

MINUTES
UAF FACULTY SENATE MEETING #157
Monday, March 2, 2009
1:00 p.m. – 3:20 p.m.
Wood Center Carol Brown Ballroom

I Call to Order – Marsha Sousa

Faculty Senate President Marsha Sousa called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

Abramowicz, Ken
Allen, Jane (video)
Baker, Carrie (Josef Glowa)
Barboza, Perry
Barry, Ron (Link Olson)
Begosyan, Seta
Cahill, Cathy
Christie, Anne
Davis, Mike
Dehn, Jonathan
Fowell, Sarah
Hazirbaba, Kenan
Hogan, Maureen
Huettmann, Falk
Illingworth, Marjorie
Konar, Brenda (Alex Oliveira)
Koukel, Sonja
Leonard, Beth
Little, Joe
McEachern, Diane (video)
Moses, Debra
Newberry, Rainer
Reynolds, Jennifer
Sousa, Marsha
Thomas, Amber
Weber, Jane

Members Absent:

Barrick, Ken
Bret-Harte, Marion
Heaton, John
Jin, Meibing
Liang, Jingjing
Lowder, Marla
Potter, Ben
RaLonde, Ray
Zhang, Jing

Others Present:

Larry Duffy
Doug Goering
Linda Hapsmith
Karl Kowalski
Eric Madsen
Joy Morrison
Caty Oehring
Lael Oldmixon
Robert Perkins
Brian Rogers (online)
Tim Stickel
Juella Sparks
Dana Thomas

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #156

Out Day with prospective students. There are forms for this event, as well, if departments wish to have a table for students to visit. She asked for updated info for major explorer guides from the departments, so they provide accurate info to these students.

Linda also recapped what Inside-Out Day is about, for new, prospective students. It's a more structured tour of the campus. Students can choose tracks to explore with 'classes.' They get to meet faculty and staff. There are activities for parents. Lael Oldmixon asked for someone to teach a mock class for prospective students for the event.

IV A. President's Comments – Marsha Sousa

Senate elections are coming up and units have gotten word from the Faculty Senate Office. Research has been done to update the numbers for reapportioning Faculty Senate numbers for representation. However, the data took longer to compile than anticipated (particularly information about joint appointments), so it will not be available for use in elections this year. Faculty Affairs is looking at it and making recommendations for next year's elections. Encourage your unit faculty to get involved.

Bookstore issues: Ken A., Jane W. and Marsha met last week with Robert Holden and Scot Ebanez. They touched on all the issues again, including late enrollments and students moving to different class sections, and shipping. Representatives from Follett will be on campus this week on Wednesday and Thursday. Meetings with the Follett reps and Bookstore reps are scheduled for March 5 from 11:30 a.m.-1 p.m. in the multi-level lounge (for faculty) and, 1:30-3 p.m. (for students). They'll also meet on Thursday at TVC for a combined session with faculty and students. They're actively working on solutions. Electronic access to materials for students whose books do not arrive on time is one of the major solutions to be addressed.

If you can't make it to one of those forums, then let them (Jane, Ken and Marsha) know of your concerns. We, as a campus, need to advertise bookstore loans. They cost \$10 and then books can be ordered 30 days in advance (and may be paid back with the student loan). If students have problems with a Follett book order there are mechanisms in place to help them (as opposed to Amazon where we can't help them). A link in Banner is being worked on so students could order books online during the registration process.

A representative from the Senate is needed to sit on the Usibelli Awards committee.

Senate committees have lots of business to finish up since the year is coming to an end very soon.

Tim S. said it was approved to have a virtual shopping cart in Banner; however, it won't be ready for use with Fall registration in another month. Marsha responded that it's a major glitch and they will be discussing that. Tim mentioned that while UAF voted for it, it was considered only medium priority by UAA and UAS. Jane asked about readiness for the following spring. Tim said he may have an answer in the next couple of weeks as the issue is still under consideration.

B. President-Elect's Report – Jonathan Dehn

Jon has been having extra meetings with the Faculty Alliance and the SAC and RAC committees to get the Academic Master Plan into some sort of format we can look at, and a majority of the credit for progress made on this should go to the Provost. The criteria are crystallizing. The scope of the document ha

He has reviewed sabbatical proposals and approved all of them that were forwarded to him from the Provost for next year.

