

**MINUTES**  
**University of Alaska Southeast Faculty Senate**  
**September 7, 2012 Egan Library 211**

In Attendance: M. Stekoll, V. Fredenberg, B. Blitz, E. Hill for A. Sesko, S. Neely, C. McMillan for A. Jones and as Juneau at Large, C. Hassler, M. Pennoyer, scribe.

Via Audio: R. McDonald, L. Doctorman, C. Donar, J. Martin, T. Anderson, R. Caulfield

Guests: L. Hoferkamp, C. Hedlin

Faculty Senate President Mike Stekoll called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm.

**I. Approval of Agenda**

There were no additions to the agenda.

**II. Approval of General Assembly Minutes 22 August 2012 and Faculty Senate Meetings of March, April and May 2012**

E. Hill moved to approve all meeting minutes with a second from C. McMillan. B. Blitz offered corrections to the minutes and will forward them to President Stekoll for his review. After corrections were stated, E. Hill amended her motion to approve all meeting minutes as to be amended; C. McMillan seconded. The motion passed without objection.

**III. Provost Report Chair's Report – R. Caulfield**

**A. Fish Tech Program in Sitka**

UAS has a one year certificate and a two year AAS degree in fisheries technology. The UAS program review in AY11-12 resulted in recommendations to strengthen and grow the UAS program; and, to focus on building relationships with Prince William Community College, Kodiak College and the Bristol Bay Campus. The program has two faculty: Kate Sullivan in Ketchikan and Jim Seeland in Sitka. The administrative home for the program is in Ketchikan.

In the last session, the Legislature approved general funds for a tenure track position for the Fish Tech program. To better access three operating hatcheries and to continue the partnership with the Sitka Sound Science Center, with whom UAS has a memorandum of agreement, the administrative home for the program will move from Ketchikan to Sitka. Core courses for the program were developed by faculty working with the Sitka campus instructional designers and are delivered on line from the Sitka campus. Caulfield is hopeful that the extensive hands on learning experiences available in Sitka and on line delivery of courses will help to grow the program with other campuses.

E. Hill asked if this change to the program is part of a larger re-arrangement of programs between Sitka and Ketchikan. Caulfield responded that this is not part of a larger rearrangement; but the change comes as a result of the program review process. The Sitka campus with their community support, the Sitka Sound Science Center, and the capability of the instructional design team is an important combination for the

success of the Fish Tech program. Caulfield reiterated that he worked with directors and faculty from both campuses and all are supporting the move.

#### B. Fisheries Seafood Maritime Initiative Update

UA President Gamble stated at Fall Convocation the governor is asking UA to hold the line on budgets. One area with a potential funding opportunity is the Fisheries Seafood Maritime Initiative (FSMI). Gamble pulled together a team, from all three MAUs, lead by the UAF School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences (UAF FSOS) to identify what the university system is doing to meet the needs of the different sectors across all three campuses. The McDowell Group surveyed industry employers asking what they saw as strengths, opportunities and gaps in UA offerings. Gamble asked MAU leadership to submit proposals for a \$1.0 to \$1.4MM funding request to the legislature for the FY14 budget.

With a deadline of September 10, UAS has submitted seven concepts for consideration. After a review of the proposals by fisheries industries partners, President Gamble will decide, in October, on which concepts from the MAUs will be part of the funding proposal sent to the legislature.

[http://www.alaska.edu/voice/2012/May\\_2012/News/fsmi/](http://www.alaska.edu/voice/2012/May_2012/News/fsmi/)

B. Blitz asked if the Fish Tech program was the only program involved in the only UAS proposals. Caulfield responded that the School of Management is working with Ketchikan on a proposal; the McDowell survey of industry employers identified a need for mid level business managers in fisheries, seafood and maritime industries. Career Ed is considering a proposal in marine technologies and refrigeration for seafood processing plants and vessels. The School of Arts and Sciences is writing a proposal for a faculty position to expand courses in biology and marine biology programs.

L. Doctorman stated Keith Criddle from UAF FSOS is working on a proposal for a master's program and is interested in classes available through the MPA Natural Resources Policy program emphasis.

Caulfield stated the leadership groups are encouraging those submitting proposals to look across the UA system for opportunities to collaborate with other MAUs and programs.

