

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 Long, P. - President, UAFSC
 Hedahl, G. - Dean, CLA Eichholz, M. - GSO
 Tremarello, A. - University Registrar

NON-VOTING MEMBERS ABSENT:

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

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 at 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

400/600 level courses. John indicated that you can not take a 400

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

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

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 thbewAA

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

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

B.

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

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

Board of Regents and Legislator's meeting, December 17 in

Kara Nance indicated that the Faculty Alliance proposed the