

## FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Sheri Layral  
312 Signers' Hall  
474-7964 fysenat@uaf.edu

For Audioconferencing: Bridge #: 1-800-910-9710  
Anchorage: 561-9710

A G E N D A  
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #76  
Monday, December 8, 1997  
1:30 - 3:55 p.m.  
Wood Center Ballroom

1:30	I	Call to Order - John Craven A. Roll Call B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #75 (November 10, 1997) C. Adoption of Agenda	5 Mn.
1:35	II	Status of Chancellor's Office Actions A. Motions Approved: Amend Article VI of the Constitution B. Motions Pending: none	5 Mn.
1:40	III	A. Remarks by Chancellor J. Wadlow B. Remarks by Provost J. Keating C. Guest Speaker - Senator Gary Wilken	10 Mn. 5 Mn. 15 Mn.
2:10	IV	Governance Reports A. ASUAF - S. Nuss B. Staff Council - P. Long C. President's Report - J. Craven (Attachment 76/1) D. President-Elect's Comments - M. Schatz (Attachment 76/2)	5 Mn. 5 Mn. 10 Mn. 10 Mn.
2:40	V	Public Comments/Questions	5 Mn.
2:45		***BREAK***	10 Mn.
2:55	VI	New Business A. Motion to approve the Certificate in Microcomputer Support Specialist, submitted by Curriculum Review (Attachment 76/3) B. Motion to Approve the AAS in Microcomputer Support Specialist, submitted by Curriculum Review (Attachment 76/4) C. Motion on Unit Level Criteria for Development of Distance Education (Attachment 76/5) D. Resolution on RIP (Attachment 76/6) E. Motion to approve policy concerning UAF faculty and advanced degrees, submitted by Faculty and Scholarly Affairs (Attachment 76/7) F. Motion on recommended changes to the draft Board of Regents' Student Affairs Policies and Regulations, submitted by Curricular Affairs (Attachment 76/8) G. Letter to the Governor, submitted by Legislative and Fiscal Affairs (Handout)	5 Mn. 5 Mn. 5 Mn. 5 Mn. 5 Mn. 5 Mn. 5 Mn.

- 3: 30 VI I Committee Reports 15 Mn.
- A. Curricular Affairs - G. McBeath (Attachment 76/9)
- B. Faculty & Scholarly Affairs - R. Gavlak
- C. Graduate & Professional Curricular Affairs - M. Whalen (Attachment 76/10)
- D. Core Review - J. Brown
- E. Curriculum Review - J. French (Attachment 76/11)
- F. Developmental Studies - J. Weber (Attachment 76/12)
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight - J. Kelley
- H. Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement - D. Porter
- I. Graduate School Advisory Committee - S. Henrichs
- J. Legislative & Fiscal Affairs - S. Deal
- K. Service Committee - K. Nance

3: 45 VIII Discussion Items 5 Mn.

• 0yh€-•u —\ Š f Ž †•

3: 50 IX Members' Comments/Questions 5 Mn.

Ø @ p`À ,° P Pđqp-•u q` APœ ``Ø @`€€• P€†€• P ‹‹• ... Àq•0

3: 55 X Adjournment

‹... † ‘ 0

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/1 —: †0Š † À 0 à 0 - Pli@ X 0`\\0

UAF FACULTY SENATE #76

DECEMBER 8, !U

passed it. For completeness, the motion as passed reads as follows:

"The Board of Regents receives President Komisar's recommendations regarding the Redesign of the University of Alaska Administrative System and the Creation of Administrative Service Centers: expresses its tremendous thanks to President Komisar for appointing the committee and for the work of Dr. Vadow specifically, and her committee for their very fine effort; and directs President Komisar to re-engineer functions and organize the administrative system according to the following seven points:

1. maintain a strong presidency with the ability to concentrate on policy issues but responsible to the Board of Regents for both the executive and service functions;
2. endorse the concept of a President's Council;
3. clearly distinguish between executive and service functions;
4. maintain a university-wide system that avoids unnecessary duplication to the maximum extent possible;
5. assure that re-engineering of functions and organization results in new reductions of executive/administrative costs of at least \$2 million per year for a total of \$10 million over the next four years beginning with FY99;
6. keep operational authority closest to customers; and
7. assure that this be done in a form in which actual savings can be projected and reported."