Mike Davis mentioned that he had talked to Jerry Gallagher last Friday about the stimulus package. Some of the money from that goes directly to communities and organizations, and he wondered who tracks that here at the university. Brian R. responded that it's Martha Stewart, our lobbyist in D.C.; but there are multiple ways this is impacting us. There are areas they're exploring; for example, dollars for police being made available federally – could UA police get some of these funds? No single person right now is responsible because there are so many different possible routes for accessing the money. So it's being handled on multiple fronts.

The chancellor ended his comments by encouraging faculty, particularly rural faculty, to please testify on Tuesday or Wednesday and help

Mike D. mentioned some history of the past twenty years with multiple appropriations. He was down there last week and met some members of the finance committee. One member said that he thought we beat that push to go multiple appropriations. The idea of having a voice down there is a good one and he's willing to work on that, too. He also wanted to mention how important he thinks it is to have a strategy on testifying about the budget; otherwise, if cuts are made and no one objects about them, this will be noted by the finance committee.

Juella mentioned there is some amount of 'wild card' going on with the federal stimulus, with some saying not to put things in the budget if the stimulus package might cover them. She thinks the end of the session may be more hectic because of this wild card.

Cathy Cahill mentioned the discussion of these topics in Faculty Affairs. They concur that Anchorage is changing the rules. They wish to meet with the chancellor about a targeted, coherent approach so that they're not down there only when the budget is under discussion, but rather when the legislature is in session, so that they are hearing from them on a regular basis with a consistent story about our successes. A targeted approach is needed.

B. ASUAF – Brandon Meston

Not available for comments.

C. UAFT/UNAC

Abel was still out of town. Marsha mentioned that she still wants the union representatives to comment to the Senate about ORP issues.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Karl Kowalski, Executive Director, OIT User Services

Karl has noticed over the past year and a half, through meetings with staff, faculty, deans and directors and general observation, that OIT has not done a very good job of supporting faculty in their use and innovation of technology in their teaching. He's been working with FDAI and Joy Morrison on improving support for faculty. OIT is moving toward making a more focused training effort by working with faculty and departments to develop custom training in instructional technology to fit needs in those groups.

This fall a small group attended EDUCAUSE to look at IT developments for universities and

to provide faculty with incentives to incorporate technology in their teaching. FAST – the Faculty and Student Technology committee -- was formed out of this transition team effort. Karl said the president (Marsha) has the list of current members nominated by the chancellor for that group, though not all of them have accepted yet. The majority of members on this committee are faculty. It provides a sounding board for IT issues straight to the chancellor's office.

Maureen H. expressed concerns about making tenure requirements based on use of technology. She feels the faculty decide what is required for their teaching needs. Use of technology does not necessarily make one a brilliant teacher. We need to have intelligent discussion about the role of technology in society, and evaluate things in a situated context with a critical eye and not just go with the next best thing – we can't get good audio conferences for that matter. We can benefit from it, but we have to evaluate our approach and consider the union issues and academic freedom issues.

Jon D. brought up the point of how tempting it is to look at new technology and try new things, but we need to get our accepted technology working (like audio/video) now before we move forward. There might be more support from faculty were the services currently available from OIT working better than they are. Better balance with the technology we have before trying new things – walk before we fly. Karl acknowledged the truth of that comment. He notes that a lot of our technology does not work as well as it could because

Marsha mentioned a conference on instructional design usually offered in the spring by CDE, called iTeach. Dana T. mentioned that they'll work with individual departments whether one is distance teaching or not.

Mike D. commented that some rural students pay more for internet access than they do for a course. It's a great cost to rural students and we're requiring its use. Karl concurred from experience. It's all the more reason to find a process by which we can use the e-rate funded connections to the schools to deliver to those remote areas. Marji mentioned \$80 per month cost for internet in some areas.

Karl described the new IT Governance structure called ITEC – the IT Executive Council. They've formed a portfolio management team and each of the three chancellors has nominated two representatives for their campus. He and Stuart Roberts serve for UAF. He's heard concerns that faculty are not being represented. Karl encourages the Senate to invite ITEC members to come and explain how the structure is going to work and to assure everyone that campus-based issues won't be lost in the mechanism. It's a real attempt for statewide to be more transparent about their IT decisions.

Marsha asked about the merged UAF/statewide organization. Karl said it's still merged despite the MacTaggart report.

Falk H. talked about the other countries he's

Anne C. asked about who can take it? Do you have to be employed? Dr. Perkins answered no. Most of the courses will be sponsored by an employer such as the Department of Transportation or the Corp of Engineers. To get into the program, they should be recommended by their employer, although they don't have to be actively working when they take the courses. The program is designed for those actively working in the field.

