

UAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

February 4, 2005

The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order by President Ginny Mulle at 3 p.m.

Present: Chuck Craig, Eve Dillingham, Joe Liddle, Priscilla Schulte, Seon Chun, Jennifer Brown, Lynne Shepherd, Jonathan Anderson, David Noon, Brian Blitz, Ginny Mulle, Sherry Tamone, Robbie Stell, Nina Chordas.

1. January's minutes were approved.
2. Agenda was approved.

No Faculty Alliance meeting had taken place since the last Faculty Senate meeting, and therefore nothing to report.

The selection committee for VP of Academic Affairs, chaired by Carol Gold did meet, and reportedly have over 40 applicants.

3. Committee Reports:

- a. Online student evaluation ad hoc committee: Janet Dye was not present, but suggestions regarding establishing incentives for students to complete online evaluations will be forwarded to her.
- b. Scholarship of Teaching Committee: Lynn Shepherd reported that data has been compiled on the survey passed out by Virgil at the September meeting. Responses were disparate, which was taken into consideration when devising the categories in Scholarship of Teaching for the sample matrix that Lynn provided to the Senate. 10 items under "Teaching" are ones faculty are currently evaluated on, and there were more the committee feels should be included. Other categories apply to different people at different stages in their career, but the committee felt these too should count toward review. In all about a dozen characteristics of Scholarship of Teaching were identified. The committee asked for feedback regarding the usefulness of these characteristics when making expectations clear for review purposes: are they too specific? Too general?

Ensuing discussion included comments that these Teaching categories ought to be similar to those that currently exist defining the evaluation of research. Opinions were expressed that the Scholarship of Teaching criteria not be assigned points (as are research criteria) but that they be worked out with the Dean, possibly in the workload; they would then be assessed not by assigned points but in the meeting of workload expectations. The committee was commended for the good job they did with the framework of teaching criteria, dovetailing with the criteria applicable to descriptions of Assistant, Associate, and Full professorial guidelines. It was brought up, however, that faculty workload may not meet requirements of "peer" evaluation. A question was raised about whether these new criteria would replace existing criteria; the main point of ensuing discussion was that we can't create categories that supercede current criteria for promotion, since we are obliged to go by the faculty handbook. Lynn Shepherd made the point that what this document can do is reduce the weight of student evaluations to a smaller percentage of overall faculty evaluation. There was strong feeling that at the moment WE DON'T

WANT QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA for teaching evaluation guidelines (applause for Lynn when she said this).

- c. Distance Education: Jennifer Brown reported on the Statewide DE committee's meeting of earlier in the day. Faculty Senate asked the DE committee. to discuss issues they want to see addressed at the system wide March meeting. Out of 26 critical issues listed in the First 45 days report, the DE committee was asked to come up with the 7 most critical for the Faculty Senate to adopt as UAS faculty concerns for the March meeting. Lynn Shepherd, who is putting together a white paper (usually a prelude to policy decisions), stated that faculty need input into the white paper before it is issued. It was observed that there has been a history on the part of management of consulting with 1 or 2 faculty and then claiming that "faculty" had been consulted; faculty in general need strong input, not just a chosen few. It was felt that DE committee recommendations should carry more weight than "surveys" done by Statewide, and that there should be specific language regarding faculty input. Another issue that was raised was that, if centralized, DE issues policy may affect more than DE because of the technological aspects involved. It would be good if the Faculty Senate endorsed the 7 items for the March 28-29 meeting.
- d. The Academic Information Services committee had not met, so no report was available.
- e. The Curriculum committee had not met, so no report was available.
- f. Plagiarism ad hoc committee: David Noon reported that on the plagiarism report form being developed by the committee, the first offense issue needs to be clarified. If the form is approved, faculty can start utilizing it. Currently, after the first offense a letter is filed with Tish Satre; if there are further offenses, a file is opened on that student. To a question about whether there is any policy regarding faculty dealing with the issue on their own, David replied that faculty have the discretion of filling out the form; however, they need to know a form exists. Faculty are encouraged to forward information to a central place regardless of how the issue is dealt with, so there is a record, or in other words a central "bank" of offenders. It is, overall, a pretty lenient policy. It is possible for faculty to cut and paste the plagiarism blurb from the Senate web site for inclusion in syllabi.
- g. Working group on CC forms and process committee: Jonathan Anderson reported that the meeting had been delayed.
- h. Senate Committee G: The last person asked to serve by Richard Stevens declined due to the enormous time commitment. The Faculty Senate had requested that Committee G minutes be forwarded. Robbie Stell clarified that "enrollment management" is about recruitment and doesn't keep real minutes; instead, it interacts with the marketing committee as a kind of working group. There was discussion of concern about marketing: how are we presented to world? Program is mostly marketed to traditional freshmen, whereas own student population is more diverse. Robbie Stell said there is not really a marketing committee, though Kevin Myer does some marketing functions; departments need to decide what kind of marketing they want and pressure their Dean to push for a share of Kevin Myer's "piddly" budget. Departments currently don't know where students are finding out about our programs (mailing? Website? Ads?). Organized departments get more attention. It was agreed that we don't need representation on Committee G; Seon Chun, who is a member of both Committee G and the Faculty Senate, could notify the Senate if academic concerns come up.

- i. Faculty reports on guidelines regarding the chair elect: After much discussion, it was unanimously decided to try the plan proposed by Robin Walz.
- j. Technology Transfer Practices: put off till next meeting.
- k. Technology Transfer Practices: put off till next meeting.
- l. Course caps: Nina Chordas read the memo she had sent to Ginny Mulle regarding Humanities faculty concern about the arbitrary raising of course caps. This is an issue for faculty across the curriculum, including DE. Faculty feels that ultimately class size needs to be faculty driven, but who decides? Deans? It was recommended that we find out what UAA and UAF do; the bottom line ultimately drives course cap decisions, and all the Senate can do is write a memo of recommendation. It was suggested we get a position statement from John Pugh and Robbie Stell: what is the official UAS policy about upper limits on course caps? It was pointed out that faculty can't keep taking course overloads, but instead must demonstrate the need for more faculty. When Seon mentioned that a course cap raise memo to Ed. came from the Chancellor through the Dean, it seemed apparent that there are different policies under different deans. Rising course caps affect pedagogy as well as ability to deliver optimum courses. It was decided that the Senate would look at UAS course cap policy and go from there.

Meeting adjourned shortly after 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Nina Chordas.