#### C. Reconciliation Meeting

After discussion with Faculty Senate President Stekoll, Caulfield is aware of the process that took place several years ago between the Faculty Senate, Chancellor, Provost, Deans and Directors as a means to reconcile differences and misunderstandings between the groups. Chancellor Pugh and Caulfield think another meeting of this type, stressing shared governance, good communications and anticipating needs for the coming year, is a good idea. Caulfield asked President Stekoll and the Faculty Senate for their thoughts. The meeting would take place on Saturday September 22 from 8:30 am to noon.

Following discussion between the Senators including concerns about levels of interest and issues from constituencies, opinions that the last meeting was a good event, evaluations of administration, and concerns about what there is to be reconciled; President Stekoll offered the suggestion to reframe the meeting as a meeting of faculty and administration. Caulfield supported Stekoll's suggestion to change the name of the meeting and direction of the agenda. Topics of discussion may include shared governance, good communications, planning for the new academic year, and 360° reviews of administration.

C. Donar asked if Faculty Senators from Ketchikan and Sitka will be able to attend; and, if the Provost's Office would cover the costs.

#### **IV. President's Report**

##### **A. President Elect – Virgil Fredenberg**

President Stekoll announced the election of Virgil Fredenberg as Faculty Senate President Elect. Fredenberg will serve on the Faculty Alliance and as a member of the Chancellor's Cabinet.

##### **B. Faculty Assembly Stats**

Stekoll noted that there are 95 members of Faculty Assembly. The Assembly is comprised of faculty who are tenured, tenure track, and terms who have worked in their positions three years or more. Voter turnout on the Faculty Senate presidential election was about 60%.

##### **C. Visit by Dana Thomas, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Statewide**

Dr. Thomas is planning to visit various campuses and would like to meet with faculty leadership. He asked to attend a meeting of the Faculty Senate. While visiting the campus, Thomas will also meet with Provost Caulfield and attend a meeting of the Provost's Council. President Stekoll asked the Senate if they would like Thomas to attend a meeting of the Senate, or have a less formal event.

B. Blitz asked what Dr. Thomas will discuss with the Senate. Caulfield responded that since Dr. Thomas works directly with President Gamble, topics of discussion may include incorporating academic topics into the Strategic Direction Initiative (SDI), faculty promotion and tenure, and the program review process.

Comments from the Faculty Senate included that if Dr. Thomas was to attend a meeting of the Faculty Senate, he should have the entire meeting, Senators were eager to meet with him, and to insure a good faculty turnout, the meeting should be with Faculty Senate. Stekoll suggested that Dr. Thomas attend a meeting of the Faculty Senate and that it would be open to UAS faculty to attend. Meeting details will follow.

##### **D. ITEC Rep - Susan Feero**

President Stekoll sent a request to Faculty Assembly for a faculty member to serve on the Statewide Information Technology Executive Committee (ITEC). Susan Feero in Sitka

has agreed to serve on the ITEC and will report, formally, to the Faculty Alliance and, hopefully, Faculty Senate. R. McDonald offered to get a report from Susie and bring it to Senate.

#### E. Grading of UA/UAS in National Reports

President Stekoll provided a laptop presentation to the Senate: UA systems don't fare well in national reports.

<http://icw.uschamber.com/reportcard/alaska/>

[http://collegecompletion.chronicle.com/state/#state=ak&sector=public\\_four](http://collegecompletion.chronicle.com/state/#state=ak&sector=public_four) (two year available here as well)

[http://measuringup2008.highereducation.org/states/report\\_cards/index.php?state=AK&myYear=2006&cat=10yr](http://measuringup2008.highereducation.org/states/report_cards/index.php?state=AK&myYear=2006&cat=10yr)

<http://www.luminafoundation.org/state/alaska/>

Stekoll shared the statistics with the Senate to point out that this is what UA administrators and legislators see – this information came from Dr. Thomas and Faculty Alliance.

#### V. **Old Business**

President Stekoll asked if Senators, last year, received information on Student Evaluation of Instruction. Stekoll has an electronic copy of the document and will forward it to Senators. He could find no record of voting or other final actions by the Senate in AY 11-12. This issue will be discussed at the October meeting; no vote is planned.

