

**MINUTES**  
**University of Alaska Southeast Faculty Senate**  
**November 02, 2012 Egan Library 211**

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

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

Guests: K. DiLorenzo

**I. Call to Order**

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

**II. Approval of Agenda**

The meeting agenda was approved as presented.

**III. Approval of Minutes – 10-05-2012**

L. Doctorman made a clarification on item 7.B of the minutes: Rather than the School of Management, Doctorman meant to say BPA was in favor. B Blitz moved to approve the minutes as amended from the October 5, 2012 meeting. With a second from C. McMillan, the meeting minutes were approved.

**IV. Amendment to Bylaws – M. Stekoll**

With respect to the Information Systems (IS) academic unit, President Stekoll presented the Senate with an amendment to the bylaws correcting the omission of IS as an academic unit. The amendment provides for IS to have a voting senator on Faculty Senate as well as a voting representative on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The amendment is attached.

S. Neely moved to accept the amendment. With a second from B. Blitz, the motion was approved by eight senators. Stekoll explained changes to the bylaws require a majority vote of senators. The amendment will be sent to Chancellor Pugh for his signature.

R. McDonald thanked the Senate for their support of this amendment.

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

Progress on NWCCU Accreditation Report Guidelines

The guidelines for the Year Three Self-Evaluation Report were distributed electronically to faculty. As part of a seven year continuous improvement cycle, the report will be complete in July 2013. The first report of this cycle was completed in 2011 and addressed the UAS mission statement and fulfillment of that statement.

During the first week of October 2013, UAS will host a NWCCU site visit. The NWCCU team will be reviewing the Year Three Report. Report subject matter includes: an update on the UAS Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations; Resources and Capacity including governance, human resources, education resources (learning centers, online education, advising), student support

resources, library and information resources, financial resources, physical and technological infrastructure. The report will be about 100 pages in length. Caulfield stated faculty across the three campuses will be asked to contribute information and data analysis for each section of the report. He asked Senate to share this information with their constituents.

Vice Provost C. Hedlin is lead for the report. She has been in contact with people for their roles on the project. There is an extensive timeline available showing due dates for sections of the report. <http://online.uas.alaska.edu/online/portfolio/irdg/accreditation>

For a more detailed list of report sections and details, go the NWCCU website. <http://www.nwccu.org/Pubs%20Forms%20and%20Updates/Publications/Standards%20for%20Accreditation.pdf> .

#### Procedures on Curriculum and Graduate Committees

The Faculty Senate President, Provost, Registrar and others met to confirm processes regarding curriculum issues requiring actions from the Provost's Office. One result of the meeting is the Registrar's office will continue to be the official repository for curriculum information. A second is the Registrar's office would maintain the spreadsheet on the Curriculum Committee website tracking curriculum proposals and actions taken by Graduate and Curriculum committees and Faculty Senate. The purpose of the spreadsheet is to track processes, actions on proposals, actions of committees, and to close the loop on all processes.

M. Stekoll noted the inactive spreadsheet on the Curriculum Committee website and said the Registrar's office would now be the custodian of the spreadsheet. In previous years, the spreadsheet was maintained by the chair of the Curriculum Committee. Stekoll stated the Registrar, or representative, should have a standing invitation to attend Faculty Senate meetings – particularly when curriculum issues are on the agenda.

Caulfield stated actions taken by Faculty Senate will be reported to the Registrar in a timely manner by the note taker from the Provost's Office. This action will occur in advance of formal approval of the meeting minutes by Faculty Senate.

#### Program Reviews

Caulfield reminded Senate of the BOR policy to complete reviews of all academic programs at least every five years or, more frequently if needed. There is information on the program review process located on the Provost's Office website: <http://www.uas.alaska.edu/provost/Programreview/index.html>

Caulfield stated program reviews are more meaningful and manageable if they have good data and are 15 to 20 pages; they don't need to be 120 pages. There are three academic programs up for review in AY 12-13: AAS in Health Sciences, CIOS Programs, and the BLA. Caulfield has conducted a thorough review of the program review schedule and noted nearly two thirds of the programs in the School of Arts and Sciences fell into one year. He is in discussion with Dean Sousa to modify the schedule.

Caulfield discussed program review of the School of Education programs with Dean Lo. Previously, it was thought NCATE professional reviews were sufficient to serve as program reviews. Dean Lo believes the regents are looking for a program review that is different from the one provided by an NCATE review. Each program will now be reviewed by the same program review process used by other academic programs.