If I read this correctly, President Komisar can now begin to re-engineer the operations as he desires, subject only to these very general guiding principles. I don't wish to put Chancellor Vadow on the spot without asking her in advance, but I hope we can gain from her some insight into what may now actually occur.

As my last item concerning the Board of Regents' meeting, you may have read that the meeting with the State Board of Education did not take place, as "they" ran out of time. If you delve more closely you will find that an apparent breakdown occurred in communications and each side thought the other had gone home. From my perspective, the Regents were late in finishing their work, as described above, and did not adjourn until after they were due elsewhere in Anchorage to meet with the State Board of Education. Given the delicate situation with regard to our School of Education, this was no time to be making such huge mistakes in communication. I still have no idea what really happened, but the message was clear at the Regents' meeting; the other side had gone home, rightly or, as it now seems, wrongly.

And finally, I want to say what has been on my mind even before the Regents' meeting. It was stimulated by Dean Carla Kirts article in the 7 November 1997 issue of the Cornerstone. In this article, Dean Kirts appears to have accepted the notion that students are consumers, for she says "...is it really worth arguing about?" That notion may be useful at Student Services, but I hope it does not permeate the rest of the campus. Personally, I find the notion abhorrent that an educational institution is delivering a product, education. Let me explain my view. First, the consumer, the state to which we can be personally reduced by modern advertising-driven capitalism is a human-powered machine that labors to buy those things that are needed and, more importantly, those numerous commodities that are not needed. The simple fact is that most of us are participating, whether we acknowledge it or not.

Now to education, or, more correctly, the continuation of our never-ending attempt to decrease ignorance of the world and people around us. By this I do not mean to imply personal ignorance on our parts, but to emphasize that no matter how hard we try, there is so very much of which we will have no -- not little, but no -- awareness,

try as we will. Education is highly personal. Our improvements are centered around personal initiatives and intellectual achievements; they are not purchased at the grocery store or Student Services. The achievements are gained by hard personal work, mental and physical, in the classroom within study groups, in the late nights of reading and writing, in our numerous out-of-class experiences, in our homes through distance education courses, in our personal everyday readings and conversations, in our contributions to the community, and in so many more ways. They are gained because of personal effort, only heighten and focused by the persons sometimes honored





NOTI ON  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the A. A. S. in  
Microcomputer Support Specialist.

EFFECTIVE: Upon Board of Regents' Approval

RATIONALE: See full program proposal #29 on file in the  
Governance Office, 312 Sigmund Hall.

\*\*\*\*\*

Executive Summary  
A. A. S., Microcomputer Support Specialist  
60 credits

As computers become indispensable in our daily lives, agencies and businesses are discovering that providing ongoing support for computer users is an absolute necessity. The critical need for well-trained professionals with the requisite technical computer knowledge and people support skills is becoming every more apparent. Thus, the objective of this A. A. S. program is to build on the Certificate for Microcomputer Support Specialist and provide additional skill development in the major area as well as associate level general education requirements. For some, this may become a stepping stone to more advanced work in computer science at the baccalaureate level.

As one of the programs approved last year for funding through the President's Reallocation Fund, this program meets the criteria for being collaborative statewide, focused on vocational/technical training, and utilizing alternative modes of delivery. The group of faculty and staff who compose the committee making this project proposal come from all three MAUs. Microcomputer support represents an area of vocational/technical expertise that is increasingly desired and needed within the state but which is not currently satisfied by any University of Alaska program. And, there is a direct relationship between the requirements of the courses and the expected skills and knowledge the student will need on the job; the program will be competency based, individualized, and available at a distance through a variety of delivery modes.

