Draft Minutes
Faculty Senate
May 5th, 2005

Present: Ginny Mulle, Seon Chun, Lynn Shephard, Brian Blitz, Jennifer Brown, Chuck
Craig, Jonathan Anderson, Eve Dillingham, Joe Liddle, Robbie Stell, Nina Chordas,
Sherry Tamone

Guest: Tom Dienst, Yuliya Ivanova

The minutes of April 1st, 2005 and the agenda were approved

I. President's Report

1. Future Senate President Elect: Chuck Craig is the next Senate President Elect.
Congratulations Chuck!

2. Future Chair of the Curriculum Committee: Elise Thomlinson. Thank you Elise

3. Promotion &Tenure Faculty committee members (Jonathan Anderson, Sherry
Tamone, Ginny Mulle, David Noon, Brendan Kelly, Robbie Stell and Carol Liberty) met
to discuss issues involved in P&T. Several issues of concern were identified. The
committee will meet again in the fall and take action. Robbie will bring the concerns of
UAS to SAC and see if there are any similar issues at the other MAUs as well as receive
their concerns. This may eventually result in a statewide evaluation of P & T.

Phones went out as Jonathan asked Robbie about a statewide issue. Lynn went under the
table. Whatever she did…she fixed the problem.

4. Responses from Departmental Faculty

> **1) UAS Advising Task Force Recommended Standards of Care**
> Recommendations of Standard of Care (faculty feedback). Ashley Ahrens for the
> Social Science department brought up the fact that a large percentage of our
> students are NODS, and that a lot of students are denied their application for
> graduation. The students denied are mostly AA (20%) and AAS (23%) degree
> seeking students. So perhaps there is a real gap in advising for these students.
> There is a correlation but no data to support the association between NODS
> students and advising and high denial of applications for graduation and advising,
> but it is an area to explore. Robbie broke down the number of May 2005
> graduates: Certificates (30) AA (72), Bachelor (105) and Master (94). This was
> in response to Joe's observation that the greatest majority of our graduates are AA
> graduates. Lynn mentioned that Banner should be set up to "trigger" student alert
> for specific advising. Ginny requested that faculty who expressed concern with
> the Standards of Care write up their concerns and send them to Vickie Orazem.

2) Scholarship of Teaching Committee. The document and matrix were distributed to all departments. Certain faculty are skeptical as to the worth of these or research guidelines. How will these really be implemented? Business and Public Administration is concerned with the first column in the matrix that applies to everyone. Does everyone have to demonstrate all of the aspects of this column and how is this documented?   An example is the follow up after a professional meeting that is supposed to be turned in to a document that a faculty member attended a meeting. They supposedly should write a statement about how this meeting benefited them. This would result in a lot of paperwork. Also there might be a motive for junior faculty to try to do everything. A purpose of this document was that the committee wanted to identify other mechanisms to evaluate teaching. Lynn's response to Robin's point concerning the relationship between teaching and professional development: Is Scholarship of teaching connected to teaching or to Professional development? Both are connected in the new document. If a faculty member is evaluated on professional development, should it be linked to teaching or research? Positive notes on this document include the availability of guidelines (better defined than those in the faculty handbook) for a bipartite faculty member. The charge of this committee was to come up with new guidelines that would be more complete for faculty. A long discussion on the conceptualization of professional development and workloads ensued. Should we add a sixth part to our workload to reflect the professional development activities in which a faculty member engages during the year as they are evaluated on professional development? (It is noted that this would be a violation of the UnAc and ACCFT contracts). Questions to take back to units:

1. Bipartite versus Triparte: should these guidelines apply equally?
2. Should activities have points associated with these (analogous to the research guidelines)?

Business and PADM believes that some of these guidelines should be evaluated at the departmental level. Ginny requested that faculty who expressed concern with the Scholarship of teaching matrix write up their concerns and send them to Lynn Shepherd.

3) Online Evaluations
Natural Sciences expressed concern that classes with TA or team taught are difficult for evaluation. Faculty reported that the evaluation process for team taught classes has been worked out.

4) Faculty Volunteers for Faculty Development Seminars
Ron Hulstein and Jennifer Brown have come forward to serve as coordinators for 2005-2006. Katy Spangler and Pricilla Schulte mentioned that they would serve as coordinators in 2006-2007.

5) Faculty Alliance Report

1. Credit Hrs for Post Baccalaureate Certificate Programs. Two examples of certificate programs that were introduced in April 2005 were

distributed. The requirement for the certificate is 24 credits. UAS does support the post baccalaureate certificate; Ginny and Lynn will take back to Faculty Alliance.

2. Acceptable Academic Degrees: Concern had been expressed regarding application of the policy to current faculty. Ginny added sections eight and nine to address this concern that the policy not be retroactively applied. Abel added sections ten and eleven which extended the policy to include UAS and UAA. This policy will go forward to the BOR.

3. DE Summit concerning Statewide Distance Education (Ferro, Spangler, LaConte). Susie reported that the group met at the end of March. One working group is looking at who counts the students. Another group is looking at supporting faculty who teach distance courses, another at equitable workloads. One group is looking at articulation agreements (centralizing these agreements). The charge of this committee is to find out what faculty at other MAUs are doing. Susie does not think this will lead to centralization. Could distance become a fourth MAU? A resounding NO. All of these working groups were to come up with a consensus report after 90 days and these reports are up on the web. Recommendations have not been put forward at this time. Course management systems were a topic of extensive discussion.

4. Common Start Dates: should there be a common start week or a common start date? We really don't care. It seems that the most diplomatic option is the common start week and some flexability concerning the start date will remain.

5. Faculty Electronic Workload: Dave Veazy's proposal was passed out at the last meeting. Tim Hinterburger reviewed this and this came back with suggestions for improvement. The improvements are geared toward more privacy and tighter control. For example, "composite data" has been changed to "aggregate data." Faculty Senate likes what Tim did although there is still the general sentiment that automation is not what the faculty desire because of the fear of statewide data compilation

II. Committee Reports

1. Curriculum Committee (attached)
2. Plagiarism: no report
3. Bookstore: no report
4. Scholarship of Teaching (see above I. 4. 2.)

5. Information Technology Committee: (Ciri, Whitney, Steve Smith (CAO for UA)) so UAF and UA statewide share IT support Information Technology is concerned with

University server use. What is the content of your website? There have been two instances that were concerning UA. Publishing the list of Diploma Mill University. Can be a serious liability. How do we state appropriate use of university server? More imp. Who makes that determination?

6. Learning Center Director is hired and he is John Bilderbeck. The budget was handed out. A bit of an increase from last year. Evaluation: 55 students responded; 70 responded to testing center. It is impossible to predict when LC will be busy or not. Comment about Testing Center made by students is that scraps of paper are taken out of the TC with test questions which are then distributed to other students. Faculty should be aware of this. David Noon will look into this as it relates to plagiarism.

7. CC Forms: Jonathan Anderson brought examples of forms that will be electronically given to faculty to evaluate. Get feedback back to Mona and Jonathan

III. Tom Dienst: Focusing on Direct Hires and Affirmative Action hires. Went over EEO laws. Affirmative action plan looks at percentage of folks in the workforce compared to the percentage of qualified individuals in to population.   Different job EEO based on job position ie faculty positions can be international so the population is much larger.