

**Meeting Minutes**  
**University of Alaska Southeast Faculty Senate**  
**February 01, 2013 Egan Library 211**

In Attendance: M. Stekoll, A. Sesko, A. Jones, B. Blitz, C. Hassler, C. McMillan, L. Doctorman, S. Neely, R. Caulfield, D. Monteith, M. Pennoyer, scribe.

Via Audio: C. Donar, J. Martin, T. Anderson, R. McDonald, V. Fredenberg

Guest: B. Hegel, via audio.

**I. Call to Order**

President Stekoll called the meeting to order at 3:03 pm.

**II. Approval of Agenda**

C. McMillan moved to approve the agenda. With a second from B. Blitz, the agenda was approved without objection.

**III. Approval of Minutes – 12-07-2012**

B. Blitz moved to approve the meeting minutes as presented. With a second from L. Doctorman and without objection, the meeting minutes were approved.

**IV. Provost's Report – R. Caulfield**

Accreditation Year Three Report Preparation Update: Caulfield provided an update on the Year 3 Accreditation Report and announced there would be no site visit to UAS by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) in October 2013. UAS will have an offsite visit including a written report to evaluators and an audio conference with evaluators and the UAS Chancellor, Provost, Faculty Senate President, and others.

UAS has contracted with Dr. Mary Lou Madden to produce a draft of the Year 3 report by the end of February 2013. It is the goal of the Strategic and Assessment Planning Executive Committee to present a draft of the report to each UAS governance group by March 1, 2013; with feedback due back to the Committee by April 1.

B. Blitz asked for clarification on previous years' reports. Caulfield explained the 2009 NWCCU report and visit were from standards built around a ten year cycle. After 2009 NWCCU shifted to a seven year cycle of continuous improvement standards with a written report in year one; written reports and site visits in years three, five, and seven.

Student Success and Remediation: Caulfield has brought together a group of faculty and staff called the Provost's Ad Hoc Working Group on Student Success and Remediation. The group is charged with looking at developmental education offerings and Learning Center services at all three campuses. With the goal to increase effectiveness of these services, the group is looking at action steps for UAS to take over the next twelve months. It's important to assess the Learning Center's connections to faculty and changes in practices at the Center are properly vetted by them. A sub-group – N. Chordas, E. Hayes, B. Blitz and H. Sellner and C. Hedlin, chair, is considering a proposal to create a writing center with English faculty separate from the Center. While

considering the proposal, Caulfield has asked the sub-group to recommend budgetary changes for the Learning Center ahead of next year's budget.

Caulfield said VPAA D. Thomas cited a national example of students who were just below the cut score and rather than being placed into a developmental course, were placed into regular classes with assistance of a one credit lab. UAF is experimenting with this concept. Thomas is not dictating what UAS should be doing, but encouraging faculty to think of ways to better serve students who need this help. The purpose of the ad hoc group is to brainstorm and work on continuous improvement.

C. McMillan asked how many faculty across the MAUs were in favor of or were resistant to developmental courses.

B. Blitz commented faculty want to help, but students who are in need of the extra help don't want it. Faculty get frustrated and move on to other students who need and want the help. Students who get help are more successful.

Caulfield is hopeful a result of the working group will be that UAS will have a more consistent policy and approach to encourage high schools to administer Accuplacer tests..

Program Review Processes: Caulfield reminded Senate that UAS is redoubling its efforts to complete quality program reviews as required by Board of Regents policy every five years. His goal is to have meaningful and manageable reviews for each degree program of about 20 to 25 pages. The reviews provide faculty an opportunity to show what is working, needs for improvement or additional resources. After a review by the dean, the report is assigned to an institutional review committee comprised of appropriate external members and faculty. The committee recommends actions based on the findings of the report. The report with committee recommendations goes to the Provost for final review.

The program review schedule is located on the Provost's Office website.

<http://www.uas.alaska.edu/provost/docs/program-review/programreviewtable.pdf>

Blitz noted the review calendar indicates appointment of the lead person in May, Institutional Review data arrives in July and the project begins in the fall.

Caulfield responded the lead person and their colleagues have the fall semester to prepare the report with a January submittal to the dean of the school. The report process begins when faculty return on their contract. The dean and department chair identify the lead person in May thereby insuring appropriate workload assignment.

Academic Record File Location: Caulfield began by stating the UNAC and UAFT CBAs are specific about faculty files. Because UAS is out of compliance with one CBA about location of faculty academic records, Caulfield proposes shifting academic record files

from the Provost's Office to the offices of deans or campus directors. The relocation of files will bring UAS into compliance with both CBAs. The CBAs also state faculty rights to review their own academic record files during regular business hours. Caulfield has drafted a memo which has been reviewed by T. Powers, UAFT; L. Hoferkamp, UNAC; and M. Stekoll, President, Faculty Senate; and is now discussing with Senate. The memo outlines the timeline for relocation of the files over the summer, training for school and campus administrative managers, and the significance of these steps to UAS.