The program staff developed a questionnaire regarding microcomputer classes that was sent to 1247 people in state government, educational institutions, libraries, military bases, private corporations and businesses including Native corporations; 257 responses were received for a response rate of 21%. About 78% of the respondents indicated there was a need for a program leading to a certificate as a microcomputer support specialist, and 84% said it would be helpful to have a person trained in this area working for their organization; 58% said, if they were in a position to hire staff, they would seek to hire someone with such a certificate. Finally 56% said they themselves would be interested in obtaining a microcomputer specialist certificate.

A great number of students have already inquired about this program having heard by word of mouth, apparently, of its imminent availability. Extended campus directors, faculty in this area, and others have told us that many potential students are waiting to enroll. Therefore, it is anticipated that a sufficient number of students will enroll in the program. In fact, the opposite problem of





UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTION  
=====

WHEREAS, The University of Alaska Faculty Senate has discussed in depth the consequences of the 1996-97 academic year Retirement Incentive Program and

WHEREAS, Positions vacated in that RIP were not refilled on a one-to-one basis by the administration; and

WHEREAS, The loss of faculty members to retirement in certain departments caused undue hardship to certain academic programs; and

WHEREAS, College deans were given the power to decide in which way faculty members in their units would have input into the decisions as to which positions were more important to departments than others; and

WHEREAS, Recommendations from the dean's level in colleges were not always followed in replacing faculty positions once these recommendations reached the Provost and Chancellor levels; and

WHEREAS, The RIP program unduly impacts departments with a

NOTI ON  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft Board of Regents' Policy and Regulations 09.01.00, 09.03.00, 09.04.00, and 09.05.00, at the request of the Faculty Alliance, and recommends that Regulation 09.03.00 rejected as written and makes no suggestions with regard to the other draft regulations and policies.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The basis for the draft language submitted to the Board of Regents was the existing and functioning UAF rules, which were specifically designed to guarantee completion of the procedure in ONE semester with only one meeting of a review committee, and to keep it as simple as possible. The draft procedures do not guarantee completion in one semester, provide for as many as three review committee meetings, and turn it into a student-unfriendly procedure that will dissuade many from seeking corrections of what may have truly been arbitrary and capricious grading. The present UAF rules were written in response to a request by the Provost (UAF Chief Academic Officer) to get this issue out of his office. The draft reverses this by replacing the dean with the "Chief Academic Officer", hence putting it back in his office and the other MAUs' chief academic officers; it is regressive. The draft review does not protect faculty rights to due process. The draft rules violate the fundamental axiom of academe that degrees are awarded by faculty in that it violates the corollary that only faculty award grades that count toward degrees. Based on experience by several faculty members, having two students on the committee rather than another faculty member is probably detrimental to the student's chance of a successful appeal. There are basic structural problems with the draft. For example, in Section B, "Resolution of Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions", the first sentence is general, and states that section is not limited to assignment of final course grades. The second sentence limits this entire section to assignment of the final grade. It can't be both and the material that follows is designed to address the question of final grades, but with confusing language related to the other issues. There are other serious structural problems.

The UAF Faculty Senate's Curricular Affairs Committee has spent many hours on this review and has concluded there are too many issues involved for a simple markup of the draft. The UAF Faculty Senate offers to meet with the drafting committee to make clear the areas of concern and to aid in the creation of regulations that will truly aid as opposed to hinder students.

\*\*\*\*\*



## a. Academic Leader

The term "academic leader" is used to denote the administrative head of the academic unit offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arose. The term is adopted to refer to the person with immediate administrative authority for the program generally but not always, at a level below that of dean or director.