B. Blitz noted having an updated program review schedule will help Deans appoint faculty to lead the process as well as to address faculty workload issues.

#### Faculty Alliance

Faculty Alliance is planning an institute in early 2013 to look at UA general education requirements (GERs). Caulfield asked Alliance to specifically address the BOR question on alignment of GERs across the UA system.

Caulfield stressed the importance of discussions, particularly with math and English faculty, about articulation of GERs across the system. There is data supporting the transferability of student credits; Caulfield is asking Alliance to address the perception held by the BOR that students have trouble transferring GERs to the MAUs. If the perceptions are not cleared up, Caulfield is concerned the BOR will tell UAS how to remedy the problem. He said he prefers to see faculty in the driver's seat on this issue rather than the Legislature dictating a mandate.

Caulfield noted VPAA Dana Thomas' interest and has some funding available for the institute.

#### Spring Startup (formerly Convocation)

Caulfield stated spring convocations are generally attended only by Juneau faculty. In January 2012, the event turned to faculty professional development and was renamed Spring Startup. Caulfield would like to, again, do this in January 2013. The suggested date is Tuesday January 8, 2013, the first day of classes is January 14. The day will include a series of workshops and faculty professional development events. Caulfield is looking for feedback on topics or presentations – DegreeWorks, blackboard training, how to deal with challenging students and disability services. There will be no promotion and tenure training at this event. Suggestions and comments should be emailed to Provost Caulfield with a copy to President Stekoll.

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

Stekoll reported receipt of an email from United Academics summarizing eight motions approved by the Joint Health Care Committee for the UA Choice Plan in FY 14. He recommended faculty contact their union representatives for more information; and, will forward the email to the Sitka and Ketchikan representatives.

#### **VII. Committee Reports**

President Stekoll began by stating organizational standard procedures include committees within the organization reporting their activities to the organization. Upon acceptance of the committee report by the organization, the report becomes official.

### Curriculum Committee

P. Dalthorp

Stekoll will ask the chair of the Curriculum Committee for a summary of their actions at each meeting of the Faculty Senate who will then accept it. The Curriculum Committee has no actions to report for today's meeting.

### Research Committee

D. Tallmon

Chair D. Tallmon reported the Research Committee is trying to pursue information indirect on grants and what happens to it once it comes back to UAS. The committee is working with B. Hyde. Research Committee agendas and meeting notes are accessible at their website.

<http://www.uas.alaska.edu/research/committee.html>

### Graduate Committee

K. DiLorenzo

K. DiLorenzo reported the committee's first meeting was in October; the second will be next week in early November.

The committee has two issues on the table: regarding graduate programs and extended registration for graduate students should they not complete their final project during the class semester. If graduate students do not finish their final project, there is a clause in the Academic Catalog requiring graduate students to sign up for an additional credit in the semester they graduate. The Graduate Committee has decided to take the policy out of the committee and put it into departments to have schools determine whether or not graduate students will be required to sign up for extended registration. The committee will alter the language in the academic catalog in the graduate section to provide more flexibility for schools to determine how graduate students will be tracked administratively if they need to continue beyond their final semester.

The second issue will affect some undergraduate programs and is being discussed by the Schools of Education and Management. In the past, the Graduate Committee has been against stacking classes between the 400 and 600 levels. The committee has had concerns with curriculum and determination of academic rigor. At their next meeting, the committee will recommend and vote to allow UAS to begin stacking classes between the 400 and 600 levels. Accountability and decision of whether or not courses meet the appropriate rigor will be placed with the respective deans of the schools involved. Should the School of Arts and Sciences choose to stack a class with the School of Management or Education, faculty and deans of both programs will determine whether or not it is appropriate.

V. Fredenberg asked about stacking of UAS graduate courses with other MAUs.

DiLorenzo answered the Graduate Committee's decision speaks to undergraduate programs only. If UAS were to stack graduate courses across the system, the issue is much broader than can be handled by the Graduate Committee and may be a question for the Provost. If 600 level courses are being partnered with other MAUs, it is considered cross-listing. This approach is accepted under graduate programs; policy is needed to work across MAUs and, again, may be a question for the Provost.

Stekoll asked if proposals including stacked classes would have to go through the Curriculum and Graduate Committees as well as the Deans.

DiLorenzo answered that currently the Graduate Committee doesn't entertain notions of stacked classes. The Committee is voting to say they will entertain the notion of stacked classes. Stacked classes would follow the format of any other classes being proposed. They need to be listed on curriculum forms and pass through, with help from Deans, both the Curriculum and Graduate Committee processes.

