

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes DRAFT  
October 7, 2005

**Senators in attendance:** Brian Blitz, Jennifer Brown, Nina Chordas, Eve Dillingham, Yuliya Ivanova, Virgil Fredenberg, Lisa Hoferkamp, Robin Walz, Tim Ewest, Joe Liddle,

Ex-officio: Lynn Shepherd, Robbie Stell, Chuck Craig  
Guests: Wynne Waugaman, Ted Kassier

- 1. Approval of minutes for September 2, 2005 meeting - passed as is.**
- 2. Approval of agenda** – Motion for old business from last meeting to be top of today’s business (#8.B.ii on September 2<sup>nd</sup> agenda). **Motion passed unanimously.**

Provost Stell announced the “UAS Conversations Series” is looking for topics to be suggested. This series is an open archive for communication on issues important to the UAS community.

### **3. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL)**

We looked at Motion 1:

**SOTL Motion 1:**

“The Faculty Senate approves the *SOTL Matrix – Condensed Version 4 05/12/05* as representing criteria, activities, and sample evidence for the evaluation of faculty members’ scholarship of teaching and learning.” (attachment 8.5 ([pdf](#)) ([word](#)) )

Discussion:

ACCFT and UNAC union representatives will need to be notified about the new matrix for union input or legal comment.

Are there guidelines for the distribution of responsibilities for evaluations? Under the Pedagogy category of the matrix, there is a place for “appraisals written by colleagues.” The introduction which accompanies the matrix indicates that supervisors are responsible for using the matrix in conjunction with the faculty member and evaluation committees should look for evidence that the matrix has guided a faculty member’s choices.

Is there a similar model like this elsewhere? No, a committee of six created the matrix and it is unique.

If approved, the matrix and its accompanying explanatory introduction will replace criteria in faculty handbook, once the Senate passes the package, the Chancellor and legal counsel need to approve it and the unions need to negotiate implementation of the new criteria and a timeline for adoption.

The matrix is comprehensive, yet flexible as a tool. Some aspects will apply to each individual but not all. It’s already possible to imagine situations / categories / levels that fit with what faculty are already doing. The intention is that the matrix should be used for positive identification of attributes and not as criteria for negative screening to disqualify someone. Presumably, it’s possible to cut out evaluator bias by using the flexibility within the matrix in order to set goals.

Motion 1 to approve the SOTL matrix  
**Motion 1 passes unanimously.**

We looked at Motion 2:

SOTL Motion 2:

For reference: Faculty Handbook

<http://www.uas.alaska.edu/FacultySenate/handbooks/FacultyHandbook2003.pdf>

“The Faculty Senate approves the *DRAFT FACULTY EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING*. (attachment 8.6 [\(pdf\)](#) [\(word\)](#))

Along with the *SOTL Matrix*, it will replace sections in the current Faculty Handbook under  
a) ACCFT Evaluation Criteria: section TEACHING (currently p. 67), section Research/Creative Activity (currently p.68-9), and section OVERALL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (currently p. 69).

and

b) UNITED ACADEMICS EVALUATION CRITERIA: section TEACHING (currently p. 73) and section Overall Professional Development (currently p. 75).”

Discussion:

The phrase “should use” in the ‘How to Use the SOTL Matrix’ portion of the introduction is vague. What if a faculty member doesn’t do something in one of the categories? Not everything in the matrix is required; nor are all possibilities covered.

Motion to amend the “How to Use” portion of the draft as follows:

**Under existing section: How to Use the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Matrix add the following (in bold and underlined)**

Faculty Members

All faculty members should use the Matrix as a guide for the creation of their annual activity reports and pre- and post-tenure review portfolios.

Deans and Directors

Deans and Directors should **look for evidence that the faculty member has used** the Matrix **when advising** faculty members in performance reviews.

Faculty Evaluation Committees

Faculty evaluation committees should **look for evidence that the faculty member has used** the Matrix as a guide when reviewing faculty members’ Scholarship of Teaching and Learning activities for retention and tenure.

**Provost**

**The Provost should look for evidence that the faculty member has used the Matrix as a guide when reviewing the decisions of Deans, Directors, and faculty evaluation committees.**

Chancellor

The Chancellor should **look for evidence that the faculty member has used** the Matrix as a guide when reviewing the decisions of Deans, Directors, and faculty evaluation committees.

Discussion: Is there a way to avoid evaluator bias? By using the matrix as a guide for determining activities and presenting or looking for evidence, evaluators should recognize its flexibility. Departments can make adjustments to the matrix as a group, but any changes would have to go through Faculty Senate and appear as a department-specific version of the matrix in the Faculty Handbook.

**Motion to amend passes unanimously. Motion 2 passes, as amended, with 9 in favor, 1 opposed.**

We looked at Motion 3:

SOTL Motion 3:

The *FACULTY EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING* and its accompanying *SOTL Matrix* will be utilized by:

- a) tenured, tenure-track and term faculty who were hired on or after May 15, 2005 as criteria for faculty evaluation (retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews)
- and
- b) tenured, tenure-track, and term faculty who were hired on or before May 14, 2005 as criteria for faculty evaluation (retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews) starting January 1, 2006.”

Discussion: Different start dates for using the matrix won't work because there are some faculty who are currently under review. What about faculty who have been working under the old system, vs. new faculty being hired? We discussed different possible starting dates and decided to just implement the matrix beginning on January 1, 2006 for everyone.

