedures are designed to provi de a means for students to seek review of final course grades alleged to be arbitrary and capri cious. Before taki ng formal action, a student must attempt to resolve the issue informall y with the instructor of

the course. A student who files a written request for review under the following procedures shall be expected to abide by the final disposition of the review as provided below and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the university.

## II. Definitions

A. A "grade" refers to FINAL letter grades A, B, C, D, F, NB and Pass. The [[NB (no basis) and]] I (incomplete) [[designators are not grades and, therefore, are]] DESIGNATES A TEMPORARY GRADE, NOT A FINAL GRADE, SO IT IS not subject to appeal.

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

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

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

D. All references to duration in "days" refers to university working days, which exclude weekends, holidays and days in which the university is officially closed.

E. "Department head" for the purposes of this policy denotes the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course (e.g., head, chair or coordinator of an academic department, OR THE CAMPUS DIRECTOR IF THE FACULTY MEMBER IS IN THE COLLEGE OF RURAL ALASKA).

## III. Procedures

AP • 0 • 0 Error by instructor or university staff in transcribing the grade are sources of error that can be readily corrected through the student's prompt attention following the normal change of grade procedure.

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

2. Notification must be received by the instructor and/or department head within 20 days from the first day of instruction of





4) The student has not taken prior action to resolve the grade conflict with the instructor, as described under section III, A.

d. In the event that the committee votes to dismiss the request, a written notice of dismissal must be forwarded to the student, instructor, department head and dean within five days of the decision, and will state clearly the reasoning for the dismissal of the request.

6. [[5.]] Acceptance for consideration of the student's request will result in the following:

a.





Don Lynch, Norman Swazo, Ron Illingworth and Maynard Perkins will be on this committee.

The following Faculty Affairs report was submitted as a handout at the Faculty Senate meeting by Barbara Alexander.

#### "Collections" I, II, III: Policy Reviews and Schedule

The Faculty Affairs Committee met twice since the last Senate meeting, on Dec. 11 and Jan. 29 and has continued the debate on currently proposed policy reviews and changes. Committee members continue to urge ALL UA FACULTY to respond to the Regents' and the Administration's request for faculty recommendations!!! Committee members are particularly interested in changes of those policies affecting tenure and promotion review workload, unit criteria (OX. 01. xx and OX. 02. xx).

#### Policies for Hiring of Administrators Supervising Faculty

##### RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate passed a motion of censure of Chancellor Joan Wadlow on Dec. 4, 1995; and,

WHEREAS Chancellor Wadlow has not formally responded to the Senate to said motion; and,

WHEREAS the issue of search procedures for administrative positions remains unresolved;

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that Chancellor Wadlow (a) provide the Senate with a formal response (written or oral) to the Dec. 4 Senate vote of censure; and (b) that she and the Senate come to agreement on the search procedure for appointments of any administrative officer with line authority appointed by the Chancellor and whose primary responsibility is supervision of faculty.

#### Compensation Review and Implementation

Several members of the committee reported recent requests from College and/or Division Administrators soliciting nominations for ad hoc committees of faculty on implementation of new compensation policy. The Faculty Affairs Committee requests a roll call vote to determine whether the Senate sustains its prior resolution on compensation from Sept. 18, 1995.

##### C. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES - Paul Layer

No report was given.

##### D. GRADUATE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS - Robert Carlson

The Graduate Curricular Affairs Committee is primarily a reactive one which meets to consider various proposals. They are considering three issues: 1) course compression for graduate courses; 2) differentiation of 4 U





## Collection 3 - June 7, 1996

The policy coordinator is Nanne Myers, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Purpose of these academic policies:

"A firm direction has been taken in these revisions toward more collaboration between separately accredited components of the University of Alaska." (Cover letter page 1) The changes are intended to:

"Redirect academic policies to enhance and support student access to resources of all MAUs so that their educational goals may be better met

"Emphasize and support the accountability of the President for the overall academic program..." (Cover letter page 1)

Budgetary implications:

- a. Promotion of more effective use of academic resources.
- b. Reallocation of funds to support distance delivery and innovation in non-classroom instructional methods.
- c. Reallocation of funds in support of the community college mission.
- d. More expenditures on inter-MAU communication.  
(Cover letter page 2)

COLLECTION ONE: ESTABLISHES POLICIES DESIGNED TO COORDINATE PROGRAMS AMONGST ALL MAUS

Highlights from Collection 1: The title Instructor is made an academic rank and one holding this rank can be considered for tenure. Those holding special ranks, including Research (employed primarily to conduct research and supported primarily by research funds) are not entitled to consideration for tenure (page 5).

"...each MAU will have the responsibility of serving both local and statewide constituencies. Each MAU will contribute to the integrated instructional program of the University of Alaska..." (p. 15, Policy 10.04.01). Such collaboration will include sharing

or classified information will not be accepted as satisfying degree requirements (p. 2, 3).

Chancellor's make decisions regarding promotion of tenure track faculty based on recommendations of faculty, administrators, and other relevant sources (p. 10, Policy OX.01.03.C.1).

Tenure track instructors and assistant professors will be reviewed for tenure no later than the seventh consecutive year of service. (p. 15-16)

#### POST-TENURE EVALUATION (Policy OX.01.06)

"Tenured faculty members will be evaluated intensively at least every three years... Once a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation, annual evaluations will take place until the faculty member receives a satisfactory evaluation. If evaluations are unsatisfactory for three years, grounds exist for termination for cause." (p. 17, Policy OX.01.06)

#### Discontinuation of Program

"When a decision is made to discontinue a program... a good faith effort will be made to place tenured faculty in another program where appropriate." (p. 19) "Should the program be reactivated within two years, previously tenured faculty members will be invited to return..." (p. 20) Faculty member when offered the opportunity to return, has thirty days in which to respond. (p. 20)

"When a decision is made to reduce a program a good faith effort will be made to retain tenured faculty in preference to non-tenured faculty, or to place tenured faculty in another program where appropriate." (p. 20)

"Following a declaration of financial exigency according to Regents Policy, University Regulations, and MAU rules and procedures, faculty members are entitled to a minimum of sixty calendar days notice in advance of the cessation of their employment." (p. 21)

Sabbatical leave policies follow

#### OVERALL COMMENTS BY D. LYNCH

These policies, as I interpret them are designed to provide flexibility in academic programs so that changes can be accommodated by making programs statewide, using distance delivery techniques, transferring faculty from one program to another, discontinuing programs, establishing easy transfers or core curricula from one campus to another, and for eliminating tenured faculty with unfavorable post tenure reviews. In addition, the policies also vest authority in the Statewide Administration for reporting on academic achievements or failures in order to reallocate resources from one branch or program to another, assess where the greatest needs are for faculty and programs and where they do not exist, and to determine the university's interests in copyrights, patents, and royalties. Flexibility in academic programs under the supervision of the Statewide President seems to be the theme.

#### IX Members' Comments/Questions

John Craven indicated that the chairs of all committees need to notify the Governance Office of meetings. The Governance Office then distributes Public Meeting Notices.

X Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 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.