

MINUTES

UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #218

Monday, November 07, 2016 1:00 - 3:00 PM - Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order - Orion Lawlor

A. Roll Call

Faculty Senate Members Present:	Members Present - continued
ABRAMOWICZ, Ken (18)	QUICK, Kate (18)
AGGARWAL, Srijan (18)	REMBER, Rob (17)
AGUILAR-ISLAS, Ana (18)	TILBURY, Jennifer (17)
ANAHITA, Sine (18)	TOPKOK, Sean (18)
ARNDT, Kathy (17)	TUTTLE, Siri (17)
BACSUJLAKY, Mara (18)	WILDFEUER, Sandra (18)
BARNES, Bill (18)	ZHANG, Mingchu (18)
BENOWITZ, Jeff (18)	
BOLTON, Bob (18) – Jessie Robertson	Members absent:
BRET-HARTE, Donie (17)	CROSKREY, Wendy (18)
CARROLL, Jennie (17) – Andy Anger	HUNT, Steve (18)
COLLINS, Eric (17)	ICKERT-BOND, Stefanie (18)
CUNDIFF, Nicole (17)	LUNN, Lisa (17)
DIERENFIELD, Candi (17)	MEYER, Franz (17)
FALLEN, Chris (18)	PETERSON, Rorik (17)
FARMER, Daryl (17)	

GIFFOR002 k q 95.4 376.68 210.72 18V1717OF

B. Approval of [Minutes for Meeting #217](#) (linked)

The minutes for Meeting #217 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as submitted.

II Status

average (the .3 is to address cost of living for Alaska). Backtracking from 2025 to present, given our current enrollment, to achieve these elements would require a budget of \$341 million. We were allocated \$325 million this year. So, how useful this model will be remains to be seen, along with whether or not the Board of Regents will support it.

The budget is set to be approved at the November meeting. Once approved, it will go to the governor, and he will release his budget in December. He reminded everyone that the initial guidance from the governor's office in late August noted a 5-10 % reduction across the system. They're expecting that from the governor's office, but where it will fall exactly within that range is yet to be determined.

Eric C. asked for clarification about reaching the goal to increase enrollment by making it more expensive to go to school. Chancellor Thomas responded that there is some evidence that it doesn't negatively impact, but it depends upon the area. The local evidence is that both the Schools of Management and Engineering got super tuition, and their enrollments have grown. But, this wouldn't work for

research. There were 57 different

examination of our organizational structure in that realm. He's happy to hear other suggestions, noting that ASUAF is also reaching out, which Colby Freel will describe.

The Provost was asked to speak more specifically about what might constitute a good decision when it comes to special program review, and if it's possible to arrive at a good decision after special program review that excludes disbanding academic departments and losing faculty positions. She remarked that the best decision very much depends upon the circumstances. One of the fundamental circumstances is how much the budget is reduced; another is student demand for a program, and so on. It's hard to make a blanket statement about what the best decision is in all cases.

V Public Comment

Professor Abel Bult-Ito commented on an alternative plan to Strategic Pathways, called A New Vision for the University of Alaska. The plan's main theme is to greatly reduce statewide administration, and reduce administrators and middle management by 5% over three years. The savings would be reinvested in teaching, research and service. He shared revenue projections if the plan were followed. Spreadsheets with a cost/benefit analysis to back up the plan are posted online (see link below). He offered to present his plan at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

<https://sites.google.com/a/alaska.edu/a-new-vision-for-the-university-of-alaska> (14) 0 57 (163/146) 1:09:56:392 11203 DTH ()

Ken A. asked for clarification about Colby thinks is still missing from the attendance policy motion, especially since Faculty Senate is voting on the motion today. Colby noted there are no allowances for absences that come up after the start of the semester that are related to university-sanctioned events (i.e., the Strategic Pathways meeting he has been invited to attend by President Johnsen). Colby is personally facing a dock in his grade for the absence. It's a very difficult position to be put in as a student. Eileen H. responded that they don't want fo(d-38.4.650.007 Tw -

NCAA, and as such, has some scholarships. There are 136 athletes of which 65% are receiving financial aid in the form of partial scholarships. There are no athletes on full scholarships here at UAF. Only about 20% of them get over 80% of their costs covered (typically seniors). They have 10 sports currently, of which eight are Division II. They have one Division I sport (rifle, an open division sport). They represent five different sport conferences. She also reported that it is an NCAA mandate that student athletes cannot miss class for practice sessions; only for competitions.

Chancellor Thomas commented that many sport scholarships are privately funded endowed. Dani commented that each of the students on the rifle team have privately endowed scholarships.

Jeff B. asked if there have been any new initiatives for fund-raising in the intercollegiate athletics world at UAF since SP Phase I came out. Dani said yes, and they are looking at marketing ideas and new initiatives at every staff meeting. Chancellor Thomas also added that UAF is in the 85th percentile for fundraising relative to other Division II institutions.

