

**DRAFT** Minutes for UAF Faculty Senate Meeting #222  
Monday, April 3, 2017  
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)	MAY, Jeff (18)
AGUILAR-ISLAS, Ana (18) – Melissa Good	MEYER, Franz (17)
ANAHITA, Sine (18)	NEWBERRY, Rainer (17)
ANGER, Andy (18) – via Zoom	QUICK, Kate (18)
ARNDT, Kathy (17)	TILBURY, Jennifer (17)
BENOWITZ, Jeff (18)	TOPKOK, Sean (18)

BRET-HARTE, Donie (

B. Approval of Minutes for Meeting #221

The minutes for Meeting #221 were approved as submitted.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with one amendment: an item was added at the request of Sine A. regarding the program discontinuations of Sociology, and Economics. (This request was withdrawn at the end of the meeting due to time constraints and acknowledgement of a discussion at the next Administrative Committee meeting.)

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

Motions approved:

A. Motion to approve Unit Criteria for DANSRD

B. Motion to amend Midterm Grade Reporting policy (as amended)

Motions pending: None

III A. President's Remarks - Orion Lawlor

President Lawlor let everyone know he might need to cut participants' comments and discussion short to accommodate the packed agenda.

He was pleased to hear there will be cost benefit analyses done on Strategic Pathways Phase II recommendations. The final decisions will now happen in September, and he hopes this extension will provide a more reasonable time-frame for good decisions to be made.

B. President-Elect's Remarks - Chris Fallen

President-elect Fallen noted the election of the 2017-18 president-elect taking place today, with two outstanding candidates: Donie Bret-Harte and Gordon Williams. Donie could not be here today because of serving on the chancellor search committee (which is conducting finalist interviews today).

He noted that he and the new president-elect will be working on the 2017-18 committee assignments this month. They try their best to accommodate the preferences indicated by new and continuing members.

The Arctic Broadband Forum is coming up in May. (Flyers at the back table.)

IV A. Chancellor's Remarks - Dana Thomas

Chancellor Thomas noted that April is sexual assault awareness month. A national day of action is occurring tomorrow, and there will be information booths at Wood Center from 11 AM to 2 PM. There is an event at the Moore-Bartlett-Skarland complex from 4-

He mentioned the Week of the Arctic coming up, and schedules for that have been provided at the back table. He noted two of the related events: a film screening at the Regal Theatre, and a community celebration of the Arctic.

He encouraged faculty participation in the SP Phase II open forums taking place tomorrow and Wednesday, noting they have been advertised in the Cornerstone.

The chancellor search interviews taking place at this time will culminate in the selection of several finalists who will be selected for candidate forums.

#### B. Provost's Remarks - Susan Henrichs

Provost Henrichs announced that the Planning and Budget Committee will start meeting on Friday of this week, and recapped the membership which includes faculty, staff and administration. They will be considering proposed actions, including the proposed 2014-15 TIC (063-596-101-163(m))



Education Management Systems), have been invited to speak about the Oregon model to the Board of Regents at their June meeting. He invited faculty to hear them.

President Johnsen expressed his confidence in the Strategic Pathways process as a means to meet the university mission at lower cost in a time of daunting challenges. The process is inclusive of faculty, staff and students from each of the three universities. The recommendations are largely based on the inputs received. He noted that while there are some decisions that should be left to the individual campuses, there are others that require the statewide perspective. When he's asked if there are three universities or one, he responds "yes" -- one university where it makes sense for our students and the state, and three where it makes sense for our students and the state. He referenced the one university vs. three with regard to accreditation as an exam

T6.6(s)88(am)-6(T)11.81-6(e i)2.6(t)4.2( )TJ 0.0n</MCID [(r)-9 -16[(r)-9 -6

interest that stand in its way. The heart of the question is how we strengthen the faculty voice and presence in Regents' meetings. Chair Gloria O'Neill is interested in expanding the role of governance in BOR meetings. The proposed legislation is one means to address the important issue, but he believes there are also other ways to effectively address it.

Jeff B. countered that these issues have been dealt with already for the existing student regent seat on the BOR. Johnsen responded that students are not employees, which is a big difference from faculty and staff. In terms of intent, however, he feels they are on the same page.

