

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

In Attendance: M. Stekoll, B. Blitz, S. Neely, A. Jones, L. Doctorman, C. Hassler, T. Anderson, J. Martin, C. McMillan, M. Pennoyer, scribe.

Via Audio: V. Fredenberg, B. Urquhart for A. Sesko, C. Donar, R. Caulfield, R. McDonald

Guests: L. Hoferkamp, M. Ciri

I. Call to Order

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

II. Approval of Agenda

M. Stekoll asked to move M. Ciri's report to the top of the agenda. There were no objections to changing the agenda.

III. Approval of Minutes – 11-07-2012

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

IV. Presentation – M. Ciri

M. Ciri met with A. Sesko, R. Caulfield, M. Stekoll. E. Tomlinson and C. Hassler to discuss the new student ratings form. With recommendations gathered from the meeting, Ciri has developed prototypes of the new form as it will appear to students.

Ciri stated the new rating instrument contains questions approved by the Course Evaluation Committee and will be presented in separate pages. As in the previous instrument, faculty will be able to add questions. Questions relating to academic support may be suppressed by faculty. If faculty do not add other questions to the rating instrument, than only those questions approved by Faculty Senate committee will be presented to students. At this time, faculty are not able to suppress the committee approved questions.

Stekoll confirmed with Ciri that the questions approved by Faculty Senate are in the ratings instrument and have not been changed.

Ciri went on to say faculty will have access to raw data through their course website page. The data will be presented in a summary giving the aggregate analysis. Faculty will have access to these data around the time Fall 2012 rating results will be available.

Since it is available in the system, faculty can access ratings data back to 2004.

Ciri said the new ratings instrument is targeted for use in the next academic year.

The live prototypes are available at:

Current rating form (1 page, 4 questions):

<https://online.uas.alaska.edu/preonlinesrc/evalnew.cgi/MACIRI-TEST01/eval/preview?term=BBSANDBOX>

New form – default configuration (2 pages, 13 questions):

<https://online.uas.alaska.edu/preonlinesrc/evalnew.cgi/MACIRI-TEST01/eval/preview?term=BBSANDBOX&example=newrating1.dat>

New form – library/technology questions disabled (1 page, 11 questions):

<https://online.uas.alaska.edu/preonlinesrc/evalnew.cgi/MACIRI-TEST01/eval/preview?term=BBSANDBOX&example=newrating2.dat>

New form – custom question added, library questions disabled (3 pages, 14 questions):

<https://online.uas.alaska.edu/preonlinesrc/evalnew.cgi/MACIRI-TEST01/eval/preview?term=BBSANDBOX&example=newrating3.dat>

There were no questions from Senate.

Stekoll asked Senate to review the forms and be prepared to vote on them at the February meeting.

V. Provost's Report – R. Caulfield

Caulfield began by thanking M. Ciri, M. Stekoll, A. Sesko, E. Tomlinson and C. Hassler for their additional effort on the student ratings instrument.

Caulfield announced the BOR approval of the AAS Law Enforcement. He reiterated there would be one full-time faculty providing oversight to the program; recruitment has already begun.

NWCCU Accreditation Year 3 Report: The Strategic and Assessment Planning Executive Committee (SAP) has oversight on the report process. The committee meets monthly; membership includes Dean and Campus Directors, Faculty Senate, Staff and Student Councils. Vice Provost C. Hedlin is lead on the project. Caulfield stressed the need and importance for information from all academic departments over the next two to three months. The report, due in August 2013, will be about 120 pages with a site visit in October.

Program Review Schedule: UAS continues to focus on academic program reviews. The UA BOR requires reviews every five years. The updated schedule is on the Provost's Office website. Caulfield encourages Faculty Senate to review the schedule. He noted the change in scheduling for the School of Arts and Sciences: rather than many reviews completed in one academic year and to relieve the burden on faculty, the reviews have been staggered.