F. [Faculty Alliance Report](#) - (Report from T. Smith linked)

Tara Smith, chair of Faculty Alliance, was present in person and commented on recent UAA Faculty Senate action (passage of a resolution similar to the one passed by FA). She noted that both UAA and UAS passed motions in opposition to the consolidation of the schools and colleges of Education. The announcement of the consolidation plan came after the public testimony period for the upcoming Board of Regents meeting. She would be happy to hear from UAF Faculty Senate and UAF faculty before she gives her BOR report on Thursday morning.

Jeff B. commented that the BOR will still take written testimony up to the meeting time. Chris F. mentioned the evening social with the Regents, also.

G. Senate Members' Questions / Comments

There were no further questions or comments. The break occurred at this point in the meeting (approximately 2:10 PM).

BREAK

VII New Business:

A. [Resolution in Support of Allowing Candidates for Promotion, Tenure, or Comprehensive Review to Opt for Open Meetings](#), submitted by the Administrative Committee

Orion commented on the lateness of bringing this resolution before the Faculty Senate this semester, but noted it had been passed by the Senate each year for many years. With no objections, the resolution was passed unani0.5(R)c(obj)-8o

Jennifer T. asked if the draft document pertains to regular program review or special program review. She also asked about the proposed committee selection process being undertaken by the Faculty Senate and if that would be done in conjunction with the deans and directors.

Orion noted the difficulty he already has of seeking names and volunteers for other various committees and functions.

Provost Henrichs commented that the deans have the authority to assign faculty workload to these kinds of tasks and should be involved in the process. She suggested that one way to address both the deans' role and Faculty Senate in the process is for the provost to develop the committee in consultation with the deans, and have the final list reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate. (omn4s)10.6(w)1.

chosen to do that in the past, but it's not inconceivable that they could do so. Another layer that has not been mentioned is that if there is a major change to a university that alters its mission, core themes and objectives, they need to apply to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) to make those changes before they can be enacted. The NWCCU decides what constitutes a substantive change. An example of such a change would be if the Board decided to end three of the seven schools and colleges. Other scales of change would be decided by the NWCCU.

Orion noted the Google Doc will be open for comments.

Jeff M. asked for clarification from the members of the program review committee who were

Permanent Committees:

5. Committee on the Status of Women - Ellen Lopez, Diana DiStefano
6. Core Review Committee - Andy Seitz ([Minutes for 09/12/2016](#) linked)
7. Curriculum Review Committee - Rainer Newberry
8. Faculty Development, Assessment and Improvement Committee - Franz Meyer
9. Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee - Donie Bret-Harte, Sean Topkok ([Minutes for 09/19/2016](#) linked)
10. Information Technology Committee - Siri Tuttle
11. Research Advisory Committee - Jamie Clark, Gordon Williams ([Minutes for 09/16/2016](#) linked)
12. Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee - Sandra Wildfeuer, Jennifer Tilbury
13. Faculty Administrator Review Committee (No Group A reviews in 2016-17)

XI Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 PM.

Background:

The following resolution was first passed at Faculty Senate Meeting #146 in November 2007, and was endorsed by a letter distributed to the UAF faculty in Fall 2008. Since then the Provost has annually provided this resolution to all Faculty Review Committees. The Faculty Senate reaffirmed this resolution at Meeting #176 in September 2011, Meeting #184 in September 2012, Meeting #192 in September 2013, Meeting #200 in September 2014, and Meeting #208 in September 2015. For academic year 2016-2017, the Administrative Committee submits an updated resolution to the Faculty Senate Meeting #218 on November 7, 2016.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the members of Faculty Committees are called upon under the concept of shared governance to provide professional review of other faculty candidates undergoing Tenure, Promotion, and Comprehensive Review (Pre and Post-tenure),

WHEREAS the faculty portion of the review process must be fair and reasonable in order to maintain the reputation of the University, and the integrity of the academic process,

WHEREAS open and transparent Committee deliberations facilitate fair and reasonable review,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the UAF Faculty Senate strongly requests that all Faculty Review Committees choose to follow the traditional option of allowing a candidate for Tenure, Promotion, or Comprehensive Review to opt for an “open” meeting, and that “mandatory closed” meetings be avoided, including during the 2016-17 review cycle.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty Committee meetings are “open” at the request of a candidate and are consistent with all other relevant UAF rules and procedures.
2. Open meetings provide strong incentives for fair and reasonable review, including the oversight of the candidate.
3. The Committee can query a candidate for clarification of the file, which will greatly reduce the number of false assumptions and errors during deliberation.
4. Open meetings are educational—candidates who opt to attend their review have the opportunity to learn about academic traditions and practices.
5. Attendance can reduce candidates' anxiety, and make them feel like a part of the process.

MOTION:

Motion from GAAC concerning F698 course grading.

MOTION

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to authorie the Office of the Registrar to automatically change all pass/fail project credits (F698) on a student's record that are graded DF"(Deferred) to the grade of P" (Pass) once the project has been fully approved and accepted by the Graduate School. The responsibility for changing the DF"grade for letter -graded F698 project credits p.8(r)8;.1(e)-65p .1(e)-(p)-0.7(o)-978(a)-p.8(r)(o)-9.6u)