Another result of this change is to the faculty tenure and promotion files and the distinctions between this file and the academic record. Faculty tenure and promotion files should and will contain a list of required elements – such as annual activities reports, workloads, regular evaluations, and student ratings. The list is still to be finalized by the Faculty Handbook Committee. Beyond the required elements, the remaining documents of the faculty tenure and promotion files are determined by each faculty member. Caulfield recognizes these steps are a culture shift for UAS.

M. Stekoll clarified that in the past, there were two parts of the tenure and promotion file: the first part was put together by faculty; and, the second was the academic record maintained by the Office of the Provost. With this change, the academic record will no longer be available as the evaluation file. The academic record will be located in the deans or directors offices and faculty will be required to duplicate documents contained there into their own tenure and promotion file.

Stekoll said UAF has a detailed checklist of what goes into faculty tenure and promotion files, the number of binders allowed and specifics on how documents are placed into the binder. Stekoll recommends UAS review the checklist to help standardize the UAS process.

McMillan asked for clarification on what happens to each review as it's generated during the review process.

Stekoll replied that each document produced in the review process will be placed into the faculty member's binder.

Caulfield followed-up by saying the review process won't change; but faculty are responsible for preparing their tenure and promotion binders. The Provost's Office will continue to assist with the reviewers' work and house the binders throughout the process.

D. Monteith asked about the process involved in obtaining copies of student ratings.

Stekoll answered faculty have access to printed summaries of student ratings and that option will continue to be available.

Caulfield said he's shared the memo outlining the forthcoming changes with the Faculty Handbook committee. If Senate or constituents have comments, direct them to him or President Stekoll. The upcoming changes will be reflected in the AY 13-14 Faculty Handbook.

Blitz questioned the discussion on electronic tenure and promotion binders being considered by Faculty Senate.

Stekoll responded that the changes to location of the academic record do not affect the tenure and promotion files. Format of the files is not being discussed.

Faculty Excellence Award Nominations: Caulfield introduced the five categories of the Faculty Excellence Awards: teaching, service, research, adjunct instruction and faculty advising. Each winner will receive a \$1,000 award. Nominations are due by April 1, 2013. The Celebration of Faculty Excellence is on May 6, 2013 in the Glacier View Room from 2:00 to 4:30. The awards are available to faculty at all three campuses.

<http://www.uas.alaska.edu/FacultySenate/docs/facultyexcellenceaward.pdf>

## **V. President's Report**

AACU GER Meeting: M. Stekoll stated ten people from each MAU attended the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) GER Meeting in Anchorage on January 11 and 12, 2013. Two AACU representatives attending the workshop presented current best practices in general education and assessment around the country and universities. There was particular focus on LEAP (Liberal Education and America's Promise). <http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm> Many universities have developed a consistent set of Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) for undergraduate GERs. The AACU representatives were encouraging the UA MAUs to agree to the set of ELOs. The ELOs would replace the current competencies and be a framework under which UAA, UAF and UAS would place their GERs allowing for better coordination and transferability of GERs between campuses.

UAF has had a committee for eighteen months looking and revising their GERs; and, have adopted most of the ELOs in the LEAP structure.

An outcome of the meeting was to have Faculty Alliance form a committee with three members from each MAU, reporting to their own Faculty Senates, and work toward an agreement with all the MAUs for one set of ELOs. . Stekoll attached a copy of the GER Coordinator Effort Motion for UAA, UAF, And UAS senates to consider.

B. Blitz moved to approve the attached motion; C. McMillan seconded the motion.

"This senate supports the formation of a Faculty Alliance General Education Learning Outcomes UA Coordination Subcommittee, to include equal representation from each MAU and to work on the general charge of identifying a common set of General

Education learning outcomes to recommend to the faculty senates at each MAU in late 2013. “

McMillan asked for clarification on the work done already by UAF.

Stekoll explained that UAF has already adopted their version of (similar to) the LEAP ELOs with idea of aligning their GERs under the ELOs.

B. Blitz noted that a representative at the meeting noted the outcomes are broad and vague.

Stekoll said this an Alliance committee, would be volunteer and appointed by D. Monteith, V. Fredenberg and Stekoll.

C. Hassler asked if the ELOs would replace the UAS core competencies.

Stekoll answered – currently, syllabi identify how classes relate to core competencies and would change to how classes relate to ELOs.

