

UAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
October 8, 2004

Present: Kay McCarthy, Jonathan Anderson, Chuck Craig, Sherry Tamone, Nina Chordas, David Noon, Jennifer Brown, Brian Blitz, Priscilla Schulte, Bill Sallenbach, Robbie Stell, Ginny Mulle

Guests: Susan Koester

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Ginny Mulle, Chair, UAS Faculty Senate.

- I. The minutes from the Faculty Assembly Meeting were approved.
- II. The agenda was approved.
- IV. Chair's Report
 1. Ginny Mulle reported that Lynn Shepherd has been elected UAS senate chair-elect for AY 2004-05, and that she has accepted the position.
 2. The NW Commission on Colleges and Universities will conduct an interim evaluation visit and the members of the faculty senate have been scheduled to meet with the evaluators on Monday, October 25, 2004 in the Glacier Valley Room (Egan 221).
 3. A System Governance Meeting was held on October 7, 2004 which Ginny attended. A significant announcement was that the UA system will no longer be providing dial up connection to faculty, staff and students as of January 1, 2005. President Hamilton's State of the University message was that everything "is great" and that his major activity for this year will be to address the "contract" between the state and the university, and to work on creating a community commitment to education.
 4. Committee reports:
 - a. Distance Education – Jennifer Brown reported that the committee recommends that their response to the "Faculty Senate Guidance for Departments" on class size and curriculum/delivery format be included on page 48 of the UAS Faculty Handbook under "Distance Delivery Instruction." Jonathan Anderson pointed out that the section on curriculum/delivery format was already addressed in the handbook and this may be redundant. The committee was asked to continue to work on their response as well as to monitor the activities of the statewide PACDE committee.
 - b. Academic Information Services Committee – Ginny reported for Elise Tomlinson, chair, that this year's committee members are Thomas Duke, education, Steve Hamilton, business/PADM, Lisa Hofercamp, natural science, Jane Terzis,

humanities, Ashley Ahrens, social science, Susie Ferro, Sitka, and Patti DeAngeles, Ketchikan. At their first meeting the committee discussed how to improve communications between Faculty and Computing Services. Each committee representative will ask their departments for feedback on specific areas where clarifications are desired. Elise will show these areas in need of clarification to Michael Ciri in the beginning of November, and give him a chance to respond in writing as well as invite him to discuss the issues at their next meeting on November 19th. The results of this discussion will be posted on the committee's website; there will be a link to it added on the Faculty Resources page, and the URL will be sent out to all faculty at that time.

- c. Scholarship of Teaching Ad Hoc Committee – Ginny reported for Virgil Fredenberg, chair that he has received 34 completed surveys that were distributed at convocation and the committee will meet and analyze the surveys after the NCATE visit.
 - d. Curriculum Committee – no report, their first meeting is today
 - e. Plagiarism Ad Hoc Committee – David Noon, chair, reported that the committee is reviewing the documents prepared by Tish Satre that were distributed at last month's meeting.
 - f. Working Group on Curriculum Committee Forms and Process – Jonathan reported that he and Alexis Easley, committee members, were waiting for a draft report from Maria Moya in the provost's office.
- V. Ginny Mulle asked for the names of UAS nominees to the selection committee for the UA Academic VP search committee. Craig Dorman, UA VP for Research, is chairing the search committee. David Noon put forth the name of Clive Thomas as the nominee from the social science department. There were no other nominees at the present time but names will be forthcoming.
- VI. Susan Koester presented the proposed Bachelor of Arts in Communication Studies and Language Arts degree program for the Humanities department. Several questions were asked by senators, and the proposed degree program was unanimously approved by the members of the senate.
- VII. Charge for the Online Student Evaluation Ad Hoc Committee. Those who volunteered to work on this committee are Janet Dye, Virgil Fredenberg, Rick McDonald and Judy Andree. It was suggested that Rick McDonald be asked to serve as chair. Priscilla Schulte will ask him to serve; if he does not, Priscilla will become a member of the committee and serve as chair. In regard to the charge to the committee, the following was discussed by the members of the senate:

Charge to the committee:

There are two general issues that the senate would like the committee to address: issues that deal with the form itself, and issues that deal with the evaluation process.

In regard to the form, the following issues were raised:

1. Whether the present form being used is a good instrument to evaluate faculty; i.e., is the instrument both reliable (that quality of measurement that suggests that the same data would have been collected each time in repeated observations of the same phenomenon) and valid (that the measure accurately reflects the concept it is intended to measure).
2. What is the form supposed to do? If it is a *faculty* evaluation form, questions regarding the library and student services, etc. would not seem appropriate to be included on the form.
3. Standard questions – can faculty have more than one set of standard questions to choose from depending on the type of class?

In regard to the process, the following issues were raised:

1. There are several “technical” problems with the process, such as the link to block access wasn’t working, the list of students to evaluate a class was inaccurate, etc.
2. The timing of the open data collection period which is presently 5 days, which differs from 15 minutes in a classroom. It was asked if research had been done regarding the effectiveness of time lines to arrive at this time period of 5 days. The fact that the open data collection period coincided with that same days when exams were being given was also brought up.
3. Access issues – it can be difficult for students who do not have on demand access to a computer to complete the evaluation.
4. Low response rate – the response rate for many classes was very low. Can a faculty member accurately be evaluated if only a small number of the class members have actually completed the evaluation (i.e., how accurate is the overall evaluation of a faculty member if only 2 of 22 students respond).
5. Instructions should be made available to faculty regarding their managing their evaluations (questions to be included, how to set a time line, etc.).
6. Changes to form – can they vary from semester to semester? For example, will faculty added questions remain on the form from semester to semester?

It was suggested that the best place for the committee to begin its deliberations would be to look at the faculty handbook where student evaluation procedures are found. Updating these procedures in the handbook would both address and clarify many of the issues above that were raised by senate members. Thus, changing the language of the current student evaluation procedures in the faculty handbook to reflect the above concerns would be the final goal of the committee

- VIII. Election process for the chair-elect of the senate. David Noon asked that the senate consider revising the bylaws in regard to the process of the election of officers [Section 2. C.(1)]. Rather than faculty having to remove their names from a potential list of nominees, David suggested that the process be changed to one where faculty would be nominated to serve as chair-elect. The senate asked David to prepare a draft of the changes to the bylaws that he is suggesting. David said that he would ask Robin Walz, who had asked David to bring the issue forth to the senate.
- IX. Defining academic units for UAS senate representation. Jonathan Anderson asked that the senate recognize the selection of Steve Johnson as a new faculty senator representing the new CIOS department. Upon review of the senate bylaws, regarding the election of Faculty senators [Section 2.A.(1)], it was determined that CIOS did in fact meet the criterion for recognition, and a senate resolution was passed that under the current bylaws that CIOS is entitled to senate representation.
- X. Senate Committee G (Committee on Teaching, Advising and the Learning Centers). As requested at September's senate meeting, each faculty senator was asked to report on the response from their faculties regarding the relationship between Senate Committee G and the Advising Task Force (ATF) and the Learning Center Advisory Committee (LCAC).
1. Natural Sciences – Sherry Tamone reported that natural sciences faculty did not want to see Committee G dissolved and in fact felt strongly that the ATF and LCAC should report to Committee G and send representatives to Committee G. They would like to see Committee G take an active role in issues, activities and decisions concerning teaching, advising, and the learning centers.
 2. Career Ed – Chuck Craig reported that the career ed faculty felt that Committee G should be disbanded as it represented duplication of committee assignments with the ATF and LCAC in place.
 3. Humanities – no report
 4. Library – Jennifer Brown reported that the library faculty believed that Committee G should not be disbanded as it was the first committee created, and that it should be an active committee.

5. Social Science – David Noon reported that the social science faculty felt strongly that Committee G be continued and that it plays an active role in issues concerning teaching, advising and the learning centers. David pointed out that the ATF is an ad hoc committee and that, as a permanent committee, Committee G would provide continuity to issues concerning advising.
6. Business/PADM – Jonathan Anderson reported that the business/PADM faculty felt strongly that Committee G be retained, and that the faculty members of the ATF and LCAC be asked to vacate their committee assignments as they were appointed by administration and not selected by faculty. As administratively appointed members, they do not represent the views of the faculty. Only members selected by the faculty can represent the faculty.
7. Education – no report

It was agreed by the members of the senate that Committee G be retained and that it take an active role in issues and decisions regarding teaching, advising and the learning centers. The senate also recommended that the position articulated by the Business/PADM faculty in regard to appropriate faculty representation stand as the position of the senate. It was so agreed, and Ginny Mulle will meet with Richard Stevens, chair, Senate Committee G, and Vickie Orazem, chair of AFT and LCAC, to report the recommendation of the senate.

- XI. UAS Strategic Plan: Faculty Development – Jonathan Anderson reported that faculty development has been separated from staff development in the UAS Strategic Plan, and asked if anyone knew who was responsible for the development and changes in the strategic plan. Robbie Stell said that the chancellor's office has responsibility for all aspects of the strategic plan. Jonathan stated that there was disappointment that the chancellor did not solicit faculty input in to the development of the faculty development section of the UAS Strategic Plan, and asked if there was a possibility for future faculty input. Robbie said that she was certain that the chancellor's office would welcome faculty input and that faculty should communicate with the chancellor's office regarding involvement.
- XII. Provost's report – Robbie Stell reported that a new Director of Institutional Research, Patrick Moore, has been hired and begun work at UAS. His first task will be to develop a Fact Book about UAS, as well as a Trend Book. He will also work on developing academic unit profiles.
- XIII. Wilson Fund – a discussion concerning a policy change as reported in the September Provost's Report to the senate was postponed until the November meeting as Seon Chun was not present.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m. by Ginny Mulle, Chair, UAS Faculty Senate.