Anna L. noted that she had provided feedback and ideas about the budget to the Chancellor, following the forum he held on that topic. She was told that the Chancellor did not have the power to address her ideas, and so she asked President Johnsen where she could provide them for his (and the Board's) consideration. He responded that he would be happy to take her comments and ideas, or anyone else's, via email: [ua.president@alaska.edu](mailto:ua.president@alaska.edu).

Ken A. asked if student regents abstain from voting when items that present conflicts of interest come up to the Board. President Johnsen responded that they absolutely do if there's a legal conflict of interest. Ken commented that it would seem there is always a conflict of interest because the vast majority of what the Board deals with concerns the university and the students. The President noted that there are specific cases where regents or students might need to declare a conflict of interest; but most seeming conflicts for a student regent (e.g., tuition increases, where they are one among thousands of students) get washed out. The case would be similar for faculty and staff. The President added that the heart of the matter is how faculty can have a greater voice in the Board of Regents' considerations.

## VI Public Comment

No public comments were made.

## VII Election of 2017-18 President-Elect

Personal Statements:

A. [Donie Bret-Harte](#)

B. [Gordon Williams](#)

The election was held by means of secret ballot. Ballots were counted over the meeting break, and Donie Bret-Harte was elected by the majority.

BREAK (followed by announcement of election results)

## VIII Governance Reports

A. [Research Report](#) - VC Hinzman (linked)

B. Staff Council - Nate Bauer

No report was available from Staff Council.

### C. ASUAF - Colby Freel

Colby spoke about the follow-up feedback opportunity afforded to students on the Strategic Pathway II options. He also remarked upon the voluntary resolution agreement reached between the university and the Office of Civil Rights, noting the related processes need to be re-evaluated regularly. He also shared about the recent student government election and actions concerning the now-reduced Student Rec Center student fee.

Jeff B. asked about the UAF survey the students did regarding athletics. Colby noted the survey included student athletes and shared some of the more general results.

Candi D. complimented Colby on his professionalism and service on behalf of student government.

Ken A. asked Colby for some clarifications regarding the SRC fee as it related to paying off bonds. Colby explained the old \$75 fee paid for both the bonds and building facilities. The new \$30 fee will pay for supporting present needs of the facility.

### D. UNAC - Chris Coffman UNAD Report - Katie Boylan UAFT - Kate Quick

Chris C. reported that United Academics has reached an impasse in negotiations with the university administration, and has requested mediation by the Alaska Labor Relations Agency. Information has gone out to the membership and is posted on the [UNAC web site](#).

She expressed the strong opposition that United Academics holds regarding the proposed discontinuation of the Extension Research Program. She noted that this opposition stems from the fact that United Academics has found no evidence that this program exists at UAF, by which it was specifically meant they have found no evidence that it was created through the formal channels through which program approvals must go. UNAC thus considers the Research Extension Program to be a nonexistent program that was named as such outside of official processes to create a pretext for the future elimination of tenured and tenure-track faculty

## F. Faculty Alliance Report



A change to the title of the policy was made and approved to include the word “student” with reference to the policy.

Dean of Students Laura McCollough clarified that the goal with this document is provide a clear path if academic misconduct occurs in the classroom. It does not supplant the Student Code of Conduct or Board of Regent policy. She also clarified the options in the policy. the page is 002 of 026 (1/15/2002)

proposed to reinstate some the clarifying language that had been struck through in the definition of “Academic Leader,” and to remove the word “administrative” from it, as well.

Clarification was sought about items #3 under Section III. Procedures, subsection A. Informal Procedures.