## b. Academic Unit

The term "academic unit" generally refers to a department or other group with responsibility for academic decisions within a school, college, institute, or center. The term may refer to a school, college, institute or center in instances when a smaller unit is either of insufficient size for a given purpose or non-existent.

## c. Arbitrary and Capricious Grading

Arbitrary and capricious grading means the assignment of a final course grade on a basis other than performance in the course; the use of standards different from those applied to other students in the same course; or substantial, unreasonable and/or unannounced departure from the course instructor's previously articulated standards or criteria. (See also "grading error.")

## d. Chief Academic Officer

The chief academic officer is the individual responsible for the administration of the academic program of the MAU.

## e. Class Day

As used in the schedule for review of academic decisions, a class day is any day of scheduled instruction, excluding Saturday and Sunday, included on the academic calendar in effect at the time of a review. Final examination periods are counted as class days.

## f. Dean/Director

The dean/director is the administrative head of the college or school offering the course or program from which the academic decision or action arises. For students at extended campuses the director of the campus may substitute for the dean/director of the unit offering the course or program

## g. Final Grade

The final grade is the letter grade assigned for a course upon its completion. A grade of I (Incomplete) is considered a temporary grade up to one year following assignment, during which time it is not subject to review. After standing for one year an Incomplete grade may be challenged by the student.

hr. n. ~~ORCA~~ ~~and~~ ~~Fig~~ Error

A grading error is a mathematical miscalculation of a final grade or an inaccurate recording of the final grade. (See also "arbitrary and capricious ENE

semester.

(2) [[If the course instructor cannot be contacted promptly, the academic leader will undertake the review and so notify the student in writing.]]

IF THE INSTRUCTOR IS NO LONGER AN EMPLOYEE OF THE UNIVERSITY OR IS OTHERWISE UNAVAILABLE, THE STUDENT MUST BRING THE MATTER TO THE ATTENTION OF THE ACADEMIC LEADER WHO WILL MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO CONTACT THE INSTRUCTOR.

A. IF THE INSTRUCTOR CANNOT BE CONTACTED BUT COURSE RECORDS ARE AVAILABLE, THE ACADEMIC LEADER MAY CORRECT A GRADING ERROR THROUGH THE REGULAR CHANGE OF GRADE PROCESS ON BEHALF OF THE INSTRUCTOR.

B. IF THE INSTRUCTOR CAN NOT BE CONTACTED AND COURSE RECORDS ARE EITHER UNAVAILABLE OR INDECISIVE, THE STUDENT MAY REQUEST A REVIEW FOLLOWING THE PROCEDURE OUTLINED BELOW

C. IF THE INSTRUCTOR CAN BE CONTACTED AND ELECTS TO PARTICIPATE, THEN A CONSTRUCTIVE PARTICIPATION IS TO BE WELCOMED BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE. THE PROCEDURES OF PARAGRAPH III. A. 5. A. OR PARAGRAPH III. A. 5. B. WILL BE INSTITUTED IF THE INSTRUCTOR WITHDRAWS FROM PARTICIPATION.

(3) Within ten (10) class days of receipt of the written request, the instructor or the academic leader will notify the student in writing of the decision concerning the final grade and, if a change is required, process the change of final grade according to MAU rules and procedures.

(4) If the student does not receive a response or receives a negative response, from the course instructor or the academic leader by the required deadline, the student has five (5) days to submit the written request for review to the dean/director. The dean/director must rule on the final grade and notify the student of the decision within 10 class days.

(5) In the review of final grades on the basis of grading error, the dean or the director has the authority to issue the final decision of the university.

c. Formal Review Procedures for Disputes Regarding Academic Decisions or Actions Other Than for Allegation of Grading Error.







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.

(5) If the student's request for review is not dismissed, the committee will request a formal response from the previous decision maker(s) to the student's request for review. The response will be due to the review committee within five (5) class days. The previous decision maker(s) and the student will be notified in writing of the time and place of the hearing, which must occur within 15 class days of the decision to conduct a hearing. The student and the previous decision maker(s) will be invited to attend.

