

**MINUTES**  
**University of Alaska Southeast Faculty Senate**  
**April 5, 2013 Egan Library 211**

In Attendance: M. Stekoll, B. Blitz, A. Dewees for S. Neely, C. Hassler, C. McMillan, V. Fredenberg, D. Monteith, M. Pennoyer, scribe.

Via Audio: C. Donar, J. Liddle for J. Martin, L. Doctorman, R. McDonald, R. Caulfield

Guests: B. Hegel, L. Hoferkamp

**I. Call to Order**

President Stekoll called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

**II. Approval of Agenda**

There were no changes to the agenda and it was approved as presented.

**III. Approval of Minutes – 03-01-2013**

C. McMillan moved to approve the minutes as presented. With a second from A. Jones and without objections, the meeting minutes were approved.

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

Alaska's Forty Under 40: Caulfield reported on his attendance at a luncheon in Anchorage to honor X'unei Lance Twitchell as one of Alaska's Forty Under 40 for 2013. Caulfield went on to say he's also attending the first statewide Alaska Native Studies Conference.

UAS Accreditation Update: The Year 3 Accreditation Report is due in September 2013. The report should be in final draft in May and will allow time for final editing over the summer. Caulfield encourages Faculty Senate to review the draft report prepared by Dr. M. L. Madden and to provide their feedback to C. Hedlin. He stressed the importance of the report capturing the best of UAS. Dr. Madden is looking for vignettes and stories about students, programs or activities that illustrate what is unique and distinctive about UAS to add to the report.

Outcomes from Provost's Ad Hoc Committee on Student Success and Remediation: Caulfield reported the ad hoc committee has completed its work; the document was sent to M. Stekoll for future distribution to Senators. The committee focused on continuous improvements on the Learning Centers across all three campuses. With a special emphasis on the Juneau Learning Center, the committee looked at math and English, topics related to developmental English, and developmental math. The committee, with strong support of faculty, recommended the development of a writing center under the umbrella of the Juneau Learning Center. The writing center will be housed in the Think Tank with involvement from N. Chordas, E. Hayes, and C. Enge.

Another committee recommendation is to increase the Learning Center's budget during the next fiscal year. Because of increased testing and assessment taking place in the Learning Center, the budget is lagging behind. The goal is to have sufficient funding to increase the Testing Center Supervisor position from a half to full-time position. This effort will insure students in developmental English and math receive good assessments and increase general testing services.

A third recommendation is to revitalize the Juneau Learning Center Advisory Committee including representation from faculty, student services and the Center Director.

The committee also explored alternative approaches to teaching developmental English and math. An outcome from the committee is interest from E. Hayes to pilot an accelerated and intensive course in Fall 2013 offering ENGL 092 and 110 in one semester. The goal of the course is to have students complete two of their developmental English courses in one semester. ENGL 092 and 110 will continue to be offered separately in the semester format.

The committee talked about Sitka's experiences working with online math programs as an aid to learning about math. They agreed to continue tracking student responses to the availability of online tools.

The committee discussed that, both, UAA and UAF allow students, who have recently taken ACT or SAT tests, to use those scores for placement into math and English courses; and, UAS does not. The committee agreed to look at UAA and UAF practices: if a student has taken the ACT or SAT within the last two years, their norm cut scores will determine placement into developmental or college level math or English and they will not have to take the Accuplacer test.

Caulfield noted the ad hoc committee's work is complete and the committee has ended.

UAS Campus Master Plan and Academic Space Utilization--Juneau Campus: Caulfield announced the UAS Campus Master Plan is before the Board of Regents at their meeting in Sitka April 10-12, 2013. Discussions about space utilization continue on all three campuses, particularly in Juneau. He said the Bill Ray Center (BRC) is for sale and there are a few parties interested in it. Faculty currently in the BRC are meeting with Caulfield to address and plan for their program needs. Caulfield stressed even with an agreement for a sale, it may be months or a year or two until a move is required. He noted funding for renovations at the TEC Center is available and planning is underway. The outcomes of those planning decisions may impact the office and classrooms in Hendrickson, Soboleff and Whitehead buildings. Caulfield is confident the UAS Campus Master Plan will be approved by the BOR; it is time to move ahead on items noted in the plan.

