

UAS Faculty Senate
September 2, 2005
3:00-5:00 pm, Egan Library 211
MINUTES

DRAFT

Senators present: Brian Blitz, Steve Brandow, Jennifer Brown, Eve Dillingham, Tim Ewest, Virgil Fredenberg, Lisa Hoferkamp, Yuliya Ivanova, Joe Liddle, Jane Terzis, Robin Walz

Ex-officio: Chuck Craig, Lynn Shepherd, Robbie Stell

1. Approval of minutes for May 5, 2005 meeting

Minutes of May 5, 2005 were approved unanimously with changes suggested by Lynn Shepherd.

Eve Dillingham volunteered to take minutes at the first meeting; however, she strongly suggested that the duty be for staff or colleagues rather than Senators, so Senators have the ability to fully participate in the meeting. Robbie stated she does not have staff available for this task.

2. Agenda approved unanimously.

3. Assembly members' comments

No Assembly members were present to offer opinions.

4. President's report

A. Senate Committees - membership lists

Lynn does not have all of the names of the Chairs for Senate committees, but will call meetings to have the Chairs selected.

B. Chancellor's cabinet meeting

Lynn offered a report on the Chancellor's cabinet meeting and her Chair's report to the Faculty Alliance (available at SW Faculty Alliance website) as an FYI and feedback opportunity.

Chancellor's Cabinet

- FY07 federal initiative proposals due in Chancellor's office 09/30
- FY06 Chancellor's Special Projects Fund proposals due 09/30
- Easy Biz card to be used for all AK Air/AK Air-partner travel after 09/06
- Course waitlists are being handled by units/departments
- UAF and UAS start dates have been synchronized
- Online application process for new hires – faculty may add scanned docs

C. Faculty Alliance

iv. Abolish seniors' tuition waiver under consideration at BOR in September

Lynn provided a BOR meeting review of the tuition waiver for senior citizens. Faculty Alliance can attend the public comment period and offer an opinion on the waiver decision.

Pros and cons of subject discussed:

- It is “reverse [age] discrimination” to offer seniors a waiver but not younger students
- Seniors are also eligible to apply for financial aid.
- There are instances where seniors' enrollment has allowed minimums to be reached for offering a class, leading to inefficient use of personnel and resources.
- The numbers of Alaskans 60+ is increasing rapidly and it's better to deal with the issue now than wait until the impact on tuition revenues is even greater.
- Older Alaskans are not necessarily impoverished.
- With recent 10% annual tuition increases, UA continues to give seniors the same benefit and enrolled students are effectively subsidizing them.
- A Senator offered that the rationale for the waiver is to increase tuition revenues. Tuition waivers do not relieve seniors from having to pay fees.
- Seniors offer a mature perspective in a course and their attendance enhances classroom diversity.
- They often make donations to the university in appreciation for the opportunities to increase their education.
- Their attendance enhances the reputation of the university and demonstrates the university's commitment to community service.
- At UAS the majority of seniors are in Art and CIOS. They do not take a tuition-paying student's seat.
- At UAS the tuition waived last year was about \$20,500, but there is no guarantee that we will gain that amount of tuition if waivers are abolished—we will lose the fees of those seniors who choose not to pay to attend.

Various compromise proposals have come forward. For example:

- Leave the waiver at 60 years' eligibility, and charge 50% tuition.
- Raise the age to 65 years for eligibility.

Comments leading up to motion:

In classes that are full, tell seniors that if they want to take the course, they need to pay full tuition. It would be a huge public relations mistake to abolish the waiver. It is really an enrollment management problem that needs to be

solved, and the tuition to be gained isn't as significant as it has been made to appear. The public relations fallout is not worth the tuition gained.

Motion: support retaining current tuition waiver for seniors. Unanimously approved.

v. Transcription of Certificates of Completion

The proposal from Statewide is to have Occupational Certificates of Completion require between 9 and 29 credits. This would prompt formal admission process for these students.

Pros and cons of subject discussed:

One of the advantages for the 16 credit minimum is that eligibility for federal financial aid requires a minimum of 16 credits.

The amount of paperwork and processing time to admit these students will increase; however, these students will now be tracked and show up in accountability measures.

