

MINUTES
University of Alaska Southeast Faculty Senate
October 5, 2012 Egan Library 211

In Attendance: M. Stekoll, V. Fredenberg, B. Blitz, A. Sesko, S. Neely, C. McMillan for A. Jones and as Juneau at Large, C. Hassler, L. Doctorman, E. Dillingham for R. McDonald, D. Monteith, J. Martin, M. Pennoyer, scribe.

Via Audio: C. Donar, T. Anderson, R. Caulfield

Guests: L. Hoferkamp

I. Call to Order

Faculty Senate President Mike Stekoll called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. Approval of Agenda

E. Dillingham asked to change under Old Business, item A, sub-item a. CIOS: Name should be changed to Information Systems (IS); CIOS is the catalog designator not the name of the department.

III. Approval of Minutes – 09-07-2012

E. Dillingham noted that CIOS should be corrected to Information Systems or IS and, asked that the minutes be amended to reflect those corrections. The name of the department changed in 2004.

C. McMillan moved to accept the minutes as amended. With a second from B. Blitz, the motion carried without objection.

IV. Provost's Report – R. Caulfield

Caulfield expressed his appreciation to all who participated in the UAS Shared Governance Retreat held on Saturday September 22, 2012. Topics of discussion included: faculty professional development travel, academic integrity and student judicial processes.

The UAS AAS Law Enforcement, approved by Faculty Senate last spring, has been approved by the Statewide Academic Council (SAC). Review and approval of the degree will be on the agenda for the December meeting, in Fairbanks, of the UA Board of Regents (BOR).

Caulfield expressed his support of Faculty Senate appointing members to the Faculty Handbook Review Committee. He is hopeful the Committee will bring a draft of the handbook to Faculty Senate in early 2013 allowing Faculty Senate sufficient time for review and vote.

The September meeting of the BOR was in Juneau. Caulfield reviewed the events: President Gamble's Strategic Direction Initiative (SDI) continues to build momentum; he anticipates significant changes on how the entire UA system works. Caulfield encouraged Senators to have the SDI on their radar and be aware of the changes the President and Regents would like to see in the University system. Some of the themes identified within SDI are: alignment of general education requirements across the three MAUs, addressing issues of

transferability of students across the system, regular program reviews, and additional on-line programs across the state – not just more on-line classes. Cathy Cahill and Dan Monteith participated in the SDI discussions. Caulfield encourages Senate to contact them for their read on those discussions.

Regarding the UAS FY 14 Budget, Chancellor Pugh has approved proposals for new assistant professor faculty positions in biology with a focus on fisheries, teacher education with a focus on reading and literacy; a position for Director of the UAS Mine Training Center, general fund dollars for a recruitment and student success coordinator in the School of Management, and funding for a career services coordinator. The UAS FY 14 budget will go before the BOR at the November meeting for their approval. These budget proposals have come from the schools and campuses, through the Deans, and on to the Provost and Chancellor.

Representatives from the three MAUs and fisheries industries met in Anchorage on September 24 to discuss the Fisheries Seafood Maritime Initiatives (FSMI). The UAS proposals are being looked at, generally, favorably; industry representatives are asking for additional work on some. The FSMI proposals are one area in the FY 14 budget that has strong support from President Gamble.

Caulfield shared information on the Academic Innovations Fund. The fund offers faculty up to \$2000 for innovations leading to improvements in learning and teaching. There are no deadlines to submit requests to the fund; it is first come, first served.

V. President's Report – M. Stekoll

VPAA Dana Thomas visited Juneau on September 21, 2012. Part of his visit included a two hour meeting with Faculty Senate members. Dr. Thomas spoke to the small group about enrollment and completion issues. Faculty had an opportunity to express their concerns. Stekoll stated he thought Dr. Thomas was reasonable and responsive to faculty concerns.

Stekoll asked Senate for their comments on the Governance Retreat. C. Hassler stated well in advance of the retreat that she would be unable to attend. When the Library Director was invited, it was on short notice and she was unable to attend. C. McMillan stated he thought it was nice to move on.