UAS FY15 Budget Process: Caulfield said the Legislature has not been receptive to additional money for the University beyond salaries and benefits. With support from Representative Muñoz, Caulfield is hopeful the one item in the operating budget that will make it into the FY15 UAS budget is \$90,000 for the mine training center director position. In the capitol budget, UA will likely receive \$37.5 million for renewal and renovations. UAS will not see a lot of new money. Chancellor Pugh has asked that FY15 budget requests be limited to requests already in FY14 that did not receive funding. Caulfield plans to send a memo explaining the request. Requests to the Legislature are and will get more difficult to fund. For new projects and positions, UAS may have to find funding through internal reallocation.

Stekoll asked for a funding update on the UAS dorm project. Caulfield reported the first phase of the dorm project is funded and it includes the mechanical infrastructure and sixty beds; a second phase will include an additional sixty beds. Construction will begin April 2013.

Search for Vice Chancellor of Administrative Services: Chancellor Pugh has asked Vice Chancellor J. Nelson and Caulfield to co-chair the search committee. V. Fredenberg is the faculty representative on the committee. There are over forty applicants for the position and the committee review process will begin next week.

Celebrating Faculty Excellence: The UAS celebration of Faculty Excellence is scheduled for May 6<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 pm in the Glacier View Room.

## **V. President's Report – M. Stekoll**

Faculty Senate President-Elect: Stekoll reported he had received no nominations for Faculty Senate President-Elect. He confirmed with Senate that they had asked all constituents of their interest in the office. The Senate bylaws state all senators are automatically nominated and must confirm their nomination today to be on the ballot.

If there are no nominations received today by the end of the meeting, the election for Faculty Senate President-Elect will take place in August 2013, during Convocation at the meeting of Faculty General Assembly.

R. McDonald asked if Faculty Senate President must be from Juneau. Stekoll replied that because of the number of meetings, it is easier on the candidate if they were based in Juneau.

## **VI. Committee Reports**

### Curriculum Committee – P. Dalthorp

The committee has not met and there is no report.

### Research Committee – D. Tallmon

The committee has not met and there is no report. Tallmon did send a reminder for the URECA Symposium scheduled for April 16, 2013 in the Glacier View Room. The symposium will feature presentations from URECA students as well as those conducting research.

### Graduate Committee – K. DiLorenzo

The committee has not met and there is no report.

### SAC – D. Monteith

Monteith said there is no report today because SAC will be meeting next week in Sitka prior to the meeting of the Board of Regents.

### Faculty Alliance – M. Stekoll

Stekoll had nothing to report from the last meeting of Faculty Alliance.

### Faculty Handbook Committee – M. Stekoll

Stekoll reported the Committee concluded their work for now. He sent a PDF draft of the AY 13-14 Faculty Handbook to Senators asking for their feedback. The Committee will meet on April 26 to discuss comments received. Stekoll told Senate to be prepared to vote on the draft Handbook at the May meeting. He recommended Senators use the sticky note comment tool in Adobe Acrobat when reviewing the draft handbook; and, to send their reviewed versions to Stekoll.

B. Blitz noticed the Faculty Senate Bylaws in the draft Handbook are out of date.

Stekoll said if Senate approves the draft of the AY 13-14 Faculty Handbook, it would affect faculty seeking promotion and tenure in the next academic year.

R. McDonald asked of the new provision in the draft Handbook requiring UAFT faculty to notify their dean or director prior to the end of the current contract of their intent to stand for promotion and tenure – since the draft Handbook is not in effect until AY 13- 14, would UAFT faculty notify their dean or director of their intent to stand for proportion and tenure by October 1, 2013 or before the end of the AY 12-13 contract? Stekoll responded UAFT faculty would advise their dean or director by October 1, 2013.

R. Caulfield said it is the goal of the Faculty Handbook Committee to offer faculty the benefit of the most current handbook as reference as they prepare their promotion and tenure binder. He went on to say there would be a committee to review the handbook throughout each year with a Faculty Senate approved version in place prior by the end of the spring semester for the coming year.