The value of the skills, ability and knowledge in higher credit count certificates is significantly more than that of the 9-credit certificates and that range is too great to compare. Workforce Certificates could capture the successes of the lower credit count certificates, and Workforce Certificates have not been considered.

Senators expressed concern with the overuse of the word "Certificate" for BOR, Occupational, and Workforce programs. The modifiers typically are dropped and "certificate" signifies a large range of completers. License, credential and endorsement were some possible substitutes offered for lower credit count programs.

Motion: support 16 to 29-credit range for Occupational Certificate of Completion. Passed unanimously.

vi. Supporting Students at a Distance

- Ask the ad-hoc Distance Ed steering committee to look at the Educational Technology Team's draft document from a faculty perspective to determine the issues or problem points and report back to the senate, and ultimately the Faculty Alliance.

5. Committee Reports

A. *Permanent committees*

i. Undergraduate Curriculum

Deadlines:

Deadlines are posted in the online faculty handbook.

Online forms and processes

There was discussion of the Provost's directive to obtain a Deans' signature for curriculum proposals before they reach the Curriculum Committee. There needed to be a Senate's opinion on a curriculum proposal even if the Dean opposes the proposal, per discussion on the 3/4/05 Senate Faculty meeting. The March 4 discussion left open when a Dean signs off on the forms, and whether or not the Dean's rejection of a proposal is final.

The Senate agreed that the quality of curriculum is up to the Curriculum Committee. A new program needs approval of a Dean to avoid duplication of curriculum, but new degree programs come to the Senate before going to Curriculum Committee anyway. What is at stake here is course proposals.

Senators seemed to agree that a signature line makes sense, but exactly how that would work out in relation to curriculum decisions that have been made in the past by departments and Chairs was left unresolved. The forms are still being worked on.

Motion: to add a signature line between Chair or Program Faculty Group and Curriculum Committee Chair for the Dean's signature.

The tasks left to resolve:

- Bring the faculty handbook to decide where to place the protocol of adding the Dean "signing off" on curriculum proposals. To be decided: Is it checking that the Dean saw and rejected it or saw and approved it?
- Newer forms will be brought before the Senate

iii. Faculty Alliance

Ginny Mulle is volunteering to be a Faculty Alliance member, although she has a 50% administrative appointment.

Lynn was seeking an opinion on appointing her. No objections were made.

iv. Faculty Evaluation

Robbie met with tenured faculty on issues with board policy regarding reviews for retention, promotion and tenure. There are questions about stopouts, family leave and other issues yet to be defined that are not already in policy. SAC is asking us to define the issues and bring those forward. There is an ad-hoc committee, and Lynn will provide the committee makeup to Robbie.

v. Advising, Learning Center, and Tutoring – Senate recommendations to Advising Task Force May 2005

In response to the Advising Taskforce recommendations for standards of care, Senate committee members have requested that the Advising Taskforce focus on guiding non-degree-seeking students.

B. Ad-hoc Committees

i. Online course evaluations

There needs to be more room in the *Comments* textboxes for student essay responses as these are often the most valuable feedback faculty receive.

Some sample questions suggested by last year's ad-hoc committee:

- How many times have you attended?
- What kind of grade do you expect?

Motion: have ad-hoc committee develop additional instructor's questions. If technologically feasible, have those questions appear in the *Instructor Performance* portion of the evaluation form. Passed unanimously.

Motion: to enable a visible/invisible option to the six different UAS competency items so that only those competency questions that the department considers applicable to a course may display to the student. Passed unanimously.

- Take the wording of the draft Online Course Evaluations for the Faculty Handbook Appendix C back to the units for discussion and editing. Determine if it incorporates what faculty members want the evaluations to accomplish. For example, at the moment the draft does not automatically make course evaluations available to the students.

ii. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- Make sure that Scholarship of Teaching materials (the draft Faculty Handbook language for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning matrix and guidelines) go to faculty department meetings for review.

Adjournment:

Motion: to put all unseen business at the top of the next meeting's agenda and bring matters forward which have been discussed within faculty meetings. Passed unanimously.

DRAFT