

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Meeting – December 13, 2017

Minutes:

Meeting began at 1:00 p.m., Gruening Building, School of Education Conference Room. Notes by Jeff May

Present:

- Committee Members: Andy Anger, Josh Greenberg, Jeff May, Sine Anahita, Gordon Williams, Ataur Chowdhury, Debu Misra, Courtney Carothers, Jak Maier
- Dean Paul Layer
- Guest Visit: Carol Gering from eLearning

Approval of Meeting Agenda:

Meeting agenda approved.

Approval of Minutes from last Meeting:

Minutes discussed and approved.

Old Business:

1. Ownership Rights of Course Materials Discussion Continued

Carol reported that current (and past) eLearning practice has been to require a new faculty member wanting to course copy an existing Blackboard course shell taught by a different instructor to ask and receive permission to use and copy that material. She reported that about 80% freely give permission. The others get settled in some other way (such as new course creation or involving UA Legal Counsel to help determine ownership rights).

Carol reported that it is up to the Deans to designate whether course development is University-Supported or University-Sponsored (each treated differently under the CBAs).

Questions to consider: Is development part of a workload? Is development of the course being paid for by the Dean? Is development being compensated as an overload? Etc.

Carol discussed how the development effort and needs are much greater for an online course than a face-to-face course so eLearning has for some time advocated that faculty developing online courses be compensated for their efforts.

Carol reported on how eLearning is currently approaching course development:

1. Adjunct Faculty – because of their different at-will status and undetermined longevity, if adjuncts develop an online course then they do it through a contract and that contract spells out that it is University-sponsored work. Carol is of the opinion that that faculty could still use that work if they leave and teach somewhere else, so long as the use of it is not in direct competition with UAF (She gave a helpful example where a faculty members uses a video made with the help of eLearning as part of a face-to-face course at another institution – not considered a direct conflict).

2. Full-time Faculty – because eLearning presumes these faculty are going to be teaching the course for some time into the future, they have not been working about having a contract that designates the work as University-Sponsored. Instead, they consider this University-Supported. The Deans and faculty are free to enter contracts to the contrary or that spell out any other special terms.

Dean Layer discussed how it may be good for the Dean’s Council to take up this discussion to see how the various Deans are addressing and treating the situation. Dean Layer considers all work assigned as part of a workload as University-Supported work where the faculty member retains ownership rights to the content.

Grade Appeal Process Discussion Continued

Faculty Senate made the decision that the Curriculum Affairs Committee have the chance to review the proposed Grade Appeal Process modifications before the Faculty Senate takes it to vote. The proposed changes were also emailed out in a Google Doc to all FS members to offer comment. Few comments have been made.

Rachael Plumlee of UA Legal Counsel was not in favor of dropping the sentence in the bottom paragraph of page 1. It is important that any decision have an avenue of review and we can’t make the final decision of the Grade Appeal Group not subject to some other level of review if necessary. The Provost and Rachael are to meet and discuss how best to word this to account for this need. The key point is that we need to ensure that both the student and faculty are given due process.

It was reported that some on Faculty Senate wanted to leave in the opportunity for a graduate student representative to sit in on graduate student grade appeals.

FAC discussed the need to resend the Google Doc out asking for comments after the Holiday Break.

New Business

Program Review Process

Gordon spoke of the need to address the program review process being currently used to make sure it has the ability to be productive and accomplish actual improvement in what programs are doing.

- It would be helpful to better define the purpose of Program Review (make it a Department working on improving Programs model rather than just to check some requirement).
- Would like to see faculty have more input on the criteria for special program review
- Would like to have all degrees in a Program reviewed at the same time and not piecemeal. The process involves the same people and so to not make it constant effort each like degree a program offers should be reviewed at the same time, but include outside reviewers in the process.
- Make sure the question in the Program Review form match the questions that are really being considered in the actual review.
- Clarify when these different types of program review will occur (frequency)

Dean Layer suggested we make sure we check what Northwest Accreditation requires in a Program Review to ensure our's is in keeping with those requirements.

FAC Committee decided to form a sub-committee to address this issue. Committee will be led by Gordon with help from Sine, Jeff, Jak, and Aatur.

Other Matters:

The FAC Committee thanked Dean Layer on his service as ex-officio member. Dean Layer said he already reminded the Provost of the need to appoint a new one to this Committee.

Andy reminded us that FS wants FAC to take the lead on finishing up the effort to revise the Blue Book. Sine will be leading that sub-committee with the help of Debu.

Andy reminded us that FS wants FAC to take the lead on the review of Faculty 180. No one interested in that at this time or feels that we have the time and ability to address it within our Committee.

Starting in January, Jak will take over leading the FAC meetings as Co-Chair. Andy will send out a Doodle Poll to help us schedule the time and day of our meetings in spring semester.

End of Meeting