## Motion to Confirm Outstanding Senate Service of the Year Award

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Dr. Sine Anahita for the Outstanding Senate Service of the Year for 2016-2017.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The screening committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and with concurrence of the Faculty Senate President, forwards the nomination of Sine Anahita for confirmation by the Faculty Senate. Procedures stipulate that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*



Early Modern period almost from the outset of their college careers. The structure of this minor

PHIL F411/PS F411 Classical Political Theory---3 Credits\*  
PS F411/PHIL F411 Classical Political Theory---3 Credits\*  
PHIL F412/PS F412 Modern Political Theory---3 Credits\*  
PS F412/PHIL F412 Modern Political Theory---3 Credits\*

3. Minimum credits required---18 credits

\* Course offered every two years

\*\* Course offered every three years

## RESOLUTION

of Support for a Faculty Board of Regents Member

**WHEREAS**, State of Alaska Statute AS 14.40.120 in combination with AS 14.40.130 codifies the composition of the University of Alaska Board of Regents to include a student Regent, but currently does not include any faculty Regents; and

**WHEREAS**, the outcome of a survey reported<sup>1</sup> by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) reveals that many universities have included faculty members in their governing boards.

**WHEREAS**, the current faculty of the University of Alaska have a wealth of institutional knowledge and serve a vital role in promoting the health and well being of our State's University; now

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, the UAF Faculty Senate goes on record to support the modification of the State of Alaska Statute, as needed, to legislate the addition of a faculty member to serve on the University of Alaska Board of Regents.



**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to place the Ethics requirement under Baccalaureate Degree Requirements and the Library Science requirement under Associate Degree Requirements and Baccalaureate Degree Requirements and to remove Ethics and Library Science requirements from the General Education Requirements (GERs). Students pursuing Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degrees will no longer be required to take Ethics; however, they will need to fulfill the Library Science requirement as part of the Associate Degree Requirements. All students pursuing Baccalaureate degrees will be required to fulfill both the Ethics and Library Science requirements.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE: The new classification list system for the General Education Requirements (GERs) implemented in 2016-2017 was intended to meet the charge to faculty across the UA system by the UA Board of Regents (BOR) to develop and adopt common GERs. (See BOR's resolution at the April 3-4, 2014 meeting.)

When the UAF Faculty Senate approved the criteria for courses within the GER lists on November 9, 2015, it also voted to retain the Ethics requirement.

The Ethics and Library Science requirements are UAF-specific requirements andrsyAFsp



**Plagiarism:** presenting the work of another as one's own. Examples of plagiarism include submitting as one's own work that of another student, a ghost writer, or a commercial writing service; directly quoting from a source without acknowledgment; paraphrasing or summarizing another's work without acknowledging the source; using facts, figures, graphs, charts, or other information without acknowledging the source. Plagiarism may be verbal or written and may include computer programs and files, research designs, distinctive figures of speech, ideas and images or any other information that belongs to another person and is not acknowledged as such.

**Falsification:** inventing or unauthorized altering of any information or citation in an academic work. Examples of falsification include inventing or counterfeiting data or research procedures; falsely citing a source of information; altering the record of, or reporting false information about, practicum or clinical experiences; altering grade reports or other academic records; submitting a false excuse for absence or tardiness; altering a returned examination paper to obtain a better grade.

**Tampering:** interfering with, altering or attempting to alter academic records, grades, assignments, laboratory experiments, or class-related documents without authorization. Examples of tampering include using a computer or false-written document to change or affect the grade recorded for a student and forging the signature of a University official on a drop/add sheet or other official University record.

**Procedures:**

If an instructor has reason to believe that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, the following procedures apply:

**1) Informal Resolution:** The instructor shall personally and privately advise the student there is reason to believe that the student has committed an act that constitutes academic misconduct. The student shall be allowed a reasonable opportunity to respond or explain. This communication may be conducted face-to-face.



## **Academic Misconduct Notification Form**

The Academic Misconduct Policy at the University of Alaska Fairbanks requires that an instructor complete this form if he/she decides a formal resolution is required. Having completed the form, the instructor should keep the original in his/her files and give a copy to the student, to the department chair, to the appropriate dean, and to the Dean of Students.

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate, upon recommendation of the Student Academic and Development and Achievement Committee, moves to amend the Admissions policy for how pre-majors are admitted and moved to major status. Students who do not yet meet the requirements for a Bachelor's degree will have pre-major status as General Studies students until they meet the minimum requirements to move to major status in General Studies. At this point students may change major to a department of their choice if they have met that program's requirements.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE: This motion amends the current pre-major policy at UAF. This addresses a concern that students were advancing to major status under the current pre-major policy without meeting the minimum requirements. Classifying pre-major students as General Studies students eliminates confusion about who advises them and provides students with consistent access to advisors and support networks. Under the new policy, students will not be admitted to a major until they have met the minimum requirements for that major.