R. Caulfield asked how would this play out across the other MAUs. UAS should align with the practices already in place and if possible, follow their processes.

DiLorenzo responded by saying the Graduate Committee is deciding whether or not to have stacked classes. If the Committee votes in favor of stacked classes, when implementing the process, they will look to the other MAUs for alignment. There are steps in place for UAS to bring in emphasis areas from other MAU graduate programs. For seamless transferability and expanded degree offerings to students, it is beneficial for UAS to be in line with the other MAU policies.

B. Blitz asked if UAA and UAF stack undergraduate and graduate courses.

Stekoll answered UAF does stack courses.

DiLorenzo reiterated the importance of differentiating 400 and 600 level courses. Addition of a paper or presentation by faculty is not sufficient; Deans will determine the appropriate distinctions between 400 and 600 level courses.

#### Faculty Alliance

M. Stekoll

President Stekoll reported Faculty Alliance would meet next week. Alliance has concerns about President Gamble's Strategic Directions Initiatives (SDI) and how faculty should respond to it. Administration has indicated the BOR has a positive view of SDI. D. Monteith reported Faculty Alliance is sponsoring the General Education Institute with four to six [now 10] participants from each MAU. The proposed date is January 17 and 18, 2013 in Anchorage.[new date is January 11-12, 2013]

R. Caulfield announced a visit by President Gamble to UAS on Tuesday November 13 in Juneau. Gamble will attend a special meeting of the Provost's Council from 2:30 to 4:00 in the Chancellor's conference room. If members of Senate would like to meet with Gamble Caulfield recommends contacting the Chancellor's office to set an appointment.

#### Faculty Handbook Ad Hoc Committee

M. Stekoll

Because of complicated schedules, the committee hasn't yet met. Committee membership includes M. Stekoll, L. Hoferkamp, T. Powers, V. Fredenberg, R. Caulfield and M. Moya. To allow adequate time for Faculty Senate review, Stekoll said the committee will complete updates to the handbook by February 2013.

## Other

Stekoll noted the Faculty Senate website is very out of date – most recent committee information is from 2007. Provost Caulfield asked what information should be on the website or in a UAS Online portfolio: contact information, committee lists, meeting minutes and agendas. Stekoll requested a list of committees and links to their websites if available. Caulfield offered support from the Provost's Office to update the Faculty Senate website.

## **VIII. Old Business**

### Vote on Proposed Student Ratings

A Sesko moved to approve use of the student ratings form developed by the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Ratings; C. McMillan seconded the motion.

L. Doctorman began the discussion by providing specific suggestions and corrections to the student ratings form as presented: guidelines for graduate student should be considered for the different levels of success and responsibility expected of graduate students, roles of graduate students in their own learning; the grid on page 2 – the third statement needs clarification, well defined and fair; boxes on page 3, duplicative; and page 4, to address distance students, the addition of n/a as an answer. Regarding scheduling of the class and convenience to students, is this information administrative or of value to faculty?

Sesko noted the committee's concern about well defined and fair and agree; the word fair will be removed. She also explained the purpose of the scheduling and convenience question as a source of demographic information. The purpose of the question is to help faculty know whether students are enrolled in class because it fulfills a degree requirement, is of interest, or because it fits into the student's schedule.

McMillan asked about students taking asynchronous courses and an n/a answer. In order to get better information, should the n/a answer be changed to unimportant?

Sesko moved to amend her motion: to approve use of the student ratings form developed by the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Student Ratings, as amended. The amended motion was seconded by McMillan.

Reports from Senate:

S. Neely – Humanities recommends moving forward and to deal with issues as they arise.

C. Donar – Ketchikan noted minor issues and typos, with attention to the matrix on page 4.

Doctorman – For graduate students, a stronger focus on how they see their role in learning.

Sesko noted this ratings form is used to evaluate courses, not in how students see their responsibility in learning.

Stekoll asked Doctorman if she was asking to have the ratings form go back to the committee without Senate approval. Doctorman replied yes.

Stekoll confirmed with Sesko that Doctorman's suggestion was not part of her amended motion.

C. Hassler asked for an addition to the motion: adoption of these questions on student ratings is for the purpose of course evaluation and the evaluation of teaching. Hassler is trying to avoid exclusion of evaluation of library services. The questions focus on the evaluation of teaching and by voting on this motion, the Senate is not voting to exclude other types of evaluation.