Stekoll asked D. Monteith for his comments from the September BOR meeting in Juneau. Monteith went on to say the Regents liked the direction President Gamble is going with SDI. The Regents are very interested in on-line programs.

L. Hoferkamp asked about the information gathered from the listening sessions and that is driving SDI: since the process for gathering information wasn't based on scientific principles, faculty from the MAUs were concerned and objected to its use in making decisions affecting the university.

Stekoll stated that President Gamble did not intend to use the information scientifically, it was information not data.

Hoferkamp questioned the process to include faculty participation; working together in shared governance. Stekoll said the listening sessions were offered to the community, schools, faculty and students as well as opportunities for on-line participation.

B. Blitz asked if Dr. Thomas discussed the points of SDI during his visit to Juneau; was he seeking input from faculty. Monteith said that SDI would first go to SAC, next, to Faculty Alliance; and on to faculty senates. Monteith asked SAC for more clarification on the process for faculty to question the themes of SDI. Faculty Alliance is trying to be strategic in their participation with the decisions on SDI.

Stekoll stated that President Gamble said Faculty Alliance is very important to this process.

For faculty, informal input on SDI was with Dr. Thomas; formal input is through Faculty Alliance.

VI. Committee Reports

Student Evaluations of Instruction

A. Sesko

Sesko reviewed the handout from last spring. The committee looked at student success and teaching excellence and looked for student ratings that would be more predictive of student success. Centers of Teaching Excellence across the United States are working with student ratings consisting of nine or ten questions. The committee reviewed reliable and validated questions and selected nine they felt were appropriate to UAS. Each question gets at something specific: course content, clarity of goals and objectives, clarity of expectations for students, student availability, instructional method, learning environment, and learning outcomes.

Sesko explained the evaluation includes a series of open-ended questions and through feedback from faculty and committee members, said the student comments are very useful and important. At this time, faculty are able to add questions of their own to the evaluation instrument.

A set of demographic questions completes the evaluation. Information in these questions will not be used in of faculty evaluation, but are useful to faculty.

The committee has discussed updating the questions and how to get better response rates from students. There is was a suggestion to bring the mobile classrooms in during class for students to use in completing their evaluations. M. Stekoll asked about the number of mobile classrooms available for use and were there enough to use in the classrooms for this purpose. Sesko replied M. Ciri assured the committee there were enough.

L. Hoferkamp stated she had twice tried this method in her classes: the first time, the mobile classroom was unavailable; the second, computers from the mobile classroom were slow to boot up and the evaluations were incomplete.

M. Stekoll noted two issues in need of discussion: first, to go with the committee recommended evaluation; and second, how to implement it.

Sesko asked Senate to review the questions and send it to their respective units for input; and later discuss implementation.

C. Hassler commended the committee for their work, but having asked twice for membership on this committee, noted no library faculty had input or participation in this effort. Hassler stressed the importance of the questions pertaining to Library, IT and core competencies. The information from these sets of questions is used in institutional effectiveness, student success, accreditation, and assessment. In particular, the library questions are used to build up needed course materials, assess the need and use of quiet study space and student success. Hassler asked about the committee's plan for other stakeholder's questions. She stressed she was not speaking for the other stakeholders, but of the importance of their participation on the committee.

Sesko answered that student ratings are being used to evaluate faculty. The charge to the committee was to find a course evaluation that could also evaluate faculty. These evaluations are important to faculty in their tenure and promotion reviews. She said the library and IT could have their own questionnaires go out to students. Sesko noted library and IT questions were used when faculty were being evaluated. Hassler said faculty evaluations should not include library and IT questions; she thought this was a procedural error and that it had been corrected by the Provost's Office.

Sesko suggested that students complete a rating for each course they took and one rating for library and IT services.

Stekoll thought the questions about library and IT should be separate from the questions related to the student evaluation of instruction.