Caulfield stressed the importance of acknowledgement of UAS core competencies in relation to the Accreditation Year Three Report due this fall. Caulfield recognizes there may be need for change and that it is a faculty process, but would like to continue to point to them until there is something to replace them.

V. Fredenberg asked Caulfield when do undergraduate and graduate competencies get updated; should there be a group who reviews them every two or three years?

Stekoll said ELOs will replace competencies and if adopted, UAS would not be able to change them without coordination with UAA and UAF.

D. Monteith said before UAS changes their competencies, he recommends waiting to see what UAA and UAF decide to do with their ELOs. He noted the goal is to have the ELOs or competencies between the three MAUs on a similar path while preserving the unique identity of each campus. He further recommends UAS not appoint a UAS task force until the other two MAUs move ahead.

Stekoll called for the question in support of the motion and it passed without objection.

ELab Revisions: Stekoll reported that last year Faculty Alliance formed a committee to review ELabs for distance GER courses. Stekoll distributed a recent draft Joint Statement of Intent on General Education Natural Science Laboratory Courses statement to Senate. The draft statement is UAA’s version of what should happen and has not been approved.

Stekoll noted there is no due date for implementation of the process and UAA recommends reviews will be conducted via the ordinary MAU assessment processes.

UAA and UAF have a five year review process for each course; UAS does not. Program reviews are not the same as course reviews.

Blitz asked about the process at UAA; do they send a curriculum document for an existing course through Curriculum Committee for review.

Stekoll confirmed this is the UAA process for each course. He noted the UAA statement is for all GER natural sciences labs, not just distance course labs. The difference between the current UAA statement and the one approved by UAS Faculty Senate in AY 11-12, is UAS approved reviews to be completed at the department level by 2014. Stekoll noted the Faculty Alliance committee plans to send a still to be approved statement through to the Statewide Academic Council (SAC) for their review.

Monteith reminded Senate the process approved by them last year is ready to be implemented; the UAA statement provides more leeway for a deadline.

Stekoll noted the UAA process is not a good fit for UAS.

Fredenberg notices the UAA statement lacks direction, doesn't make a statement and needs re-writing.

Stekoll informed Senate there is no need for a vote. The statement was approved by UAA Faculty Senate and is under review by UAF, Stekoll recommends UAS review it as well.

Referring to the UAA statement, A Sesko asked about questions without criteria to accept teaching techniques.

Stekoll agreed with Sesko's question and asked Representative Martin to explain the process Natural Science faculty are using to assess course learning outcomes.

Martin said Natural Science faculty propose use of a logic model to assess learning outcomes; to establish the general outcomes for each ELab to make sure they align with outcomes of face to face labs. The faculty chose to use the logic model introduced at the AACU GER conference. They have chosen Juneau face to face Anatomy and Physiology and Sitka distance Anatomy and Physiology with lab kits for the model. They're unsure if the course and logic model process will work but plan to report their findings to the Natural Sciences department. Martin stated that he's unsure of the timeline for completion of the review process as outlined in the UAS statement.

Stekoll clarified for Martin there are 1.5 years, September 2014, to review all classes or they will not be taught.

After comparing statements, Stekoll will go to Alliance with the differences and work towards a more pared down, more general statement. Those with comments should send them to Stekoll.

Elections in March: At the next meeting, nominations will open for Faculty Senate President Elect. Stekoll outlined the nominations process and recommended Senate read the bylaws. <http://www.uas.alaska.edu/FacultySenate/faculty-senate-bylaws.html>

## **VI. Committee Reports**

### Curriculum Committee – P. Dalthorp

Stekoll sent the committee report via email to Senate. C. Donar reported the Associate of Science degree will be in its second reading at the meeting on February 15 and he will be in Juneau to attend.

### Research Committee – D. Tallmon

No report.

### Graduate Committee – K. DiLorenzo

The committee will meet on February 6, 2013.

### Faculty Alliance – M. Stekoll

Stekoll reported on the audio conference which took place on January 18, 2013. Alliance discussed UA SDI metrics and reported what will be used and has been shared with BOR. Alliance is trying to reduce the list of 300 metrics to be more meaningful for the three MAUs and then, be reported to BOR.

Caulfield stated that each MAU has its own metrics having to do with accreditation and core themes which are linked to the five themes of SDI. He said the UAS core themes are, largely, in alignment with those of SDI. There is a lot of attention to metrics now. <http://www.alaska.edu/shapingalaskasfuture/what-is-sdi/>

There was a presentation from President Gamble.

### Faculty Handbook Committee – M. Stekoll

Stekoll reported progress on the Handbook and in order to present Senate with a revised version by March 1, more meetings have been scheduled.