Amendment to motion to change the wording of Motion 3:

SOTL Motion 3:

The *FACULTY EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING AND LEARNING* and its accompanying *SOTL Matrix* will be utilized by existing tenured, tenure-track and term faculty and those who are ~~who were~~ hired on or after ~~May 15, 2005~~ **January 1, 2006** as criteria for faculty evaluation (retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews).

and

- ~~b) tenured, tenure-track, and term faculty who were hired on or before May 14, 2005 as criteria for faculty evaluation (retention, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews) starting January 1, 2006.”~~

**Motion passes to adopt wording as amended (see strike throughs in text above) in SOTL Motion 3, 9 in favor with 1 opposed.**

#### **4. Bookstore Textbooks**

President Hamilton asked Interim VP for Student Affairs, Saichi Oba, to look at issues involving the escalating costs of textbooks. Ohler, Blitz and Boyer (faculty at UAS) are members of the textbook committee with Sara Hagen, Bookstore Manager and Tom McBrien, Manager of Business Operations. This committee has been asked to look at these issues. Senate President asked for a committee report for the next Senate meeting.

**5. Faculty Handbook revisions** – Eve, Chuck, and Lynn with Wynne Waugaman are looking at making revisions to the faculty handbook and will report their activities to the Faculty Senate.

#### **6. Provost's report**

A. UAS academic priorities for SW academic program planning and budget preparation, attachment 6.1 ([pdf](#)) ([word](#))

B. UAS 2005 Performance-Based Budgeting White Paper available at <http://www.alaska.edu/swbudget/pm/details.xml>

Discussion: In terms of proposals for the FY07 budget, other campuses said the CORE/GERs should be budgetary priorities, instead of just high-demand job areas – why didn't UAS? In the UAS proposal, there were two positions requested specifically for the core curriculum – in Geography and Anatomy/Physiology – while the rest were in high-demand areas.

Is there a disconnect between the UAS Strategic Plan and where funding is allocated? Why so much emphasis on graduates in high-demand job areas without paying attention to impacts on liberal arts courses? While our strategic plan has UAS as the leading liberal arts school at UA, how can it flourish in the liberal arts if the budget isn't allocated there? There has been turnover in faculty teaching in the core curriculum and hires are underway in English, Psychology, and Economics

UAS has to 'earn' the money we get from Statewide allocations by showing that we

- meet targets in the Performance-based Budgeting (PBB) measures
- have a high percentage of full classes (i.e. little 'headroom'), especially in the GERs
- demonstrate relatively consistent classroom space utilization
- show faculty/student ratios comparable to the other main campuses.

While the emphasis in the FY07 budget will be to "finish the unfinished" and "prepare for the next boom," any budgetary increases granted by the Legislature will be used first to meet the university's contractual obligations (salary increases, health costs, retirement benefits) and

utilities' increases. Any new faculty positions will either have to come from internal reallocations or from funding allocated by the President for having met PBB targets.

Ted Kassier, Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and a guest at today's Senate meeting, stated that UAA is broad in its educational offerings, while UAS is more of a "boutique for liberal arts".

Because of the way the budgetary planning process and timing works, we need to work on our priorities and ideas now. By April/May 2006, we should put forward our suggestions for budget proposals to influence budget preparations for two years ahead (May '06 suggestions for FY'08 budget).

Set up committees for this now.

**Resolution: "Be it resolved that Faculty Senate needs to put together a plan that will sustain and strengthen the core curriculum."**

Kassier: SAC wants a financial implementation plan that matches the curriculum. It looks at GERs in conjunction with any proposed new degree programs, as it is essential to make provision for collateral costs.

In terms of Statewide Academic Planning, Craig Dorman, VP for Research and Academic Affairs, told the Board of Regents that the initial focus would be on engineering, health, and education, with the liberal arts not mentioned. At all of the MAUs, there are liberal arts problems: GER transferability, competing programs, many adjuncts where full tenure-track faculty positions would be preferable to improve teaching and learning.

Kassier pointed out that identification of engineering, health, and education could just be areas of growth with built in success. A five year plan is constantly under review and growing/changing. SAC maybe needs a broad view of inter-MAU five year plans to identify duplicative efforts, and this is what is meant by "integration and differentiation."

## **7. Academic Units**

Statewide administration is suggesting revisions to BOR Policy and Regulations with regard to Academic units (attachment 7.1) ([pdf](#) [word](#)). The proposed revision has the President deciding on creation, elimination, or major revision of academic units below the MAU level. Senators should take a look at how power is distributed now and what is proposed, by examining all 3 documents and the proposal with revisions. Should the BOR be part of decision making process and not just the President? At what level?

## **8. Online Course Evaluations**

There is a proposal from this committee. When the committee discussed the Senate's motion for placing optional instructor-defined questions at the top of the evaluation form, it concluded that

this would hurt the validity of the instrument, because there needs to be parity among all evaluation forms. Instead, the committee included a statement at the top of the questionnaire alerting students that an instructor has added his/her own questions at the bottom of the form.

For the same reason, the committee suggested putting a message at the beginning of the skills section directing students to use NA for questions about skills that were not specifically taught, instead of implementing options for the instructor to turn on/turn off particular questions.

Discussion: The two motions from the Senate's last meeting should have been applied to any revisions put forward at this meeting. For the next meeting, we can discuss this more fully. There is a November 18 deadline to have questionnaires implemented for this semester, but it was suggested that the revision process should not be rushed. It will take as long as it takes, because it is so important. The unions can continue to voice their objections to the tool.

The OCE Committee does not want to continue to meet and suggested that the issues be resolved through Faculty Senate debate. We will discuss the questionnaires and the guidelines for their administration again at the next Senate meeting. Even though tenured faculty used to comment that only written comments, and not numerical scores, on the paper-based UW forms were taken seriously in the faculty evaluation process, perhaps the Senate should consider re-instituting a paper-based evaluation system again.

**This item tabled until November 4 meeting.**

**Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:30pm Friday, October 7, 2005.**

Minutes submitted by Jennifer Brown, Library