(6) The meeting will be closed unless otherwise requested by BOTH THE INSTRUCTOR AND the student prior to the start of the proceeding. A request for an open meeting will be granted to the extent allowed by law unless the facilitator/moderator of the review committee determines that all or part of the proceeding should be closed based upon considerations of fairness, justice, and other relevant factors. The INSTRUCTOR AND student may choose an advisor to be present at all times during the proceedings. However, the advisor may not speak or ask questions on the student's OR INSTRUCTOR'S behalf except on limited occasions at the discretion and request of the facilitator/moderator.

(7) The committee will deliberate in private and will forward its written findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the [[chief academic officer]] DEAN or designee within five (5) class days of the meeting.

A. THE COMMITTEE IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO AWARD A GRADE (LETTER OR PASS/FAIL) OR TAKE ANY ACTION WITH REGARD TO THE INSTRUCTOR.

B. ACTIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE CAN TAKE IF IT ACCEPTS THE STUDENT'S ALLEGATION OF ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS GRADING MUST BE DIRECTED TOWARDS A FAIR AND JUST RESOLUTION, AND MAY INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, THE FOLLOWING:

1) DIRECT THE INSTRUCTOR TO GRADE AGAIN THE STUDENT'S WORK UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD,

2) DIRECT THE INSTRUCTOR TO ADMINISTER A NEW FINAL



[Reserved]

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/9  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

MINUTES OF THE CURRICULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, 12/2/97

The Curricular Affairs Committee met at 3:45 p.m. in Wood Center

A. All members of the committee except John French and Paul Reichardt were in attendance. John Craven also attended the meeting. The committee discussed the three items on its agenda:

1. Review of motion on course level definitions

The committee reviewed the entire text of the motion and made several recommendations, by section.

UPPER DIVISION COURSES

The committee recommended that the third sentence (Freshman and sophomore students are rena

2. Review of motion on recommended changes to the draft Board of Regents Student Affairs Policies and Regulations.

For the third time, the committee reviewed these draft policy statements. After several attempts to remove contradictions, improve linkages, and clarify and simplify procedures, the committee found it could not remedy the basic flaws in the document. The committee then voted, unanimously, to approve John Craven's substitute motion, as follows:

MOTION  
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate has reviewed the draft Board of Regents' Policy and Regulations 09.01.00, 09.03.00, 09.04.00, and 09.05.00, at the request of the Faculty Alliance, and recommends that Regulation 09.03.00 rejected as written and makes no suggestions with regard to the other draft regulations and policies.

3. Review of draft common grading policy

Committee members noted several errors in the proposed common policy, and opined that it requires further, detailed examination. The chair appointed a sub-committee composed of Ann Tremarello and Alexandra Fitts to review the policy and prepare recommendations for the next CAC meeting.

4. Agenda for the next meeting

Discussion produced three agenda items for the next CAC meeting (in late January or early February, 1998):

A. Whether "D" grades, currently disallowed in the major, should also be disallowed in the minor.

B. Whether core curriculum courses can be counted toward major and minor requirements.

C. The timeline for issuing freshman low-grade reports.

The committee adjourned at 4:55 p.m. Submitted by J. McBeath.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/10  
UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
DECEMBER 8, 1997  
SUBMITTED BY GRADUATE & PROFESSIONAL CURRICULAR AFFAIRS

UAF Faculty Senate  
Graduate and Professional Curricular Affairs Committee  
Meeting Notes  
November 19, 1997

Present: Allen, Finney, Lando, Whalen (Chair), Dean Kan (Ex-Officio), Craven (Ex-Officio), Stephens (Ex-Officio), Gregory (Ex-Officio)

Chair Whalen called meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

I. File Review Assignment.  
Divided responsibility for review of proposals into five categories. Person responsible will study the file, report back to the committee at the next meeting, and make recommendations.  
Responsibilities were as follows:

Allen	Education
Lando	Undergraduate/Graduate Listings & Physics
Conti	Ph. D. Marine Biology & Fisheries
Finney	Biology & Wildlife Biology
Whalen	Anthropology, Art, Accounting, Business
Administration,	Information Systems

Gregory: Gave the concerns that Sheri Layral summarized as a handout for the committee.