Stekoll recommended Senate review the promotion and tenure procedures and how files are set up.

V. Fredenberg noted a difference in the procedure dealing with academic record files in that they will no longer be located in the Provost's Office. They will be kept in the faculty member's dean or director's office. The only file kept in the Provost's Office will be the faculty member's promotion and tenure file.

Stekoll added the change in academic record file location is required to be in compliance with the UNAC Collective Bargaining Agreement. The committee agreed to apply the change to all faculty academic record files regardless of union affiliation. He went on to say there is a list of required documents in the draft Faculty Handbook and faculty are responsible for all documents contained in their promotion and tenure file.

B. Blitz voiced concern about not knowing what language was changed in the draft Faculty Handbook. Stekoll told him there was a track-changes version available but that it is very confusing.

L. Hoferkamp stated that the academic record file is maintained by administration and should be considered a resource for building a promotion and tenure file. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to create the promotion and tenure file that will be used throughout the review process.

Stekoll added that Senate may not be able to tell what's changed but it is important to note if this is the language faculty want to have in their handbook.

#### Online Evaluation Committee (ad hoc) – C. McMillan

McMillan confirmed with committee member J. Liddle that the committee wanted to have the contents of the blue binders (academic record files) electronic and if yes, where would they be housed?

M. Stekoll reminded McMillan the charge of the committee was not to do things, but to find out what could be done. He said Senate could comment on the idea.

B. Blitz is in favor of having the blue binder (academic record file) available electronically. McMillan added that many of the documents are already available electronically.

J. Liddle pointed out the documents in the files are currently the responsibility of other people including the Provost's Office; and, includes student evaluations and workload agreements. The file is created on behalf of the faculty member.

McMillan reported that he'd discussed with M. Ciri the process of the electronic version of the evaluation procedure. Ciri agrees with the Faculty Handbook in that the responsibility for preparation and contents of the faculty evaluation file rests with the faculty member. Ciri supports electronic promotion and tenure files as long as the faculty member is responsible for the entire process and contents including software; and, working and accessible links.

Stekoll clarified that the blue binder (academic record file) is the responsibility of university and not of the faculty. Faculty are responsible for promotion files. McMillan concurred with Stekoll's statements.

McMillan noted Ciri had one concern with electronic promotion files, as opposed to the binder kept in the Provost's Office, that, later, the University may never see the file again or have record of it. Ciri said that when job candidates are interviewed, UAS only keeps the results of the interview with the candidate. From the IT point of view, as long as the responsibility, validity, workability and readability of the promotion file are entirely up to the faculty member, IT has no concerns.

Stekoll asked about security of the electronic files. McMillan said Ciri thought security of the electronic files rested with the faculty member and not with IT.

Questions and comments from Senate included:

How is the confidentiality of an electronic promotion file maintained while it's on line if IT won't offer support?

Similar to the UAKJobs online system; could a repository of accumulated electronic promotion files with password protection be built? A model like this requiring password access would be more secure than the current set up in the Provost's Office file room.

McMillan explained Ciri's comments may have included thinking in more broad terms; beyond IT support with consideration for everyone involved with electronic promotion and tenure files. Ciri was confident the electronic format process could be as secure as any other platform.

McMillan went on to say he thought if faculty opted for the electronic file format, he believed those faculty had facility for a digital format. Faculty may choose to use the latest software. McMillan is worried reviewers may not have updated versions on their computers and may not be able to review the file and would become frustrated. Who has the responsibility of ensuring faculty have updates and current versions of software on their computers?

Comments from Senate:

Senate was shown an online synchronized system with a third part host. Should we get back to how it would be implemented and then discuss security? McMillan said he thought this would be a lot of responsibility for IT and would require constant updating.

Can the committee create a core set of documents requiring security and at what level?

Could a course created for faculty to load a pdf version of the promotion file and that would allow reviewers access? Students have a similar course where they view their own assignments but not those of other students.

