

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting – December 13, 2017

Minutes:

Meeting began at 1:00 p.m., Gruening

1. Adjunct Faculty – because of their different at-will status and undetermined longevity, if adjuncts develop an online course then they do it through a contract and that contract spells out that it is University-sponsored work. Carol is of the opinion that that faculty could still use that work if they leave and teach somewhere else, so long as the use of it is not in direct competition with UAF (She gave a helpful example where a faculty members uses a video made with the help of eLearning as part of a face-to-face course at another institution – not considered a direct conflict).

2. Full-time Faculty – because eLearning presumes these faculty are going to be teaching the course for some time into the future, they have not been working about having a contract that designates the work as University-Sponsored. Instead, they consider this University-Supported. The Deans and faculty are free to enter contracts to the contrary or that spell out any other special terms.

Dean Layer discussed how it may be good for the Dean's Council to take up this discussion to see how the various Deans are addressing and treating the situation. Dean Layer considers all work assigned as part of a workload as University-Supported work where the faculty member retains ownership rights to the content.

Grade Appeal Process Discussion Continued

Faculty Senate made the decision that the Curriculum Affairs Committee have the chance to review the proposed Grade Appeal Process modifications before the Faculty Senate takes it to vote. The proposed changes were also emailed out in a Google Doc to all FS members to offer comment. Few comments have been made.

Rachael Plumlee of UA Legal Counsel was not in favor of dropping the sentence in the bottom paragraph of page 1. It is important that any decision have an avenue of review and we can't make the final decision of the Grade Appeal Group not subject to some other level of review if necessary. The Provost and Rachael are to meet and discuss how best to word this to account for this need. The key point is that we need to ensure that both the student and faculty are given due process.

It was reported that some on Faculty Senate wanted to leave in the opportunity for a graduate student representative to sit in on graduate student grade appeals.

FAC discussed the need to resend the Google Doc out asking for comments after the Holiday Break.

New Business

Program Review Process

- It would be helpful to better define the purpose of Program Review (make it a Department working on improving Programs model rather than just to check some requirement).
- Would like to see faculty have more input on the criteria for special program review
- Would like to have all degrees in a Program reviewed at the same time and not piecemeal. The process involves the same people and so to not make it constant effort each like degree a program offers should be reviewed at the same time, but include outside reviewers in the process.
- Make sure the question in the Program Review form match the questions that are really being considered in the actual review.
- Clarify when these different types of program review will occur (frequency)

Dean Layer suggested we make sure we check what Northwest Accreditation requires in a Program Review to ensure our's is in keeping with those requirements.

FAC Committee decided to form a sub-committee to address this issue. Committee will be led by Gordon with help from Sine, Jeff, Jak, and Ataur.

Other Matters:

The FAC Committee thanked Dean Layer on his service as ex-officio member. Dean Layer said he already reminded the Provost

(aid)2.2(h)2.1.17(h)hned toed 34)2.8(n)t.5a)1 2.8(n)e.5w)1 2(o)2.8(n)e t.2(o) t.3h)2(i)2.8(2.3C)