Gregory: Raised questions regarding graduate courses in ART, a department which has no graduate degree. These courses are offered for interdisciplinary degrees. Can graduate courses be offered in a program without a graduate degree?

Examples of this practice exist on campus: There are STAT courses offered at the graduate level without a graduate program

Kan: Noted this is a standard procedure to building a graduate program

Whalen: There is no policy against this.

Kan: Most universities allow this.

## II. Final Semester registration

Craven: Work in motion for policy on registration for last semester in Graduate School. Idea is to write a clear situation of exception without appeal or waiver.

Current Rule: Graduate student must be registered for 3 credits during semester of graduation.

Kan: Why not use 1 credit?

Craven: Motion in Development:

"When a graduate student has COMPLETED all requirements for receipt of a graduate degree, including all thesis or project submissions to the Graduate School, the Library and academic department, AND has completed all formal applications for the degree and paid all fees, AND has completed all obligations to his or her advisor with regard to that degree, that graduate student is then released from the above requirements."

Rationale. Present UAF policy specifies the following:  
That a graduate student must be registered in the semester of graduation. This is an established requirement in the catalog, but the origin is not presently established. It appears to be a policy of great age.

The Fairbanks Academic Council policy effective in the fall of 1985 (approved by the chancellor on May 30, 1984) requires that all graduate students must register for a minimum of 3 credits or extended registration each semester (excluding summer session) in which he/she is actively working towards a degree.

This motion releases the student from the condition that "a graduate student must be registered in the semester of graduation," once the student is no longer placing any demands for services on the faculty and administration of UAF.

The motion in development must in addition address:

Need statement on extended registration.

What else has changed?

What does BOR say about this issue?

Additional Comments.

The effect of these two policies appears to be unambiguous, and there is nothing suggested that would provide for the application for a waiver to this policy. It does not mean that the administration can't waive payment of fees or pay the fee for the student. It just means that the student must be registered at UAF in the manner specified elsewhere, independently of the student's physical location and status of any thesis work.

Please send comments on this motion in development to John Craven. Spirit of this is that the student should be done and drawing no resources from the University.

Whalen: Will read over this proposal and act on it next meeting.

3. Proposal for changes to commencement ceremony policy, proposed by graduate student concerns. Students wish to walk through commencement before all formal processes related to thesis or dissertation are completed.

Graduate student representative was not in attendance.

Whalen summarized issue:

Goal of graduate students is to allow students who have defended their thesis to walk through ceremony.

Gayle: Objections to name appearing in commencement book, as this is an official document. Name could appear next year in book, but book is used to determine who graduated each year. She does not feel abstract for dissertation should appear either.

Craven: Board of Regents certify the graduation afterwards.

Gayle: People come to campus and look at these commencement books from the 1940's as an official record.

Stephens: Also, the commencement book is archived in the library as an official document.

Kan: We have tried this on Ph.D. students, and it did not work. People have not fulfilled their responsibilities. At one point, it was Chancellor approved, now deferred to Kan. Concern regarding Board of Regents questioning this.

Craven: Regents policy is clear against this.

Lando: I would like to see policy completely prohibiting this.

Kan: Rule should be simple. If truly a unique situation, then there can be an exception. Things may have gotten lenient.

Lando: Situation now is if thesis is completed, the student can walk through graduation.

Kan: Will research this and report back on current policy and issues next meeting.

IV. New Issues

Craven: Bylaws of this committee state ex-officio committee members cannot vote.