Linda H. asked about the baccalaureate requirement. Dr. Perkin said there's a sliding scale that is developed for those without engineering degrees. A graduate level engineer would need to have two years of experience working in construction. Someone without a bachelor's degree would need more years of experience.

Jane W. said the idea of having the sliding scale eligibility for different groups is very good. Dr. Perkins mentioned that it was a DOT recommendation.

Linda H. asked about if there was any plan to offer a bachelor's degree in this area, as there

Rainer asked where the concept ends. Can we then charge variable tuition to compete with Anchorage? It opens the door to variable tuition that depends upon how much the market will bear. Larry mentioned that Anchorage is charging variable tuition rates right now. Marsha commented that her understanding of super-tuition was that it covered especially high costs, particularly for technology that had to be provided. Larry said in this case the high cost lies in the expertise of the faculty as well as technology costs of distance delivery. Without super-tuition for this program, it could probably not go forward administratively.

Doug Goering said this program dovetails nicely with new requirements for maintaining professional registration. It is outside of our normal operation to help engineers remain registered professionally, but there are new requirements for them to take continuing education which they're expected to pay for. It's not a traditional program. It's offered at the employer's site – many non-normal delivery methods with logistics they don't normally cover. Dr. Perkins mentioned they've used the CDE Conference Room to avoid campus parking. On campus meetings require students to purchase the parking passes. Doug said it's aimed at professional development specifically, departing from the traditional programs offered on campus.

Dr. Perkins said they've talked to the UAA civil engineering department, and they're not against the program and want to cooperate with it. UAA Engineering Management also does project management and they use the super-tuition for it exactly as this program proposes to do it. Employers are comfortable with the extra tuition.

Ken A. asked about the students in this program earning credits. Dr. Perkins said they do earn credits and are assessed. Ken A. commented on the open enrollment issue and requiring a financial (rather than academic) ability to gain access to the program. It's mixing the private university concept with the public university, limiting the enrollment to those with financial ability to have it paid for.

Amber T. reiterated that this is a professional program and those taking it stand to gain enormously from it, particularly financially. Amber wonders if there needs to be more discussion in committee about having additional fees charged for the program.

Marsha asked who approves the tuition for this program. BOR does, Larry answered, also mentioning discussion that would occur in Statewide Academic Council first.

Rainer N. commented that fees are what are normally used to cover high costs of programs. Why should we have the variable tuition issue rise up (and related moral, ethical issues) just because Anchorage does it? Dr. Perkins responded that "super-tuition" is a term of art in this case; so perhaps he could rewrite that portion of the proposal and call it instructional fees instead.

Ken A. talked about where super-tuition goes, as opposed to fees, but Dr. Perkins said half goes to the college and half to the department. That's how instructors are going to be paid for. Maureen said this seems to be leaning to a for-profit model. Would tuition be charged on a market rate? Kenan H. responded by saying that the purpose is to make the program sustainable, not to make a profit. Call it a fee if this will ease things. Larry concurred with them about the slippery slope, but the debate is whether or not UAF is going to have

professional schools. That's a real question for discussion. There is demand for this type of professional instruction outside the liberal arts model. If we do this, how will we create the infrastructure to support it?

Falk H. commented about the university having many professional degrees already, the certified Wildlife degree, for example, for which super-tuition is not charged. Based on the super-tuition model, once employers get involved, will they take over the programs? By paying for the programs, they gain a powerful voice. Dr. Perkins answered that they will take over as advisors on the advisory committee. Larry didn't think this would lead to running the program, though they would have some input and access. Kenan H. reiterated that the program will be driving the costs, and Amber concurred, mentioning potential situations for additional materials and instructional fees.

Marsha asked for other substantive issues to be brought forward in the interest of time.

Rainer moved to postpone the motion, which was seconded. Larry clarified that a wording change was being requested, which was confirmed. Dr. Perkins inquired about amending

- H Faculty Development, Assessment & Improvement – Dana Greci /
Julie Lurman Joly
(Attachment 157/7)

- I. Graduate Academic & Advisory Committee – Ron Barry’
No minutes were available.

- J. Student Academic Development & Achievement – Marji Illingworth / Jane
Allan
(Attachment 157/8)

XI Members' Comments/Questions

No comments.

XII Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn, and was seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:20 p.m.