Student Success and Remediation Efforts: Faculty met with VPAA D. Thomas in Juneau last week at a brown bag event. Thomas discussed best practices in student remediation, focusing on English and math. He met with English and math faculty to share ideas about what's being done to improve the success of students taking developmental English and math. Caulfield said a majority of UAS students need to take developmental English and math classes and believes this topic is the most important one facing UAS. He asked faculty to take a look at innovations and models nationally and in Alaska for ideas to help students advance in developmental classes. Caulfield intends to have English and math faculty, Deans and Directors and the Learning Center staff come together to share their ideas. Looking ahead to the Year 3 report, Caulfield would like to show UAS is in the process of continuous improvement.

VI. President's Report – M. Stekoll

GER Workshop: Stekoll began by reminding Senate of the GER workshop in Anchorage January 11 and 12, 2013. There are ten people from each MAU attending. Attending for UAS are Stekoll, B. Blitz, D. Monteith, P. Schulte, N. Chordas, B. Hegel, J. Dumesnil, C. McKenna, E. Hayes and J. Martin.

From a document generated by Faculty Alliance Chair, C. Cahill: "The purpose and intent of this AACU GER workshop is for representatives from each MAU and the UA system to discuss challenges and potentials for the GER missions, models, outcomes and assessment. This discussion will occur within the context of learning about current best practices and GER curriculum and assessment, including identifying learning outcomes within that curriculum and means to assess them. This process will also examine the extent to which LEAP (Liberal Education and America's Promise <http://www.aacu.org/leap/vision.cfm>) outcomes are consistent with specific GER outcomes that are emphasized within the UA system. Secondary, but equally important, purpose for representatives from each MAU to discuss the extent to which learning outcomes for GERs within the system can be better coordinated and developing general strategies and timelines to achieve these goals."

UAS Student Fees: UAS is reviewing student fees; looking for a way to consolidate them to make them more fair. Vice Chancellor J. Danielson presented a draft memo of the review to Provost's Council. Rather than receiving a second bill for fees, Danielson is considering ways to have students pay tuition and fees at the same time.

Other: Stekoll asked B. Blitz if Math faculty were on the same page with VPAA Thomas regarding student success and remediation.

Blitz answered UAS math faculty teach classes of 20-25 students. National research and data is for classes of students numbering, 60, 80 and above. These data don't fit UAS faculty. UAS math faculty have a difficult time understanding what the national data has to do with what they do.

VII. Committee Reports

Curriculum Committee – P. Dalthorp

Stekoll sent the committee report via email with the meeting agenda. B. Blitz moved to approve the Curriculum Committee report. With a second from J. Anderson, the report was approved.

Research Committee – D. Tallmon

No report.

Graduate Committee – K. DiLorenzo

No report.

Faculty Alliance – M. Stekoll

Stekoll reported on the November 9th meeting that Alliance continues to be interested in the Strategic Direction Initiative (SDI). The Alliance is crafting a response on how SDI will impact faculty. Alliance has many questions about SDI, how the University functions and procedures used. The UA Board of Regents approved a tuition increase. President Gamble participated in the meeting by telephone for 45 minutes.

Professional Development Committee – L. Doctorman

Doctorman announced the committee has met twice and decided representation from each department is needed. The committee developed a revised definition of professional development which was sent to Senate by M. Stekoll. The working definition would replace current definitions on page 91 or 120, depending on union affiliation, of the Faculty Handbook. The committee is looking to delete #4 of the SOTL matrix. There is no Senate action needed at this time. Doctorman is providing an update on the committee work and hopes to have a presentation for and a vote by Senate at the February meeting. The committee is developing a broad list of examples of professional development for all types of faculty.

Stekoll asked what form the final recommendation will be. Doctorman answered the recommendations will be a definition with broad examples and to strike #4 from the SOTL.

R. Caulfield thanked Doctorman for her leadership of the committee and noted that the Faculty Handbook Committee is meeting and Professional Development is part of their discussion. He asked if the committee's work will be completed in time to incorporate it into the next version of the Faculty Handbook.

Doctorman responded if the committee brought its recommendations to Faculty Senate for a vote in February or March, they would be included in the next version of the handbook.