R. Caulfield thanked the committee members – L. Hoferkamp, T. Powers, V. Fredenberg, M. Stekoll, and M. Moya for their continuing work.

### Professional Development Committee – L. Doctorman

L. Doctorman moved to pass the attached proposed changes. In summary, the proposal strikes the entirety of Category 4. Professional Development within the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) matrix located on page 151 of the Faculty Handbook; and,

includes necessary edits. The proposal also strikes text under the heading 'Overall Professional Development' on pages 91 and 120 of the Faculty Handbook and replace them with a new definition of Professional Development. C. McMillan seconded the motion.

M. Stekoll asked for the rationale for the changes.

Doctorman answered of purpose of the changes was to make it more simplified and to express that it's not something upon which faculty tenure and promotion should be weighted. Professional development is in all areas including teaching, service and research; and should not be considered a fourth component.

C. Hassler added that Professional Development may still be a section of a tenure and promotion binder; but, it is not a requirement.

R. Caulfield thanked the committee for their work. He went on to say he understands faculty want more opportunities and funding for professional development but are unclear about expectations. The Faculty Handbook process offers an opportunity to clarify this issue. He suggests this work be considered Senate's input on the process and allow the Handbook committee to consider how it best fits. The Handbook committee will see if other issues arise and incorporate the language where it feels it can. Addressing Doctorman, Stekoll suggested if she agreed with Caulfield's comments she should change her motion to "the UAS Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee recommends the following changes to the Faculty Handbook (AY 2011-12) in relation to Faculty Professional Development:".

Doctorman amended her motion and Hassler seconded it. The motion passed unopposed.

Stekoll thanked Doctorman and her committee for their work and discharged the committee.

## **VII. Old Business**

### **Student Ratings Proposal**

A. Sesko presented the following motion: The UAS faculty senate supports the student ratings process be accepted and implemented starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. The rating system will include 1) student ratings intended for rating course and faculty teaching effectiveness, and 2) course related questions assessing library services and technology effectiveness. Faculty will have the option to disable individual questions from part 2, and should do so if library services and technology are irrelevant to their course content. Faculty will also have the option to add their own custom made course related questions that will appear after part 1. At course completion faculty will be provided with both an excel sheet containing raw data and a sheet containing descriptive statistics (i.e., mean level data).

B. Blitz seconded the motion.

L. Doctorman asked for clarification as to whether or not the graduate rating instrument included questions about the Library and IT; and, if so, is there an option to suppress questions.

C. Hassler explained the work associated with this committee was for undergraduate ratings and competencies. Sesko confirmed the motion and committee efforts were for undergraduate ratings only.

R. Caulfield stated there are two issues being questioned: new ratings questions approved by Senate; and, disconnecting questions relating to the Library and IT from the initial undergraduate response. From their meetings, Caulfield said, conceptually, for graduate and undergraduate ratings, the Library and IT questions could be disconnected. Senate has not offered a new set of questions for graduate ratings. Should the Senate or Graduate committee take this up for consideration?

Sesko confirmed M. Ciri understood this ratings instrument was for undergraduate students.

Doctorman is supportive of offering faculty the option to suppress the Library and IT questions within the graduate ratings instrument. A. Jones reported the School of Education supports separation of Library and IT questions for their graduate ratings.

President Stekoll called for the vote; the motion passed unopposed.

#### Online Files for Evaluation

C. McMillan asked if Senators had recruited membership for the Online Files for Evaluation ad hoc committee, noting A. Jones had agreed to work on the committee. L. Doctorman reported that R. Wolk had been nominated; no other names were put forward.

McMillan went on to say there is no verbiage stating electronic faculty tenure and promotion files are prohibited. He is not interested in writing language stating faculty may use an electronic tenure and promotion file format. Further, McMillan said this effort is not about telling faculty which technology to use, but to present the option and manual, with tutorials, to create an electronic tenure and promotion file.

McMillan presented a motion to form the ad hoc Electronic Evaluation Committee with a charge to show how a person could submit an electronic tenure and promotion file, how to secure it, and how a reviewer would access it.

A. Jones seconded the motion.

Stekoll recommended M. Ciri's membership on the committee.

B Blitz confirmed that Senators will be recruiting faculty for membership on this ad hoc committee.

Stekoll reminded McMillan to provide a committee report at each meeting of Faculty Senate.

Stekoll called for the vote and motion passes unopposed.

**VIII. New Business**

There was no new business.

**IX. Regional Reports**

There were no regional reports.

**X. Juneau Items Only**

There were no Juneau items.

**XI. Adjournment**

B. Blitz moved to adjourn the meeting at 4:58 pm.

The next meeting of Faculty Senate will be on March 1, 2013.