Hassler, once again, stated library and IT could devise their own evaluation, but the other stakeholders, like institutional effectiveness who track competency questions, need to weigh in. If there are multiple ratings being sent to students, Hassler is not convinced the student return rate will be any better than it is now. She asked why the effort couldn't be more coordinated.

E. Dillingham asked if Provost Caulfield had a comment. Caulfield is pleased that Senate is looking at the nature of the questions and hasn't had a chance to review the handout. He is aware that in the past, library and IT ratings have been included in faculty course evaluations and that should not happen. For accreditation purposes, UAS should have a consistent and coherent mechanism to get both the student ratings of courses and feedback on library and IT. Caulfield would like to broaden the conversation to not just look at the questions asked, but also at the library and IT issues; to gather information and use it appropriately. The Provost's Office is available to assist with looking at required resources, processes and to gather input from on-line and face-to-face students. This is an accreditation issue and UAS must be able to demonstrate a thoughtful system in place.

With a prompt from Dillingham, Caulfield invited the committee and representatives from the library and IT to meet to discuss issues that have come up in the past, and ways to meet the needs of faculty, library, IT and other stakeholders.

Stekoll asked Sesko what was the charge to the committee. Sesko answered: to evaluate the student ratings as it applies to course and faculty evaluations. The committee decided not to have the library and IT questions as part of this evaluation.

Stekoll asked Sesko what she thought the next step for Senate should be. She suggested Senate take the draft evaluation to their units for review and input. Stekoll stated that at the last meeting, Senate had already agreed to do this. C. McMillan moved to approve the draft version of the student ratings of instruction. There was no second. Dillingham moved to have Senators take the draft version of the student ratings of instruction back to their units for review and approval; and at the next meeting of Faculty Senate, be prepared to vote. S. Neely seconded the motion and without objections, it passed.

Hassler moved to have the Course Evaluation Committee reconvene to discuss implementation of the student ratings instrument; and, to include representation from Provost's Office to answer questions on core competencies, the Library and IT. Neely seconded the motion.

Discussion on the motion included a suggestion from C. McMillan for the Library and IT to incentivize students to answer a survey to get information specific to those departments.

Sesko was concerned that Library and IT aren't getting correct information. She said its important students know why they're completing surveys; are students evaluating faculty on their ability to use Library and IT services? She supports a separate survey because it will get more reliable and valid results. The question is how to do this.

Hassler reiterated the value of getting course specific ratings for Library and IT services.

B. Blitz asked if it was possible for faculty to have a Library and IT services survey option for their class evaluation. If the class didn't use those services, there would be no survey; if services were used, the survey would be included.

E. Dillingham called for the vote.

After more discussion, Dillingham again called for the vote and stated the discussion taking place would be more appropriate for a meeting of the committee.

Stekoll asked to have the motion reread. After the rereading, Dillingham asked to amend the motion to include the Provost. Hassler seconded the motion. The motion now reads: To have the Course Evaluation Committee reconvene to discuss implementation of the student ratings instrument; and, to include the Provost, and representatives from the Library and IT services. The motion to amend passed, with one opposing vote.

Stekoll called a roll call vote on Hassler's amended motion. In favor: Neely, Doctorman, Martin, Sesko, McMillan, Hassler, Anderson, Donar; opposed, Blitz. The motion passed.

V. Fredenberg stated that IS doesn't have a vote and therefore, E. Dillingham cannot cast a vote.

Dillingham moved to change the agenda to immediately address the old business. Stekoll denied her motion.

Curriculum Committee

P. Dalthorp

M. Stekoll reported there has been no meeting of the Curriculum Committee.

Research Committee

D. Tallmon

M. Stekoll reported the Research Committee has met and Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity (URECA) grant award applications are being accepted until 5:00, December 3, 2012. The committee minutes are on their website at <http://www.uas.alaska.edu/research/committee.html>

Graduate Committee

K. DiLorenzo

M. Stekoll reported the Graduate Committee meets on the second Wednesday of the month. They did not meet in September or October.