Faculty Handbook – M. Stekoll

The Handbook committee is comprised of L. Hoferkamp, T. Powers, V. Fredenberg, M. Stekoll, R. Caulfield and M. Moya. They've met several times and have made substantive changes; currently working on Chapter 9. The committee hopes to complete their work in time for a presentation to the Senate in March. If the changes are finalized by Senate by the May meeting, they will be incorporated into the next academic year.

B. Blitz asked if the Senate, this year, has passed anything that should be added to the Handbook.

Stekoll answered that the changes to the bylaws will be added. He went on to discuss the philosophical issues around the handbook – should information be included or referred to in the handbook. In previous years, the philosophy has been to include all information. Now when information changes, like the bylaws, the entire handbook has to be reviewed to make certain all changes have been made. The committee is advocating for use of links in the handbook.

VIII. Old Business

Electronic Files for Evaluation—C. McMillan

McMillan reminded Senate he is investigating and gathering information on electronic tenure and promotion processes. He is working with a representative of LiveText, (vendor handling the School of Education electronic student portfolios), who, at no cost to UAS, has set up a dummy site for reviewers and faculty.

B. Blitz noted difficulty accessing the dummy site. McMillan submitted links, videos, and other material in the faculty portion of the dummy site. Through a webinar, McMillan and the LiveText rep reviewed most of the features, comment areas, scoring with rubrics and options for data. He went on to say he had experienced problems similar to those mentioned by B. Blitz.

McMillan offered suggestions for next steps: Senate continues to investigate the site, McMillan to create a tutorial, or LiveText rep to provide a webinar for Senate.

Stekoll confirmed options of the site; that it may be set up to mirror current faculty review processes, but it would be online. He doesn't think it's appropriate for faculty reviewers to add comments, scoring rubrics, etc.

Blitz said he had concerns about the review committee group process; stressing the importance of the group discussions. He doesn't want individual scores to be the sole determiner of outcomes from the review process.

Stekoll shared a comment from M. Ciri about security of the site. He went on to ask Senate of their interest in creating an ad hoc committee.

R. Caulfield recommended further discussion with M. Ciri about security, confidentiality, and support for this type of application and use of LiveText.

McMillan reminded Senate that electronic files for evaluation is just one option for faculty to use when presenting documents for promotion and tenure.

T. Anderson asked if the reviewer might view the electronic file differently than a printed paper version.

L. Doctorman asked if electronic files could be printed out. Stekoll wondered if the files should be printed; printed documents jeopardize confidentiality. Currently, copying of documents in faculty review files is prohibited.

Blitz recommended Senate share the LiveText site with their faculty to get questions, feedback, concerns and information and then, share it with McMillan.

McMillan is interested in creating an ad hoc committee with faculty membership to include all perspectives on electronic files for evaluation. He is hoping committee members would be available for two meetings to discuss all issues – including those who may not be in support of the idea. He asked Senate to poll their faculty on their interest to serve on the ad hoc committee.

McMillan moved to have each Senator identify individuals willing to meet to investigate this idea; and, to visit and try out the site; and, voice their concerns. There was no second to this motion.

A Jones moved to have each Senator identify individuals to investigate viability of electronic evaluation files. With a second from McMillan, the motion passed without objection.

Blitz asked McMillan what would be the charge of the ad hoc committee. McMillan and Stekoll identified the charge in two parts:

1. To decide, yes or no, if UAS will recommend use of electronic evaluation files; and
2. To develop a practical model to implement use of electronic evaluation files.

Blitz asked L. Hoferkamp if there were any UNAC union issues. Hoferkamp stated there hadn't been a response yet; but, confidentiality was mentioned.

IX. New Business

No new business

X. Regional Reports

No reports

XI. Juneau Items Only

No items.

XII. Adjournment

C. McMillan moved to adjourn the meeting. With a second from L. Doctorman, the meeting was adjourned at 4:04 pm.

The next Faculty Senate meeting is on Friday February 1, 2013.