E Hill asked about the title -- is it evaluation or rating? Stekoll replied that this is student ratings.

#### VI. **New Business**

##### A. By-laws Amendments for Information Systems, Committee E (Faculty Evaluation), Voting by the President, President must be Tenured?

President Stekoll reviewed the by-laws and constitution of the Faculty Senate. He determined the on line version of the constitution is the only one that exists; there is not a hard copy with the Chancellor's signature.

In October 2004, Jonathan Anderson brought a motion to the Senate asking that it recognize Steve Johnson as a senator representing a new Information Systems (IS) department. IS met the criteria of an academic unit as outlined in the bylaws, but neither the constitution nor the bylaws list IS as an academic unit; and therefore, IS formally should not have a senator. Stekoll went on to say that in order for IS to have a senator, the Senate must pass a bylaw amendment. Technically, the IS senator is not a voting member of Faculty Senate.

B. Blitz asked how many faculty are in IS. R. McDonald, IS senator, answered that there are currently five faculty in the department.

A concern arose at the Faculty General Assembly that there seems to be disproportionate representation among faculty. The constitution and bylaws state representation is based on whether or not there is a department chair, not on the size of faculty in a department or program. The procedure for amending the bylaws is similar to amending the constitution: amendments to the constitution may be approved by a two thirds majority of the Senate; amendments to the bylaws must be approved by a majority of Senate membership.

In October 2007, Faculty Senate passed unanimously a motion that the President Elect should be a voting member of Senate. The Constitution is silent on this issue and the current Faculty Senate should decide on this issue. The Faculty Senate Constitution states the President shall vote only to make or break a tie. Roberts of Rules of Order states the President is a member of the voting body and has the same rights and privileges as all other members. Stekoll asked the Senate whether or not they wished to change this statement.

Stekoll noted that Committee E, listed as the Faculty Evaluation Committee in the Constitution, is not a UNAC Peer or UAFT MAU committee; does it refer to the UNAC MAU review committee? The purpose of the committee is at odds with the CBAs and Faculty Handbook.

After discussion including notice of the language being a cut and paste error, reading sections of the UNAC CBA and an explanation of the process from Provost Caulfield, B. Blitz moved to delete the language referring to the Faculty Evaluation Committee from the constitution; there was no second.

Stekoll stated that in order for Faculty Senate to vote to delete the language, there must be amendments to the constitution and bylaws. The process to approve amendments requires presentation and discussion of the proposed amendments at the current meeting with a vote to follow at the next.

V. Fredenberg asked if this language is removed from constitution and bylaws, will faculty have any say over committee selection. Stekoll answered no because there is language in both the CBAs and Faculty Handbook. Fredenberg noted that if the CBAs should change, there would be no recourse for faculty.

Other issues –

Stekoll asked the Senate to consider a 2004 motion that was never voted on brought by B. Blitz stating that Faculty Senate President and President Elect must be tenured faculty. Blitz stated that when the language was written in 2004, there were not enough tenured faculty to pass the motion.

Stekoll is working with S. Tamone to find more information on these issues and amendments.

## B. Standing Committees

Active: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, chaired by Pedar Dalthorp. Stekoll noted the Proposal Tracking is out of date and if it is not being used, to remove the button.

Active: Graduate Committee, chair and membership to be confirmed.

L. Doctorman stated that Heidi Connole and Kathy DiLorenzo are on the committee. V. Fredenberg stated Lee Graham, and, possibly, Katy Spangler are on the committee.

Active: Faculty Alliance, D. Monteith, M. Stekoll, and V. Fredenberg.

Communications, purpose and standing unknown, but it is listed in Faculty Constitution and Bylaws. S. Tamone has documentation supporting the amendment to remove the Communications committee from the bylaws; from Faculty Senate minutes of 10-01-2010.

Faculty Evaluations, discussed earlier in meeting.

Academic Information Services, reserved.

Reserved in case an issue arises and the committee is needed. It was suggested that if a committee on reserve is needed, rather than voting on amendments to reactivate the committee on reserve, create an ad hoc committee or text stating that this committee will be constituted as need arises.

NOTE: the Academic and Information Services Committee has a bylaws amendment removing it from Bylaws; amendment never completed.

Research Committee, ad hoc.

