Summary of the UA Faculty Senate meeting on Monday, February 1, 2016
Approved Minutes of previous meetings, plus agenda, reports from Faculty Officers, ASUA, GPSC, APAC and the Provost and President are available at: http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu

Due to the fact that the January meeting was just a week previous, there were no reports. Please see reports from January 25, 2016 meeting.

INFORMATION ITEM: UPDATE ON THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, CO-CHAIR OF THE FACULTY AFFAIRS WORKGROUP, BECKY MOSHER
Commission sponsors workshops, luncheons and offers information to faculty and students. Information about avoiding gender bias in reference writing was highlighted. See http://csw.arizona.edu

INFORMATION ITEM: OPEN ACCESS AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT – COMMITTEE CHAIR DAN LEE AND SHAN SUTTON
Based on models and best practices employed by peer universities with Open Access policies, the ad hoc committee is working on a proposal for an Open Access policy implemented through the University Libraries and the Campus Repository it manages. The general process involves the following steps, largely the responsibility of Library faculty and staff:
1) Track the publication of new articles by faculty,
2) When a new article is detected, send an email to the faculty author(s) requesting that the authors submit the final accepted manuscript version of the article, via email as a PDF or through an easy-to-use web form, to the Campus Repository.
3) If the author elects not to submit the requested manuscript, the author may simply request a waiver to the deposit requirement (via email or easy-to-use web form); this waiver is automatically granted.
4) Once the manuscript is deposited into the repository, it will be made freely accessible on the web in ways that optimize its discoverability by web search engines such as Google. If the publisher of the article requires an embargo period before the manuscript is made accessible, the library will observe that embargo unless otherwise instructed by the author. (The library monitors publisher embargo policies and will act accordingly.)
A proposal is under development and will return to Faculty Senate in March or April.

A STRUCTURED DISCUSSION AMONG SENATORS ON DEFINING, ASSESSING AND SUPPORTING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP
VICE PRESIDENT FOR HUMAN RESOURCES AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS, ALLISON VAILLANCOURT, VICE PRESIDENT FOR STRATEGIC PLANING AND ANALYSIS, BARBARA BRYSON AND CHAIR OF THE FACULTY LYNN NADEL.

Last semester, two work groups were formed to define, measure and identify ways to support quality in teaching/learning and scholarship, and to see how the UA can roll-up our own values around quality into emerging ABOR strategic planning and metrics around ‘quality indicators’. Reports from the two groups were shared and are available on the faculty governance webpage http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/faculty-senate/senate-agenda/february-2016-senate-agenda

Table discussions resulted in the following traits emerging as indicators of quality (some are in response to the draft document, some sui generis at table discussions):
• Ability to communicate with diverse and large groups of people,
• Providing syllabi in advance of registration so that students can make informed decisions about course content, course structure, and course evaluation methods,
• Bringing in a broader view of liberal arts to tie courses, major and minor requirements, gen eds, etc. to help students see beyond course-by-course progress,
• Finding a better way to assess learning after graduation and after classes have ended (i.e., assessing long-term outcomes as an indicator of excellence in teaching),
• Ensuring a stable teaching force dedicated to longevity,
• Acknowledging that support of NTT faculty is also key to quality teaching,
• Add to the assessment long-term outcomes, and what the broader theme is, instead of looking at the minimum, looking at the excellence in teaching. With respect to assessment, there is disappointment that Teacher Course Evaluations are still used as an assessment tool and inversely correlated with teaching quality. The importance of lining up the additional resources the UA has such as peer evaluations,
• On the support side, continuing to develop Internet technologies and applications that are pedagogically sound.

Tables discussed scholarship quality included the following:
• Recognizing diversity of scholarship,
• Acknowledging that different forms of measurement of quality are needed, given that different professions require different standards,
• Knowing our audience, from colleagues to legislatures, when deciding what kinds of quality indicators are most important to those populations,
• Taking responsibility for identifying and reporting metrics and quality indicators that are important to our own endeavors,
• Recognizing that scholarship is not a big enough word – creative work, research and scholarship should be elevated in tandem,
• Assessing student involvement – as co-authors or collaborators- and recognizing that such involvement is a quality indicator,
• Expanding assessment to include more than expenditures (scholarship, translational work, patentable work, etc.),
• Utilizing peers to assess actual quality of scholarship or research.