\*\*\*\*\*

Additions in bold italics and deletions indicated with strike-through.

**Applying for Admission: Bachelor's Degree Programs**

**Pre-Major (Pre-major status when applying for admission, UAF catalog)**

~~not all requirements for immediate admittance to a bachelor's degree will have been met, pre-major students will work with an academic advisor to determine the best selection of courses to pursue. Students who are in good standing and have completed 14 credits at the 100 level or above (9 credits must satisfy baccalaureate general education requirements) with a C grade average (2.0) or **higher** better, of which 9 credits must satisfy baccalaureate general education requirements, will be changed to major status as General Studies students. The vice provost will notify students of their change of status and inform the registrar. Pre-major students do not use the change of major form to move from pre-major to major status in General Studies, but may use the form to change from pre-major status in one program to another program from **General Studies to their desired major once they have been accepted as baccalaureate students.** Academic assistance and actions are processed the same as for general studies students.~~

\*\*\*\*\*

History:

**FY02** Motion to add a "pre-major" admission status to the baccalaureate degree. Meeting #109

**FY07** Motion to revise how pre-majors move to major status. Meeting #143

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the Appeals Policy for Academic Decisions (other than assignment of grades), as shown below.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2017

RATIONALE:



scheduled instruction, excluding Saturday and Sunday, included on the academic calendar in effect at the time of a review, as defined in university regulations (R09.03.024) . Final examination periods are counted as class days.

B. The term "academic leader" is used to denote the administrative head of the academic department offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arose.

~~B. "Department Chair" for the purposes of this policy denotes the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course (e.g., head, chairpersons and the course coordinator)~~

after the beginning of the next regular semester.

3. The academic leader notifies the dean that an action has commenced. The dean invites all relevant parties that an informal review has begun.
  4. If the student wishes to appeal an academic decision, the student should work with their committee chair, department chair, associate dean, and dean as necessary to resolve the academic decision. The dean makes the final decision and provides a report to the student and to the affected parties within 10 class days.
  5. ~~2.~~ There may be extenuating circumstances when the deadlines cannot be met due to illness, ~~mail disruption~~, or other situations over which the student may have no control. In such a case, upon request from the student, the academic leader ~~Provost~~, after review of supporting documentation provided by the student, may recommend to the appeals committee that the deadlines be adjusted accordingly. ~~may adjust the deadlines accordingly.~~ At the discretion of the academic leader, A — an extension of the deadline will be limited to one semester but every effort should be made to complete the appeal process within the current semester.
  6. If the student wishes to appeal the decision of the academic leader, the student can file a formal appeal with the Office of the Provost. ~~3. In cases where the decision was rendered by a committee of faculty (such as those dealing with graduate examinations and evaluations), the provost will request the appropriate committee to conduct an informal review of its decision. The committee of faculty will determine whether its original decision should be overturned or changed in any way. The committee of faculty will submit its recommendation to the provost through the department chair and dean/director within 10 days.~~
- ~~4. In all other matters, the Provost will request the appropriate department chair to conduct an informal review of the decision. The Department chair will determine whether the original decision should be overturned or changed in any way. The department chair will submit his/her recommendation to the provost through the dean/director within 10 days. In the event that the department chair is directly involved, the provost can ask the dean/director to conduct an informal review and submit his/her recommendations directly to him.~~
- ~~5. The Provost will consult with the student on the committee of faculty's or department chair's recommendation. If the student does not find that recommendation acceptable, he/she may request the Provost to conduct a formal review.~~

