Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) MeetingNovember 8 2017

Minutes:

Meeting began at 1:00 p.m., Duckering Building, Room 502 dites by Jeff May

Present:

x Committee Members: Andy Anger, Josh Greenberg, Jeff May, Sine A cathridan Williams, Ataur Chowdhury D Approval of Minutes flast Meeting:

Minutes discussed and approved.

ContinuedBusiness:

1. Grade Appeal Process

FAC reviewed the propose policy language changes that would developed in consultation Counsel during a recent meeting with them.

Discussed the request to change "advocate" to "supportent he new process. This as view appropriate because the person assisting isnore of a support role than a representative is support persons are not there to advocate or represent the student or the instructive support to address the committee. We discussed how to make this role clear in the policitye language was agreed upon:

Both the student and the instructor may be accompanied by a supporter. Supporters fo instructor may speak only at the discretion of the corterait Supporters shall not act as representatives.

Discussed/ALegal Counsel's desire to have the hearing with both student and instructor time. This important to due processThat is clarified in the new proposed policy amendm

Discussed adjusting the bottom paragraph of page 1. Decided to keep all language exce "... and may not seek further review of the matter under any other procedure within the This language will be removed to suggest finality **efph**ocess when decided by the Grade Group There was allotion to move this document with these changesADCOM. Jeff oved. Gordon seconded. All inavor.

Sine will send a courtesy copy to UAF General Council to respond to if there a teriang/igsues.

2. Shared Governance Discussion:

Sine explained her reaction the recent guest speaker from University of OregoonTitle IX issuesThe speakerspoke of the importance of getting faculty involved in the creation of Title IX policies for UA. That speaker discussed how the Title IX can and should be changed to not make instructors mandatory reporters. Sine used this as an example of better shared governance (creating a Title IX policy with faculty input).

The group discussed the University First Year Experience Course proposed/incy ProvostAlex Fitts during the most recent Faculty Senate meeting the past, the class has been optional and few students that need it have taken it. In the past the class was free to the to the will be a one-credit course that will be required of these atrisk students. There was some debate about whether the one credit class will meet the goal of the course and whether this proposal is being driven by the Provost office or is it threesult of perceived needs by faculty. Have faculty had a part in developing it?

3. Ownership Rights on Courses Developed at the UniverBitscussion

SineAnahitareported on some new information she obtained from talking with eLearning about ownership rights for courses developed with eLearning assistance.

- X The CBA speaks of three classifications of work: (1) Independent Efforts; (2) University-Supported Efforts; and (3) University-Sponsored Efforts. See e.g. AAUP/AFT CBA, Section 14.3.
- X eLearning apparently has not been asking faculty to sign development contracts as universitysponsored in recent years (stopped doing that about 4 years ago). Since that time, development contracts and teaching contracts as overload assignments have been jointly issued by eLearning and

There was brief discussion about where the Exon mittee should go from here. Jeff May voiced that it was not his interest in taking a position on rights, as much as a desire that the FAC collect the relevant information and disseminate it out to the faculty so that they have a better understanditing issue and the applicable rules before they develop courses (particularly in the online environment). The meeting ended before a decision on this topic was completed.