Faculty Alliance

M. Stekoll

M. Stekoll reported Faculty Alliance will meet next week. The Alliance is planning an institute in May 2013 with speakers from American Association of Colleges and Universities to discuss general education classes, requirements and curriculum.

VII. Old Business

A. Revision of Constitution and By-Laws

Information Systems Issue

M. Stekoll reported he has begun making notes on changes and had not yet started writing up proposed changes.

E. Dillingham asked to speak and began by saying there was no public recognition in 2003 of the approval of the Faculty Senate Constitution signed by Faculty Senate President Janet Dye and Chancellor John Pugh. She confirmed the on-line version of the Senate Constitution is current as it matches the exhibit she brought to the meeting.

Dillingham cited portions of the Constitution pertaining to the composition of the Faculty Senate; specifically, Section 3 Composition of the Senate, A. Faculty Senators, (2) One representative for each faculty academic unit, as defined in the bylaws. She went on to cite BOR policy and regulation in regarding the establishment of an academic unit.

Dillingham reported there are two academic units within the School of Management. The first is the Business and Public Administration; the second, Information Systems. Dillingham noted

there are seven academic units listed in the bylaws. In 2004 when Information Systems (IS) became an academic unit at UAS, its representative, Steve Johnson, was introduced to Faculty Senate by Jonathan Anderson. From the Faculty Senate Bylaws, (1) A faculty academic unit is a single academic unit (excluding the individual campuses) having a Chair, Dean, or Director. Currently there are seven: Business/PADM, Career Education, Education, Humanities, Library, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences.

Dillingham stated there was a clerical omission in the Senate bylaws that does not include all of the academic units. She presented the Senate with proposed bylaws changes (attached) to correct the omission of IS as an academic unit.

Dillingham moved to have the clerical corrections made to the Senate bylaws. M. Stekoll directed Dillingham to provide a copy of the corrections to each Senator. There will be a vote on the bylaws changes at the November meeting.

Stekoll noted that the bylaws explicitly mentions the departments having voting privileges, the omission of a department means that department doesn't have a vote. The change to the bylaws is an amendment not a clerical error.

Dillingham said in 2004, the Senate did not deal with the clerical back up that needed to happen at the time.

Stekoll stated the Senate at that time didn't make the addition of IS as an academic unit a change to the bylaws. It was a motion that was passed not a clerical omission.

B. Criteria for Professional Development Ad Hoc Committee L. Doctorman

At the last meeting, Doctorman moved to appoint an ad hoc committee to develop a matrix for faculty professional development.

M. Stekoll asked for reports from each department:

Doctorman –BPA was in favor.

S. Neely – Humanities is generally in favor particularly if the effort requires review of the entire SOTL matrix.

A. Sesko – Social Sciences is against a separate development matrix. The department believes the matrices complicate the tenure and promotion process.

C. McMillan for A. Jones – Education no report.

C. Hassler – Library doesn't object to the matrix; doesn't feel a strong need for it and believes there is more flexibility for faculty without the matrix. If faculty are in support of the matrix, the Library would not vote against it.

J. Martin – Sitka has no report.

C. Donar – Ketchikan in agreement with Social Sciences; has concerns about Bipartite and Tripartite faculty, referring to Appendix B in the Faculty Handbook as an acceptable configuration for Faculty Development.

B. Blitz – Natural Sciences no report. Stekoll stated the department didn't see any reason for it, but if there is an ad hoc committee, C. Connor volunteered to sit on the committee.

E. Dillingham – IS supports forming a committee and reviewing a proposal.

Doctorman restated the motion from the September as a new motion: Create an ad hoc committee to develop a professional development matrix that includes both bargaining units. The motion was seconded by McMillan.

R. Caulfield would like to see the committee bring forward their recommendations in a timely manner so the Faculty Handbook committee could incorporate the Senate approved changes into the handbook.

Stekoll called the vote. The motion passed with one opposed.

Stekoll asked Doctorman to find membership for the committee. C. Connor and C. Donar have volunteered for the committee. Senators will ask of committee interest in their units.