Clari fied the wording for UA system descriptors for graduate courses, approved last meet—At

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/12  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
 DECEMBER 8, 1997  
 SUBMITTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Minutes of the  
 DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES COMMITTEE  
 November 18, 1997

Present: Charlotte Basham, Susan Blacklock, Richard Clausen, Cindy Hardy, Ron Illingworth, Kay Thomas (for Rose Kairaiuk), Joe Mason, Greg Owens, Mark Oswood, Ron Palcic, and Jane Weber

The committee met for the full hour with Dana Thomas to discuss outcomes assessment. Dana stated that outcomes assessment, as required for accreditation, has three parts:

Setting curriculum outcome goals,  
 Determining whether students meet these outcome goals, and  
 Reviewing the curriculum in light of these findings.

On our campus, four areas are being assessed:

Student information (which includes data used in advising such as SAT, ACT, and ASSET scores),  
 The core curriculum  
 Certificate and degree programs, and  
 Out-of-class learning (such as internships, study groups, and math and English labs).

Members of the committee asked the following questions:

Why is Developmental Studies being assessed? Where does it fall in the four areas being assessed?

Dana said that the accreditation process requires that any curriculum have underlying outcomes associated with it. The outcomes assessment process asks that we state our goals and collect information to assess how we meet those goals. DEVS may fall into its own area, though it's certainly linked to the core.

We have different class sequences on the Fairbanks campus and at the rural campuses. Do we need two types of assessment for these classes? Should we do a comparison?

Dana replied that the accreditation process looks at standards across classes. The outcomes assessment process should be the same for each class, no matter when or how the class is offered. He went on to stress that what's being assessed is student learning outcomes, not individual classes or courses.

Developmental classes do more than teach remedial English and math. They teach the learning process. How do we measure outcomes when we teach things such as these that are hard to measure?

Dana suggested that this should be an ongoing topic of discussion as we develop and refine our outcomes process.

Could we, as a result of this process, make changes in the curriculum such as changing course numbers to reflect the differences in DEV courses at the different campuses?

Dana stressed that assessment is an ongoing process. As a



result of the assessment process, we should make changes in curriculum as needed. This process will allow us to make good decisions about the curriculum.

Why is DEV being asked to do this now?

Dana noted that DEV courses came up at the beginning of the process, two years ago, but it wasn't clear then that DEV was one of the target areas that had to be part of the accreditation process. Now it's clear that DEV has to be part of that process.

Can we get real information on attrition and success such as SAT, ACT, and other assessments from Banner?

Dana informed us that the Instructional Working Group has set up a Banner web site and that he has requested that any faculty or staff be given a user ID for access to Banner through the web site. This is in the works.

We thanked Dana for an informative presentation. We will be addressing these questions again! Mark Oswood requested that the Developmental Science curriculum be placed on the agenda for the next meeting.

The next meeting of the Developmental Studies Committee will be Tuesday, December 9, 12:45-1:45 p.m.

\*\*\*\*\*

ATTACHMENT 76/13  
 UAF FACULTY SENATE #76  
 DECEMBER 9, 1997  
 SUBMITTED BY LEGISLATIVE & FISCAL AFFAIRS

Legislative and Fiscal Affairs Committee  
 Minutes 9, 12:45  
 17 November 1997  
 Conference Room A, Wood Center

Convened by Dr. Scott Deal

Present: Dr. Scott Deal  
 Dr. Edward Zilberkant  
 Daniel Cole-McCullough  
 Dr. John Craven

Discussion followed with the result being Dr. Deal would craft a reconstructed letter and resubmit it to the committee.

Marie Scholle gave an update report on the efforts of staff in gaining signatures from the public. Dr. Deal mentioned he had submitted about 400 signatures gathered from music concerts.

Discussion followed on the best way for this committee to energize its efforts.

Adjourned 2:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Daniel Cole-McCullough, Secretary.