Employees on search committees and graduate students use this model. Promotion files will need a standardized format, but this idea would allow for different formats of files and movies.

M. Stekoll reminded McMillan the charge of the committee was to provide Senate with a process on how faculty could create electronic promotional file for use in the faculty review process. The committee needs to create a specific model of how the process, from a practical standpoint, would work.

McMillan told Senate he had put together a WIKI for faculty demonstrating electronic file options. He asked if the committee needed to say "the process needs to be done this way" and was hoping for more help from Ciri. Ciri was of the opinion that it was up to faculty to resolve the issue of reviewer access to the electronic files.

R. McDonald supported the committee position to decide ahead of time whether or not to go forward with this effort and then to create the model. It is a lot of work to create a working model before there is a decision of what the objectives are.

V. Fredenberg noted the Faculty Handbook doesn't say promotion files can't be submitted electronically. The committee was formed to create a process by which faculty could submit promotion files electronically. With particular attention on security, is there a way this could work and meet the needs of everyone? McMillan went to find this out from M. Ciri. Fredenberg suggests the committee create a model showing which items are public and which are secure; and, how to keep them secure.

McMillan went on to discuss faculty academic records in an electronic format.

Comments from Senate:

The UNAC CBA requires academic records be kept in the Dean's Office.

The purpose of having the academic records in an electronic format is to provide reviewers access to the files.

There is no reason reviewers would need access to the academic record; those documents are part of the promotion file.

Might the academic record become something like human resource files or the Blackboard website and is available to anyone, anywhere so long as they have the password. The Dean's or Provost's Office would be responsible for building it.

Could the file be built by using UAOnline; the site is appropriate and secure?

The bigger question is if faculty want access to their academic record file outside of the Dean's or Director's Office.

Stekoll noted as a compromise, the Dean's or Director's Office may keep the academic record files in an electronic format and have them available to send, by request, to faculty. He asked R. Caulfield for input on the process.

Caulfield said no one has asked about the academic record file in an electronic format. He said the discussion is around two different issues – academic record files to be kept in the Dean's or Director's Offices; and, faculty promotion files to be kept in the Provost's Office as they are now. The CBAs dictate how some of the records and files are handled. In the future, at negotiations, should CBAs allow specific use of electronic files?

After further discussion, Stekoll told Senate he saw two issues – does Senate want an electronic academic record file for access by the faculty member; and, does Senate want an electronic promotion file for access by the evaluation committees?

Caulfield told Senate electronic file vary from sophisticated software similar to UAOnline to scanning a paper file onto a jump drive; or, shared drive available only to evaluators. If a faculty member took their 100 page promotion file and scanned it to a password protected shared drive with access available only to evaluators – access to the files on the shared drive would be tracked – it seems this may be a way to accomplish the task. Documents created throughout the review process can be scanned and added to

the files on the shared drive. The faculty promotion file would be available for viewing by any evaluator at any campus.

Stekoll called to end the discussion.

McMillan asked Senate for a resolution to make the academic record file accessible electronically for the faculty member it's associated with. J. Liddle seconded the resolution.

Stekoll stated since this issue was under the control of Faculty Senate, he recommended changing the resolution to a motion; to move the issue into action. If the motion passes, it will go to Chancellor Pugh and Administration.

McMillan changed his resolution to a motion to have the academic record file made available electronically to the faculty member the file is associated with. Liddle seconded the motion.

Stekoll restated the motion: To have the faculty member's academic record files available to that faculty member electronically.

L. Doctorman asked for clarification of the type of record in the motion. Stekoll said the record in the motion is the academic record file which contains evaluations, workloads, transcripts, appointment letters, annual activity report and other documents. The file will be kept in the Dean's or Director's Offices.

Stekoll called for the vote which passed without opposition.

J. Liddle noted the motion to specify the format of the electronic file. He recommends Senate take a position to support a common, coherent system.

Stekoll suggested waiting for a response from Administration before taking this action. Stekoll ended discussion on this topic.

## **VII. Old Business**

### AS Degree – C. Donar

M. Stekoll reminded Senate of their approval of the concept and the Curriculum Committee approved the proposal. Senate should be ready to accept the proposal in its final form.

C. Donar encouraged Senate to approve the Associate of Science degree. It's an entry point for students to develop a flexible program of study that will advance them to a UAS Bachelor of Science degree. The degree is flexible enough to allow students to tailor a sequence of courses that will enable them to transfer those courses to another program at another institution. It can also be made rigorous enough for a UAS Bachelor of Science in Biology or Environmental Science degree at the Juneau campus.

Stekoll asked if the proposal had changed since Senate first reviewed it. Donar told Senate all of the recommendations and changes are in the document. He noted the efforts of the Registrar and the Curriculum Committee to create a sequence of courses for students; and, for the purposes of advising, to specify, as clearly as possible, the courses available and the pre-requisites for those courses. The current proposal has the signature of the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

Donar moved to approve the Associate of Science degree; C. McMillan seconded the motion. The motion passed without opposition.

### Lab Alignment for Science GERs – B. Blitz

Blitz told Senate the Natural Sciences department has been charged with making a process for aligning UAS GER lab science courses. The department created the document and it is being presented to Senate. Blitz is not sure of what the next step should be – should it be approved?

M. Stekoll added there is a Statewide committee expecting the MAUs to align their science GERs. UAA and UAF are developing their own processes; UAA is incorporating the alignment processes into five year program reviews. UAS has developed their own process. The document is informational because Senate approved the idea last year and forwarded it to Natural Sciences. It is up to Senate as to whether or not they want a say in the process of reviewing the Natural Sciences GERs.

C. McMillan asked against what are the outcomes being aligned? Stekoll replied faculty determine what the class should be doing and verify the class structure meets those outcomes. This is determined by those teaching the classes.

A. Dewees asked what the purpose was of alignment. Stekoll answered the question of alignment originated with UAA Faculty Senate and their resolution not to accept credits from distance physics classes. This action set into motion the question what to do about e-learning classes? Are they different than face to face classes and can they meet the same objectives?

Stekoll explained the UAS model reviewed local and distance Anatomy and Physiology courses. All faculty, including term, adjuncts and full-time, would get together to decide whether or not these classes were meeting their objectives the way they were taught.

Dewees asked if they already had the objectives. Stekoll answered no, the objectives had to be created; but, the people who created the objectives would be evaluating them.

After further discussion, V. Fredenberg asked if courses are taught on all three campuses, no one knows whether or not there is a set of course objectives? Stekoll confirmed this is correct and may be so for each course taught at UAS.

After further discussion, Fredenberg told Senate all courses taught across the three UAS campuses should have same level of mastery; the outcomes should be the same. If a course is taught in Sitka, that course is as good as any course UAS has. This is a critical issue for faculty to deal with.

Stekoll reminded Senate they'd passed a resolution stating if UAS didn't address the lab alignment issue, those Science GER courses won't be taught after 2014.

R. Caulfield was asked for guidance to address the issue. Caulfield noted Blitz's document provides a way of bringing together faculty who teach a course. The broader question is what process, by program or department, is in place to do this on a regular basis? Does the process happen every three or five years to ensure confidence in the essential learning outcomes? He distinguishes a course outline, which contains learning objective and outcomes, from a course syllabus which, put together by faculty, contains details based on the course outline. If this is accepted as an approach, then Caulfield would be interested in setting up a process where during the academic year, faculty, involved in a program or department, review all of their courses and ensure succinct course outlines available for review by anyone. The syllabus would be an elaboration of the material contained in the outline.

Fredenberg agrees with Caulfield, but believes the effort with lab classes is more involved and includes review of delivery methods.

Caulfield responded by saying the first step is to identify the course objectives, regardless of delivery method. Using the work already done with A/P, test drive and develop a template for a course outline and have it on file in the Dean's Office or online. The document should contain the essential learning outcomes agreed upon by program faculty. This becomes the basis from which a variety of faculty might teach the same course, in a variety of ways, and is reflected in the syllabus.

Fredenberg suggested Senate may want to change the date of completion as voted on in last year's motion. The issue may be discussed at next year's meetings.

Caulfield recommended meeting with Senate leadership before the May meeting to address the questions coming up and develop an agreed upon process beginning with Anatomy and Physiology. With the Year III Accreditation Report coming, it will be helpful to write that UAS recognizes the importance of the effort and note the plan to begin in Fall 2014.

Stekoll restated the resolution as there are no objections to the work put forward by the Natural Sciences Department as a starting point. Caulfield, Stekoll, Fredenberg and Monteith will meet to discuss a framework to use for all classes.

### **VIII. New Business**

#### Nominations for Faculty Senate President-Elect – M. Stekoll

M. Stekoll reminded Senate they are all nominated for the office of Faculty Senate President-Elect.

#### BOR Transfer Policy Proposed Change for UAS – B. Blitz

Blitz asked B. Hegel to discuss the proposed change.

Hegel told Senate the reason for the discussion is to see if UAS wants to be in alignment with the other MAUs. UAF and UAS have the +/- system and UAA does not. Hegel's office conducted a transfer credit evaluation few years ago and reported the findings to the BOR. Faculty advisors look at the way UAF and UAA transferred in courses and are say courses should count for a certain requirement in students' degrees; UAS does not transfer C- grades. Hegel researched why UAS changed their policy and could find no information except that the policy changed in between the 1999 and 2000 catalog. Since UAS switched to not accepting C- grades, over 550 students were affected in over 2600 classes. The UAS policy states a C- grade is sufficient for pre-requisites but not for transfer classes. UAS accepts D- grades from the UA system but does not from outside the system.

A. Sesko stated her department was split on the issue; they agreed with the C- grade transfer. Their concern was with UAS accepting D- grades from the UA system but not from other universities and it seems like double standard.

Stekoll told Senate that UAS accepts C and D grades within the MAUs; the proposed change means UAS will accept C- and D- grades.

Blitz moved to change the UAS transfer policy to accept C- grades or above from outside institutions and D- grades or above UA courses. L. Doctorman seconded the motion.

Blitz commented the BOR grade policy says a C grade includes + and -.

A Jones reported because of NCATE regulations, the School of Education is not in favor of the policy change.

Stekoll called for the vote. The motion passed with two no votes and two abstentions.

The policy change will be reflected in the AY 13-14 Academic Catalog.

Process for Academic Course Substitution – A. Sesko

Sesko's department discussed the new policy. They noted that previously, when there was a course substitution, an email to the Registrar's Office was sufficient notification. The new formal process is good, but the trail of signatures is extensive and a burden to advisors. The faculty advisor is responsible for getting all of the signatures. They're asking why the advisor, department chair, program coordinator, subject chair for the original course and the dean must all sign to approve the substitution. Does it make sense to have all of these signatures; and, this is steps away from the electronic process.

M. Stekoll believes the decision should be made by two people: the advisor and the faculty member in charge of the class – the subject chair. Sesko agrees with his statement.

B. Hegel explained the new form was presented at Provost's Council last fall and implemented in January. The form becomes necessary at graduation as course substitutions are being reviewed by the Dean signing off on degrees. If the Dean hasn't approved and signed off for the substitution, they aren't aware of it. She went on to say substituted course aren't always taught at UAS. At the Registrar's Office there are times when substitutions are for a course that don't fall into the same discipline and requires extra work to find out why this is happening. The form is initiated by the advisor to create a paper trail tied to the student's file.

Stekoll doesn't believe Deans have authority over this issue.

D. Monteith agrees with Stekoll in that there are two key decisions: the advisor and coordinating faculty signatures. The form should then be routed the Registrar's Office with a good trail; either paper or electronic.

R. Caulfield confirmed with Monteith his suggestion that the advisor and coordinator of the course used for substitution, the faculty member with that responsibility, sign off on the course substitution. In light of the comments received, Caulfield will work with Hegel to take another look. The issue will be discussed at the next meeting of the Provost's Council.

Stekoll asked Senators to discuss the issue with their departments.

There were no Regional Reports or Juneau items.

L. Doctorman moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:02 pm.

The next meeting of Faculty Senate is on May 3, 2013.