B. Formal Procedures ~~The formal review will be conducted as follows.~~

1. This formal review is initiated by the student through a ~~signed, written~~ request in writing to the Office of the Provost.
  - a. The student's request for formal review must be submitted using the formal Academic Decisions Other Than Assignment of Grades Appeals form ~~may be submitted using university forms specifically designed for this purpose and~~ available in person or electronically ~~from the Office of the Provost.~~
  - b. By submitting a request for a review, the student acknowledges that no additional mechanisms exist within the university for the informal ~~formal~~ review of the decision., ~~and that the university's administration including the college dean/director can not influence or affect the outcome of the formal review.~~
  - c. The request for a formal review must be received no later than 5 class ~~40~~ days after the student has learned the outcome of the informal review. ~~(HIA4).~~
  - d. The student will work with the Office of the Provost on collecting appropriate documentation to support their appeal and must submit this documentation with the appeal.
  - d. ~~The request must detail the basis for the allegation that the decision was made on a basis other than sound professional judgment based upon standard academic policies, procedures and practices.~~
2. The ~~5-member~~ review committee will be appointed by the Provost and the Faculty Senate president as follows:
  - a. The Provost shall appoint one non-voting ~~tenure-track~~ faculty member holding academic rank, who is represented through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements, ~~from the academic unit in which the decision was made.~~ This individual shall serve in an advisory role. This faculty member shall not be the individual(s) against whom the appeal is directed.
  - b. Two ~~tenure-track~~ faculty members holding academic rank, who are represented through the current applicable collective bargaining agreements, ~~from within the college or school but outside of the unit in which the decision was made shall be appointed.~~ One of these members shall be appointed by the Provost. The other person shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President and shall be a member of the Faculty Senate (including alternate members), if available.
  - c. One ~~tenure-track~~ faculty member holding academic rank, who is represented





- i. direct the **academic leader** ~~program instructor or department chair~~ to reconsider the decision,
  - ii. provide a final alternative decision.
- b. The academic decision review committee proceedings will result in the preparation of written findings and conclusions.
- c. A formal, written report of the decision must be forwarded to the student, **academic leader** ~~instructor, program/department chair~~, dean and Provost within five **class** days of the meeting. The Provost shall then be responsible for communicating the decision to other relevant offices (e.g., Admissions, Registrar).
- d. The decision of the committee is final.

~~G. The entire process must be completed by the end of the semester in which the decision first took effect.~~

-----

**Record of Changes to the Appeals of Academic Decisions Other Than Assignment of Grades Policy:**

The following is a complete copy of the Academic Appeals Policy as passed by the UAF Faculty Senate at its Meeting #96 (Sept. 25, 2000) and amended at its Meeting #101 (April 2, 2001), Meeting #109 (May 6, 2002), Meeting #123 (May 3, 2004), Meeting #157 (March 2, 2009), and Meeting #183 (May 7, 2012).

- ” Policy at Section III, Procedures, subsection B, Item 2, was revised at Meeting #183 (May 7, 2012).
- ” Deadlines were revised at Meeting #157 (March 2, 2009).

**MOTION:**

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to amend the approved updated procedure to accomplish the program review process as required by Board of Regents Policy and UA Regulations (10.06) which it passed at Meeting #219 on December 5, 2016. The more recent amendment of March 15, 2017 is indicated in bold, italicized text (below).

Effective: Spring 2017

Rationale: The existing process was modified at Meeting #181 (March 5, 2012) to accommodate a five year review cycle. The revisions approved at Meeting #219 are intended to ensure faculty input, and clarify the role of the Faculty Senate in program eliminations. The Program Review Template as well as the BOR Policy for 10.06 have also changed since the last Faculty Senate motion in 2012, and current versions are included. The most recent amendment proposed here in red text concerns the process at step 2.

\*\*\*\*\*

Additions: bold italics

Deletions: ~~strikethrough~~

The program review process shall be completed as follows:

1. An initial review based on centrally generated productivity and efficiency summary and a unit-provided brief narrative describing mission centrality, the prospective market for graduates, the

Committee shall provide a brief narrative justifying their recommendation and describe any areas needing improvement prior to the next review. A summary of the recommendation shall be shared with the program under review and the Faculty Senate President, who may request a copy of the full narrative. The Faculty Senate President, in consultation with members of the Faculty Senate Administrative Committee, then has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks. The program under review also has the option to send a response to the Provost within two weeks.



**MOTION:**