B. Blitz stated that he believes the Research Committee was approved in AY 11-12 as an active committee of the Faculty Senate. (Note: This was supposedly done by the Assembly August 2011?)

Faculty Handbook Committee, ad hoc.

Stekoll told Senate that the Faculty Handbook Committee is currently an ad hoc committee; and asked that since the Handbook is be updated annually, should this committee be made permanent?

B. Blitz suggested Faculty Handbook Committee include work on the Constitution, Bylaws, and amendments to ensure the approved changes happen.

R. Caulfield asked that committee membership include campus representatives from both unions.

C. McMillan moved to reauthorize the existing ad hoc Faculty Handbook Committee; E. Hill seconded. The motion passed without objection.

Research and Creative Activities Committee, not in constitution or bylaws. The committee exists, but it is unknown if it is a standing committee. D. Monteith stated in September 2011, that the committee was made permanent by Faculty Senate. No date of Senate action is available and requires research. D. Tallmon is the current chair of the committee.

E-lab GER Sciences Committee, ad hoc.

In May 2011, Faculty Senate passed a resolution saying they agreed in concept with the process and changed the end date to 2014; and, left it up to the Natural Sciences department to determine the review processes. Stekoll is unsure if this ad hoc committee should report to Faculty Senate. B. Blitz suggested that as the Senator for Natural Sciences, once the review processes are complete, he will bring them to Senate for their approval.

C. Faculty Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure  
Criteria for Professional Development

L. Doctorman stated that the purpose of this item is to begin a discussion and clarification on faculty professional development as identified in the Scholarship of Teaching Learning Matrix (SOTL). She suggests the development of a Professional Development Matrix to identify artifacts and activities to prove professional development. Doctorman noted the Faculty Handbook and Faculty Senate webpage SOTL do not match; see differences in Category 4.

Since professional development is one of the criteria of the evaluation and promotion process, Stekoll supports the matrix for professional development.

C. Hassler noted the Provost's Office sends out page 91 of the Faculty Handbook that outlines the criteria for faculty professional development.

Doctorman moved to create an ad hoc committee to develop a professional development matrix. C. McMillan seconded the motion.

C. Donar asked if the matrix would represent both faculty unions.

Doctorman amended her motion to include both bargaining units in the development of the professional development matrix.

B. Blitz asked if the SOTL will have to be changed because professional development is already included. Stekoll stated that there would be changes.

V. Fredenberg suggested Senate take the discussion to departments and be prepared to discuss and vote on the current motion at the next meeting. Doctorman's motion will be on the October meeting agenda.

## Electronic Files vs. Binders

C. McMillan provided an overview of his understanding of the current promotion and tenure process which requires faculty standing to create a three ring support binder. The support binder is part of a set of binders kept in the Provost's Office and must be checked out reviewed by the evaluation committees in that office. McMillan suggests that the process be made electronic and referred to UAKJobs as an example mechanism to develop electronic binders. The UAKJobs process includes required and optional document pages, document tracking, and limited and secure viewer access. The addition of rubrics for the different pages is also a consideration.

Advantages include file access anytime and from anywhere for reviewers; for faculty being reviewed, the option of using e-tools for materials that are difficult to showcase on paper; and, time stamps which prevents tampering by faculty or members of the committee. The concept is modeled after electronic portfolios required of students and may be more authentic to faculty seeking promotion and tenure.

Discussion included support for the idea; the option for faculty to chose a binder or an electronic file; concerns about confidentiality; tracking access, use and annotations to the electronic files. What is the effect on the Provost's Office and their practices?

McMillan will do research on electronic binders. R. McDonald and Provost Caulfield's office offered to help with the research.

## **VII. Regional Reports**

There were no reports.

NOTE: R. McDonald asked how to discuss the IS technical problem with his faculty. V. Fredenberg stated it was not about IS having a seat in Senate, but if the rest of faculty are adequately represented. Should the Faculty Senate adopt a representational model rather than a senatorial model?

Stekoll restated that IS is not listed in the Constitution and Bylaws and that is why the issue was discussed.

## **VIII. Next meeting: 5 October 2012**

## **IX. Juneau Items Only**

## **X. Adjournment**

President Stekoll moved to adjourn the meeting, C. McMillan seconded the motion. Without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4:44 pm.