

DRAFT 1
UAS Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
January 21, 2005

Present: Jonathan Anderson, Brian Blitz, Jennifer Brown, Nina Chordas, Tom for Seon Chun, Chuck Craig, Ginny Mulle (President), David Noon (calling in), Priscilla Schulte, Lynn Shepherd, Sherry Tamone, Robbie Stell, and Joe Liddle.

Ginny Mulle called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

President's report

1. Update for VP for Academic Affairs: 49 applications received. Carol Gold has been asked to chair search committee. She accepted. Clive T and Tim Powers are UAS Reps.
2. Distance Education: moving towards centralization and student-centric organization of distance education. Standardization might include: co-joined skills of faculty, coordination of courses being offered, standardization of course content with faculty exchange, statewide degree/certificate path, standardization of standards, faculty gets together and 'makes sense' of programs.

Lots of unanswered questions with respect to oversight, quality control and ownership of courses, etc. Mark Hamilton refers to an augmented college for DE (CDE). MH thinks that programs need to have oversight and these needs to occur individually at campuses and can be instituted at the Dean level. Not favorably received by faculty alliance. Statewide degrees?? That most likely will not happen. There seems to be no clear design in this vision.

Lynn mentions the task forces that were given 90 days to come up with recommendations. They are meeting again at the end of March to come up with recommendations to pass along to Craig Dorman. A report has already been published on the first 45 days. Any feedback on this should be directed to representatives

Jennifer as part of DE committee will bring this up at the next DE committee to hone their recommendations

Transfer of credits from for profit (non-accredited) colleges. Each MAU will develop special steps to accept certain courses (probably at the Curriculum committee), but could be at the program level. Some programs will give credit for testing. This has been brought up over the past 2 FA meetings so may be something we should all be thinking about. Dave Veazey is the special projects guy (Asst VP for Academic Affairs) who will be giving us more information. Seems as if there is increased interest in this.

AK Competitive Research Investment – there is need for a strategy to bring to the legislature and governor to assure their support of research funding for the university. Craig Dorman's office will be setting up a committee to develop a strategy with representation from each MAU. Representatives are at the Dean level.

UA Faculty Workload System Project Charter – This was distributed to senators and reviewed at the December UAS faculty senate meeting. Several suggestions for improvement were made by the alliance to Dave V, who appreciated the input. There is more complexity than earlier thought so this isn't going to be happening soon. Faculty input is still desired. Flexibility of non-standardized workload is still a problem. Security issues are still a problem if centralization of information is the goal. There is skepticism about the purported “controlled, secure access over the public internet;” security is dubious, signatures would be missing, and disputes over versions could arise.

IT Policy - Steve will send a copy of the Technology Transfer Policy and IT Investment Policy that will be presented at the February BOR meeting. Expensive computers or software need to be reviewed for acceptability at the statewide level. Chief Information Officer can delegate this to the MAU level. For example UAF has 25 different email systems. Faculty do not see this as a problem.

Transcription of certificates of completion

Presently, the UA system does not track or transcript department level certificates of completion. As these students do not receive a degree per se, even though they have successfully completed through receipt of the certificate what they intended to do, they are recorded as non-completions. UAS has about 30 certificates.

Dave Veazey has been appointed by Craig Dorman to create a set of procedures to transcribe certificates of completion. The committee members are Barbara Hegel, Karen Polley, and Karen Schmidt. Faculty input is needed

Invalid Degrees: At the December UAS senate meeting clarification was requested as to where the UAF senate (which initiated the policy) intends to locate the policy. Abel Bult-Ito, president of the UAF faculty senate stated that the intent was to incorporate the policy in both MAU handbooks and in BOR policy. Sent to UA council. Jamo Parrish approved with the condition that they removed the list of organizations granting BAD degrees.

Committee Reports

Ad Hoc Committee on Online Student Evaluations

The committee met and submitted recommendations concerning improving On-line Evaluation Process.

Faculty Senate discussed 2 of these:

Issue 3 Low response rates, especially for classes which do not utilize UAS Online. Some students do not have access to computers to fill out the evaluations.

Recommendations: a) Instructors can reserve the rolling laptop computer cart for their on campus classes and give the students fifteen minutes in class to fill out the evaluation.

Comments: This is not doable! Faculty tried this and this doesn't work, laptops were not available...too many students compared to computer availability. Give the students some incentives like a free computer or a trip to Maui to fill these out and we might improve response rates

Issue 4 Should the on-line evaluation form ask questions not only about the instructor but also the delivery method, learning competencies, and computing/library support services?

Recommendation: Either the instructor evaluation should be separate from the other questions or the instructor should be given the option to determine which of the additional questions are applicable to their course. This could be done at the same time the dates and availability of results are set.

Comments: Separating faculty vs. technology questions is a good idea. This could be done through IT. Lynn is concerned that without the embedded technology questions she will not receive sufficient feedback on technology support to make changes. We need to still determine what the purpose of these evaluations is (Course evaluation, Instructor Evaluation...or?)

We are still discussing the actual questions with respect to how appropriate they are. The subcommittee researched questions used at many university and compiled a list of appropriate questions that we shall call “vetted” questions. These questions were tweaked to customize them for UAS faculty and perhaps through tweaking the questions have become biased or confusing?

The questions obtained through prior research can be looked at additionally. Lynn can compile these vetted questions to determine if they are more desirable.

Ginny will relay this information back to the committee and hopefully come up with a series of questions that are more appropriate for this evaluation form.

Plagiarism: (David Noon)

Form will be available for reporting incidents. If you have any input into this form pass it on to David.

Faculty Committee G: Elise is not willing to serve on the enrollment management committee. Or we don't have a faculty member on that committee. Go back to departmental faculty to find another person to serve

Chair Elect: Brian recommended that only tenured faculty be eligible. Robin Walz suggested a different protocol for electing the president that requires each department to come up with a nominee. Nominees may remove their name from the compiled list. Following is a report by senators as to their department's preference

Jennifer (Library) liked Brian's idea but thought this was too small a pool and should include faculty that have at least 4 years service.

- Education has only 2 people (tenured) Small pool.
- Business: Pool too small...should include more than just tenured faculty.
- Career Ed: Pool should include faculty past their 4th year retention to increase the size of the pool.
- Humanity: Have not met yet to discuss Robin's proposal, but liked Brian's proposal.
- Social Sciences: Narrowly disapproved of Brian's.
- Natural Sciences hasn't met yet
- Brian's proposal was voted down

Distinguished Faculty are appointed by the President at this time. Should the President's appointments be approved by Chancellor. Should we send Alliance forward with this Overwhelming yes!

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm