MINUTES
University of Alaska Southeast Faculty Senate
March 1, 2013 Egan Library 211

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

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

Guests: B. Hegel, P. Dalthorp, D. Monteith

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

II.   Approval of Agenda
C. McMillan moved to approve the agenda, B. Blitz seconded. The agenda was approved.

III.   Approval of Minutes – 02-01-2013
C. McMillan moved to approve the meeting minutes as presented, L. Doctorman seconded. The meeting minutes were approved.

IV.   Provost's Report – R. Caulfield
NWCCU Accreditation Year 3 Report: The Strategic and Assessment Planning Executive Committee (SAP) has oversight on the report; M. Stekoll is a member. The final report is due August 2013. A draft of the report has been sent to committee members; distribution of the report to Faculty Senate will be handled by Stekoll. Dr. M L Madden has been contracted by UAS to write and edit the report. Caulfield stated he would like comments on the draft report back from Faculty Senate by the end of March. Feedback should be directed to C. Hedlin

Review of Peer Institutions: Caulfield said UAS is commonly compared to institutions offering a community college mission as well as baccalaureate and graduate programs. As part of the accreditation process, the SAP Executive Committee has reviewed the ten to twelve peer institutions UAS has used for comparison. M. Stekoll recommended review of institutions with a broad mission, closer to that of UAS. D. Meador, Manager of Institution Effectiveness, has identified these peer institutions and the SAP Executive Committee will finalize the list by the end of March.

FY14 Budget UAS Update: Caulfield told the Senate of his participation in three legislative presentations for: teacher education; fisheries, seafood and maritime workforce development; and with Chancellor Pugh, the UAS budget. He noted this legislature is not inclined to give the University money above the Governor's request.

Caulfield distributed an article from the March 1, 2013 Anchorage Daily News citing the legislature's encouragement of the Governor to enter into contract negotiations, with State employees, beginning with a zero increase in salaries and benefits.

B. Blitz asked Caulfield if the legislature is not entertaining ideas from everyone, or, just the University. Caulfield answered ideas for energy projects and infrastructure are getting attention, but not education.

M. Stekoll asked if distribution of funding was being decided by the legislature or the University. Caulfield answered that the subcommittee has left it to the University to allocate the funding. He went on to say he feels the legislature is putting a cap on funding and new positions and opportunities in FY15 will have to be funded through internal reallocations.

FY13 Program Reviews: Caulfield reviewed the BOR mandated review of all academic programs at least once every five years. He said the program review process allows for careful scrutiny and constructive review of all academic programs to determine which ones UAS will support, maintain, add to, or, do not align with the mission and require changes. Caulfield went on to say, depending on outcomes, the program review process allows for reallocation of resources; he cited Early Childhood Education as an example of this outcome in the process. In AY 12-13 program reviews are underway for Health Sciences, the BLA, and CIOS. The program review schedule is on the Provost's Office website.

The UAS Campus Master Plan: The Campus Master Plan went before the BOR for informational purposes at its meeting last week. Caulfield is hopeful they will approve it at their April meeting in Sitka. He went on to discuss the sale of the Bill Ray Center and that there is community interest in purchase of the building. An appraisal is underway. If the building sells, alternative space will be needed to house programs currently located in the BRC.

McDowell 2012 UA Graduate Survey: Caulfield distributed a one page summary of comments from the ninety page survey. It includes comments from graduates of all three MAUs. He read some of the findings and noted there was a lot for UAS to be proud of.

M. Stekoll asked if the survey would be on line and if the report shows areas where improvement is needed. Caulfield answered once finalized, the full report will be available on line.

Faculty Excellence Awards: Caulfield distributed a hand out with information on the awards; he noted the addition of the award category for faculty advising. The award nominations are due April 1, 2013 to R. Caulfield or M. Stekoll. Caulfield said anyone is eligible to nominate faculty; he is emphasizing the award process with students. Information is available on line: http://www.uas.alaska.edu/FacultySenate/faculty-excellence-awards.html

V.   President's Report – M. Stekoll
Nominations Open for Faculty Senate President Elect: Nominations are open until April 1 for Faculty Senate President Elect. Stekoll outlined the nominations process and recommended Senate read the bylaws. http://www.uas.alaska.edu/FacultySenate/faculty-senate-bylaws.html Stekoll noted nominees must agree to run and be a member of Faculty Assembly.

Proposed Changes to BOR Policies to the Student Code of Conduct: Stekoll received and distributed to Senate, a copy of the proposed BOR revisions to the Student Code of Conduct. Stekoll asked R. Caulfield if the BOR or someone else is proposing the changes. Caulfield responded President Gamble asked all faculty and staff to review the current BOR policies and regulations. He believes the proposed changes originated with the UAA Faculty Senate.

Stekoll asked Senate for their comments:
B. Blitz began to compare the proposed changes with BOR policies and regulations.

Stekoll said the proposed changes are trying to broaden the definition of academic dishonesty by citing each type of academic activity where this may apply. He also noted several statements about which he had concerns: (yellow highlights indicated text added to current policy)

A.   *Academic dishonesty applies to examinations, assignments, laboratory reports, fieldwork practicums, creative projects, or other academic activities.*

4.   *Providing assistance without the faculty member's permission to another student, or receiving assistance not authorized by the faculty member from anyone another student during an examination or assignment (with or without their knowledge) in a manner;*

12.   *knowingly violating the ethical guidelines or professional standards of a given program.*

V Fredenberg questioned:
6. *acting as a substitute or utilizing a substitute; in any examination or assignment*

A. Sesko noted because of the substantive changes to the text, many of the changes do not make sense or are problematic.

Stekoll noted each proposed change needs to be carefully reviewed for possible interpretations.

Blitz asked if this document, or one like it, is about to be approved by the UAA Faculty Senate. Stekoll answered he thought SAC was reviewing it. R. Caulfield confirmed the proposed changes originated with the UAA Faculty Senate. UAA Faculty Senate forwarded the proposed changes to SAC for consideration after which it would go to the BOR for their approval.

Stekoll stated the proposed changes should have gone to Faculty Alliance, and, then to Faculty Senates. Stekoll will suggest this process to D. Monteith.

VI.   Committee Reports
Curriculum Committee – P. Dalthorp
Dalthorp reported, as of their last meeting, the committee had received and reviewed eighteen proposals; sixteen passed from first reading, two were withdrawn. Two more proposals, Diesel and Mining emphases, have been received and will be reviewed at one of the next two committee meetings scheduled before the end of the academic year.

Dalthorp told the Senate of updates to the workflow and electronic signature processes. He is working with B. Hegel (Registrar) and M. Pennoyer (Provost's Office) to finalize the new processes. He also advised Senate that the Associate of Science degree will be on the agenda for their April meeting.

Research Committee – D. Tallmon
Stekoll reported on behalf of Tallmon that the committee did not meet in the last month. Tallmon forwarded a copy of the January committee report with an update on 2013 URECA Awards. The report also noted discussion with B. Hyde and Dean Sousa on indirect cost recovery. The committee has asked for input on the look and feel of their website: http://www.uas.alaska.edu/research/committee.html .Dean Sousa asked the committee to design a brochure, to be used for recruitment, featuring undergraduate research and creative activities.

Graduate Committee – K. DiLorenzo

Stekoll reported on behalf of DiLorenzo that there are issues the committee is working on but not yet ready to report. There will be a committee report for the April Senate meeting. Stekoll also reported the School of Education (SOE) has developed a series of classes for an endorsement for distance delivery of education. The State of Alaska issues endorsements and UAS does not, but does offer the classes that qualify, if students pass them, for the endorsement. Since endorsements are included in the UAS academic catalog; and, if SOE develops endorsements, do they have to be reviewed by the Graduate Committee and Faculty Senate? Since there was no precedent, the Graduate Committee approved the endorsement, but will review the issue later.

Stekoll went on to say he believes *anything* in the Academic Catalog needs to be reviewed and approved by Faculty Senate.

SAC – D. Monteith
R. Caulfield reported on behalf of Monteith about the process used by the Statewide Academic Council (SAC) through shared governance with representation of Provosts and Faculty Alliance. After review by Faculty Senate, all degree programs are scrutinized by SAC. The review process continues with the president and then to the BOR. When reviewing proposals, SAC is looking at new proposals and their relationships or impact with similar programs elsewhere in the system.

Caulfield said Regents are supportive of e-learning and distance education. To maximize availability to students, the BOR is looking for more e-learning programs, not just courses. The BOR is looking for alignment across the three MAUs whenever possible.

Faculty Alliance – M. Stekoll
Stekoll reported VPAA D. Thomas was a guest at the meeting. Thomas said program reviews every five years includes nonacademic (administrative) programs. He wants MAUs to be more stringent in completing the reviews. Thomas is trying to reduce the frequency of annual reports -- program reviews, research reports, e-learning etc. – but the BOR is very interested in them.

Thomas went on to discuss MOOC (massive open online course) for transfer credits and whether or not Faculty Senates should be involved in this issue. Stekoll said if the institution offering the MOOC is accredited, and, if students receive credit for completing the MOOC, then, the credit has to be transferable.

B. Hegel asked if an institution offering the MOOC is not awarding credit, but another institution is, how would the credit transfer. Stekoll replied that if the transfer is coming from the institution that has given credit for the MOOC, how can we not honor that transfer?

Members of Faculty Alliance serve on many UA Statewide committees: Human Resources Council, Student Services Council, Information Technology, Retirement Committee, Tuition Task Force, and others. Membership on the committees includes Administration and Staff Councils and the committees meet as needed. The Student Services Council met to discuss tuition fee waivers for senior citizens and metrics for student achievement and success, as noted in the Strategic Direction Initiative (SDI).

The Informational Technology Executive Committee (ITEC) is reviewing Blackboard and Susie Feero (Sitka) is a member of the committee. Since Faculty Alliance hasn't received a report from ITEC, Alliance is unsure if the committee has met.

UAA Faculty Senate is interested in faculty evaluation guidelines and concerned about low response rates on student ratings. Faculty Alliance has created a committee, (General Education Requirements Essential Learning Outcome for Statewide) to work on coordination of GERs between the MAUs. Stekoll appointed N. Chordas, D. Monteith, C. Hay-Jahans to the committee; B. Hegel will be a resource for the committee.

Stekoll asked R. Caulfield to report on the SDI meeting in Anchorage on February 20, 2013.
http://www.alaska.edu/voice/2013/feb-2013/system-news/
Consultant T. McTaggart chaired the meeting.

Caulfield reported 60 people attended the meeting where President Gamble discussed the five themes of SDI. Caulfield stated the five themes aligned with the four UAS core themes. He said the BOR is strong proponent of SDI. President Gamble is encouraging the MAUs to raise the bar in everything happening on the campuses. Both the NWCCU Accreditation and SDI are about continuous improvement. Caulfield is unsure if SDI will lead to substantive structural changes to the University system, including a downsizing of UA Statewide. To reduce the number of positions at Statewide, President Gamble is pushing responsibilities back to the MAUs.

Stekoll announced M. Rizk has been appointed to Interim Chief HR Officer, replacing D. Smith.

Faculty Handbook Committee – M. Stekoll
Stekoll told Senate the committee failed in its mission to complete the revisions of the handbook in time for today's meeting. The committee is working on the faculty evaluation section and the calls/changes there will need to be approved by Senate. He is hopeful the revised handbook will be to Senate within the next week for review, and discussion at the April meeting.

V. Fredenberg asked if changes to the handbook had to be approved by the Faculty Assembly. Stekoll answered no, since Senate represented the Assembly, approval by Senate is all that is required.

B Blitz asked if Senate could distribute the draft handbook to faculty for their input. Stekoll replied yes, but it may be difficult because of the timeline.

Stekoll stressed the importance of completing and approving the revised handbook because it will affect faculty seeking tenure and promotion in AY 13-14. Because of the late date, the handbook will be sent to Senate without presentations from the committee.

Online Evaluation (ad hoc) Committee – C. McMillan
McMillan reported the membership of the ad hoc committee includes A. Jones, C. McMillan, R. Wolk, J. Liddle and J. Amundson. McMillan has created a WIKI to include everything related to the process for faculty seeking tenure and promotion including guidance for reviewers.

The committee is looking for the most direct way to have the entire evaluation process be digital on Blackboard. Another consideration is a method using any available tool allowing faculty the most freedom and creativity for presentation of tenure and promotion materials; most likely not Blackboard.

McMillan told Senate the committee will continue to work on the WIKI and upon completion of the revised Faculty Handbook, will finish the project. Faculty interested in viewing or contributing to the WIKI should contact McMillan.

J. Liddle proposed, and the committee agrees, the first step in the process is to take contents of the blue binders and make them electronic. Faculty will continue to have the option of a paper binder. Liddle noted members of faculty review committees from Ketchikan or Sitka must travel to Juneau to review paper binders.

Comments from Senate included:
Could this electronic file be housed on UAOnline?

Is Liddle's proposal to have all or a portion of faculty blue binders electronic? McMillan answered Liddle is planning to convert his binder to an electronic format.

Don't most materials contained in the blue binders come electronically now?
Because of signatures, Dean's reviews don't always come electronically.

M. Stekoll told McMillan of M. Ciri's interest in being a member of the committee. Because the current Handbook language refers to physical faculty files, Stekoll recommended the committee propose new language including the option of an electronic format.

Electronic files come in many versions: jump drive containing scanned copies of documents located in the Provost's Office, files on Blackboard, or a commercial product. Begin with the simple tools on a voluntary basis and work up.

The charge of the committee was reviewed: to show how a person could submit an electronic tenure and promotion file, how to secure it, and how a reviewer would access it.

VII.   New Business
Graduate Degree in Science Education – V. Fredenberg
Fredenberg presented Senate with a proposal from the School of Education (SOE) for a Master of Education in Science Education, K-8. The proposal was distributed to Senate; it explains the goals and courses of the program. Fredenberg said all degree courses would be taught in SOE; and, seven courses are currently in two SOE programs, and five have been designed for science education. Before the proposal goes to the Graduate Committee, it must first be presented to Faculty Senate. Once through Graduate Committee, Faculty Senate will review and vote to approve it.

B. Blitz confirmed that at today's meeting, Faculty Senate is approving the *concept* of the degree. Fredenberg noted that because it is a new program, it will have to be approved by the BOR; today's Senate action is the first step.

D. Monteith provided history on the process by saying Faculty Senate has a first view of new degree proposals to look at impacts on resources, both positively and negatively, on other programs. The Graduate Committee thoroughly reviews the proposal for content.

B. Hegel reminded Senate they took these same steps for the new Associate of Science degree.

Fredenberg confirmed since EDSE is used for Special Education, EDSC will be the new degree designator.

Blitz asked about the cost of the five new degree courses. Fredenberg said there is no cost associated with the new courses and they will be absorbed by SOE faculty into their workload.

R. Caulfield provided detail on the schedule of implementation for Spring 2013 and addition of the program to the AY 13-14 Academic Catalog. Because of process and timing, it is likely BOR won't see the proposal until September 2013. Once through BOR process, NWCCU must approve the proposal which takes sixty to ninety days. Caulfield concluded by saying the degree proposal process would likely not conclude until December 2013 and would not be added to the AY 13-14 Academic Catalog.

C. Donar asked Caulfield if the AS degree on same timeline. Caulfield answered the AS degree is already on the SAC calendar for their next meeting. He is hopeful the AS degree will be on the agenda of the June BOR meeting. After approval by NWCCU, students may be recruited for the program.

B Hegel confirmed the AS degree will not be in the AY 13-14 Academic Catalog. Students may be admitted beginning Spring 2014.

C McMillan moved to submit the proposal for the Master of Education in Science Education, K-8 to the Graduate Committee. With a second from A. Sesko, the motion passed unanimously.

Food Services Advisory Committee – C. McMillan
McMillan introduced the working group to develop a Juneau Campus Food Services Advisory Committee. Members of the group include R. Carter, student; C. McMillan, faculty; M. Moya and M. Pennoyer, staff. They are seeking endorsement for the idea of forming this advisory committee.

C McMillan presented the following motion: *Faculty Senate endorses the formation of Juneau Campus Food Services Advisory Committee composed of representatives from the food services provider, UAS shared governance groups (students, faculty, staff), and other stakeholders. The goal of the committee is to serve as a sounding board on issues related to food services on the Juneau campus.* With a second from A. Jones, the motion passed unanimously.

Revisit of Student Ratings of Teaching – J. Martin
Martin shared with Senate concerns expressed by a Sitka faculty about the wording and mechanics of the draft student ratings form. The faculty member noted the progress in dealing with Library and IT issues, but would like the form looked at again to make it clearer. Martin provided examples cited by the faculty member: some of the questions were confounded; and, double and triple barreled – question 1. The content and materials were useful, organized, and relevant to the course. The faculty member felt there were three questions in one; and, thought the student could "find the content and materials to be useful, but disorganized." question 3. What the instructor expected of me was well defined and fair; this question may also be double barreled.

A Sesko advised Martin in question 3, the word fair had been removed. She went on to say the questions were taken from the Centers for Teaching Excellence and other large universities who tested them for reliability and validity of predicting student success and teaching evaluation. The idea was to create an assessment that is effective but has nine questions to get at the aspects holistically. Sesko said any changes to the questions made by the committee were to make them more relevant to UAS: example – on line teaching.

M. Stekoll asked Sesko if she and the committee wanted to revisit the questions. Sesko replied there has been a lot of work devoted to this project and was passed by Senate. M. Ciri has a prototype of the questions ready for testing.

Martin said because they're already in the process to be published isn't relevant. If there are changes to be made, they would be pretty straightforward for Ciri to make. Martin agrees having the questions with sufficient vetting is a fair argument. He is interested in feedback from Senate.

S Neely stated students can answer the questions. If course content is useful and relevant, but unorganized, students can reflect on this issue in the assessment.

Stekoll believes students won't dissect the questions – as triple barreled, they will answer the questions as was this good or was this bad. He noted this is the fifth or sixth time the questions have been changed and it will happen again.

Martin said this was fair enough and he will tell his faculty member the issue is closed. Martin will not make a motion related to the questions for the student ratings of teaching. He will contact Sesko for information on the ratings questions.

VIII.   Regional Reports
C Donar reported the final campus director candidate will be in Ketchikan on March 8. The hiring committee plans to have a recommendation during March.
There were reports from Sitka or Juneau.

IX.   Adjournment
The next Faculty Senate meeting is on April 5, 2013.

B. Blitz moved to adjourn the meeting. With a second from C. McMillan, the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 pm.