

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting

Deborah Greenberg
Paul Lauer, Administrative Ex Temp Member

Meeting Agenda:

Items to review at a future meeting (not for this meeting today)

- (1) a review of the UAF policies for categories of Summa Cum Laude, Magna Cum Laude, etc. Andy and Sine responded that we are not the proper Committee for this. Paul thought this sounded like work for Curriculum Affairs Committee rather than the Faculty Affairs Committee. Debu mentioned that FAC can review the changes and make recommendations through the ADCOM for forwarding it to a different committee.
- (2) A review of the bylaws of the Faculty Administrative Review Committee (FARC)

That we table the discussion regarding mandatory reporting of Title IX violations
The university is hiring a new EEO/Title IX Director and that may eliminate the perceived

Changes there was a motion to approve the meeting agenda and it was supported.

Approval of October Meeting Minutes

That we adopt the minutes (with corrections added to them). The rest of the Committee
motion. Minutes were approved.

1. Revisions to Academic Program Review

Background:

At the Faculty Senate meeting earlier this week proposed changes of the Program Review process made by Andy, Sine, and members of the CAC were discussed and appeared to become strong opposition from Faculty Senators that serve on the Program Review Committee. They also said that the changes proposed would apply to all program reviews and their belief was that they would unduly bog down an already time consuming process. There was particular concern voiced over the language about allowing

the President of the Senate to review the Committee findings and write the report. No decisions were made.

Discussion of the Program Review policy resumed.

- o Andy began by explaining the revisions thus far. The bold black wording was suggested in the first round. A committee comprised of CAC and FAC added wording and changes in red. CAC added wording and changes in purple.
- x One of the changes to the program review process made by Vice Provost Fitts and denoted in black was to remove the statement, "Program deletion will require Faculty Senate action". Debu voiced concern regarding any revision that remove Faculty Senate from controlling the decision to eliminate a program. He argued it should not be given to the Chancellor because the Chancellor is not going to be focused on the impacts as the Faculty Senate would be. Specifically, the Faculty is responsible for ensuring academic integrity of the university is maintained.
- o Sine expressed that the process needs to be controlled by the faculty through the Faculty Senate. She spoke to how in the past there was always a faculty member on the review process. The current process is focused too much on expediency of process. Sine shared her Sociology Program's experience that the current special program review process is not really open to discussion and input from faculty.
- o Several committee members described how we might accomplish the need for efficient regular program review with the concern that special review be more open, deliberative, and open to faculty involvement. To accommodate this, we need to have policies that match two different tracks: (1) a process for regular program review make this one very efficient; and (2) a process for special program review make this one be very thorough because the stakes for the program and students are higher.
- o There was discussion that part of the problem is that currently there is no "special" program review. It is all considered program review and governed by the same policy. When asked, Alex Fitts is of the opinion that there is no "Special Program Review". It is all Program Review. Josh stated that this is what he was told as well. So, we may need to take that up with the Office of the Provost to see if it is possible to create a separate process for "special" reviews.
- o Debu wants the document to add a statement that says that if a program is to be deleted the decision must be supported by a vote of the Faculty Senate. To accomplish this we should move the proposed deleted language about Faculty Senate action in paragraph 3(d) to paragraph 4. This was a motion, it was seconded, discussed, and unanimously passed.

- o Val moved to have a friendly amendment of paragraph 3(d) be amended to delete the word “action” and insert the word “Faculty Senate vote” because what is meant by “action” is vague and not unanimously understood. Faculty Senate “action” refers to a Faculty Senate vote. This motion was seconded by JAK and there was Committee discussion on it. The friendly amendment was voted on and passed.
05/08/99 (r) TJ 0.2002 Tc 0.C 78D(e)10[(exp)56.3l-r)14a(r)146(7(l))-1.7(e)
- o Coming back to the original discussion, I proposed that the Program Review Process be different for regularly scheduled program review and special program review outside of the normal scheduled review.

- o Andy voiced opposition for fear that any new provisions will only further prevent any changes from getting approved this semester.
- x Vote:
 - o All in favor except for Andy

Jeff M. moved that we strike the language in paragraph 1 that says “The recommendations shared with the Faculty Senate President who has the option to respond to the provost within two weeks.” (in red font).

- x Sine seconded the motion and commented that this seemed to be the most problematic language based on the recent comments at the Senate. There was no further discussion.

x

6. Peer Review and Promotion Processes for Term Faculty

- x Jeff B. gave a short update
- x We decided to keep this on our agenda so that we can keep getting updates from Jeff B. on how this process is going.

Next meeting time: November 7, 2011 at 2:15 p.m.