Stekoll stated rather than amending the current motion, Hassler's statement will be reflected in the record.

The motion passed with one opposing vote.

President Stekoll asked for clarification on reconstitution of the ad hoc student ratings committee to address evaluation of library and IT services. Caulfield referred to the minutes from the last meeting and agreed the committee would be reconstituted with to include the Provost, Faculty Senate President and representatives for library and IT services. Caulfield will schedule the meeting prior to the next meeting of Faculty Senate.

Stekoll affirmed the committee would not be reconstituted to review the student ratings instrument, but to develop a means by which to get information from students to library and IT services. Stekoll asked for Sesko's participation in the meeting(s).

D. Monteith stated he had been in discussion with M. Ciri on implementation of the student ratings instrument. Ciri is working to revitalize notebook computers for student use in taking surveys. To get a better return rate on the survey, students will use the notebooks in class to complete them.

Doctorman asked if the survey would be on UAS Online or Blackboard. She expressed concern some students don't feel the survey is anonymous. Sesko answered the survey would be through UAS Online with a statement saying the student's identity would not be associated with the survey data.

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

Doctorman confirmed the membership of the committee: C. Connor, A. Wedler, R. Walz, D. Lord, K. Spangler, R. Wolk, J. Hamilton, C. Donar, C. Hassler, and Faculty Senate President. Doctorman will poll the committee for a meeting time. At the meeting, the committee will select a chair; Doctorman hopes to step away from the committee.

#### Electronic Files for Evaluation

C. McMillan

McMillan reviewed the question of whether or not UAS should make available, to faculty, an optional electronic promotion and tenure process. M. Stekoll asked about the role of the Administration in maintaining the information contained in the faculty "blue binders" in an electronic format.

McMillan answered that LiveText (<https://www.livetext.com/>) is working with the School of Education. For no additional cost to UAS, livetext.com has a portal available for faculty promotion and tenure binders. Using criteria from the Faculty Handbook, McMillan will build an electronic binder for Senate to review and comment. If there is support from the Faculty Senate for electronic promotion and tenure binders, he suggests that a statement from Faculty Senate should be drafted announcing the electronic option and procedures for its use.

B. Blitz reported some faculty in Natural Sciences were either in favor or not at all; no middle ground.

McMillan emphasized the need for specialized training for reviewers of electronic binders.

L. Doctorman has concerns about e-signatures particularly if they can't be supported by IT.

A. Jones asked if there have been discussions with faculty unions.

McMillan is asking Faculty Senate for support to have livetext.com create a UAS electronic promotion and tenure binder.

J. Martin noted that faculty teaching distance courses with multiple media would prefer an electronic binder.

R. McDonald suggested a transitional period to include a hybrid option including paper and cd, website, or thumb drives. Mandating transition from paper to digital may make some faculty reluctant.

McMillan reiterated that the electronic files would be an option.

McDonald asked if faculty would be rejected for submitting an electronic file now.

Stekoll answered there is no requirement for paper. He noted the official file is paper and not electronic; there are two files. One is prepared by the faculty member under review; the other is maintained by the Office of the Provost.

McDonald referred to the files located in the Provost's Office and asked if they could be made electronic. Stekoll replied there is no procedure in place right now.

McMillan closed saying there was no need for a motion and he would work with livetext.com to create a sample electronic binder.

#### Student Judiciary Re-Write

#### Faculty/Admin Committee

Caulfield has received several faculty inquiries to serve on this committee. The committee hasn't yet met.

**IX. New Business**

GER Courses Counting Toward Major

M. Stekoll

The UAA Dental Hygiene program is requesting that BOR regulation R10.04.040.C.3: *Credit may be counted towards general education or a degree major requirement, but not both*, be removed. UAA has asked the Faculty Senates to discuss the question.

D. Monteith suggested this question as a topic for SAC.

January Meeting

M. Stekoll

The Senate agreed not to have a January meeting. The first meeting of Faculty Senate is scheduled for February 1, 2013.

Spring Convocation

M. Stekoll

Spring Convocation is now called Spring Startup and is a day dedicated to faculty professional development. Spring Startup is scheduled for January 8, 2013.

**X. Regional Reports**

C. Donar asked L. Doctorman to keep him informed on the composition of the committee and to include members from UAFT.

No report from J. Martin.

**IX Juneau Items Only**

No report from Juneau.

**X Adjournment**

B. Blitz moved to adjourn the meeting. With a second from C. McMillan, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35.

Next meeting: December 7, 2012