C. Electronic Files for Evaluation

C. McMillan

McMillan found many universities using mandatory or optional electronic tenure and promotion procedures. Many faculty have weighed in on-line, both in favor and against use of electronic tenure and promotion files. Blackboard, Google sites, and Wordpress each provide options. The School of Education has an account with a web-based data collection system used for teacher preparation which also hosts electronic tenure and promotion portfolios – livetext.com.

McMillan continued the discussion saying he had contacted UAF and they had no plans to convert to an electronic tenure and promotion system; UAA didn't provide a response. He explained the process currently used at UAS involving binders and limited availability of those binders. McMillan's student use electronic portfolios; the model for faculty to use in their tenure and promotion already exists.

E. Dillingham noted the cost to campuses for faculty travel to Juneau to review tenure and promotion binders would be eliminated with the conversion to electronic portfolios. She, too, grades student electronic portfolios and supports consideration of electronic faculty tenure and promotion portfolios.

A. Sesko, Social Sciences, stated her unit had concerns about the time already invested in paper tenure and promotion binders and conversion to an electronic version.

Sesko asked about portability and ownership of electronic faculty tenure and promotion portfolios. McMillan was unable to answer her question; research is needed.

J. Martin said most Sitka faculty felt electronic portfolios would streamline the process and simplify logistics. Some faculty supported having a choice for their binder – paper or electronic. Some suggested having a period of transition from paper to electronic.

McMillan will continue to explore the subject and report back to Senate at future meetings. He will send Senators a link to livetext.com with a password to allow viewing of faculty electronic tenure and promotion binders.

VIII. New Business

A. Faculty Handbook Committee

M. Stekoll

Stekoll reported that the committee would continue to be an ad hoc committee of Faculty Senate. He is drafting language to change the bylaws and have the committee made permanent. Membership of the current committee will consist of Faculty Senate President and Elect, one representative each from UNAC and UAFT, Provost, and support from the Provost's office. Senators are to send their suggestions, concerns or changes to a member of the committee.

B. Student Judiciary Re-Write

M. Stekoll

From the discussion at the Governance Retreat, student rights and responsibilities, including student judiciary, procedures for students to dispute grades and discipline for student misconduct, as written in the academic catalog are inadequate. At the retreat, Stekoll suggested since the subject involves more than academics, Administration should craft language for Faculty Senate to review and approve. As a compromise, this effort will be completed by a committee of faculty and administration.

R. Caulfield added there was discussion for a possible statement on academic integrity and a review of judicial procedures for academic actions.

Stekoll asked Senators to discuss this issue with their units; and, ask of interest to serve on the committee. If faculty are interested in serving on the committee, they should contact Stekoll or Caulfield.

Caulfield added M. O'Brien from Statewide General Counsel is available to work with the committee.

C. New Degrees and Changes to Degrees

New Degree: Associate of Sciences

C. Donar

Donar introduced the degree as a two year program primarily for science students and as a tool for focused student advising on how to achieve a Bachelor of Science degree. The degree will allow students to complete two years of course work with a credential accurately reflecting the completed work. Donar is asking Senate to consider the proposal and at the next meeting, send it to the Curriculum Committee.

M. Stekoll stated the role of Faculty Senate is to look at the concept of the degree and then send it to the Curriculum Committee. Stekoll asked Senators to discuss the degree with their units and ask for input.

Change: Associate of Science in Health Sciences

C. Urata

The changes are requested because the current AAS degree is tailored to pre-nursing students. Urata would like to see the degree more flexible and include students who have interests in degrees other than pre-nursing. For students interested in nursing, there is a pre-nursing qualifications certificate.

Urata summarized the changes to include more course options in English, communications, mathematics, humanities and psychology.

After discussion, E. Dillingham moved to have the changes to the AAS in Health Sciences forwarded to the Curriculum Committee. C. Hassler seconded the motion. The motion passed without objection.

Because there were no regional reports or Juneau discussions, the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

The next meeting is on November 2, 2012.