

UAA Faculty Senate Agenda

April 1, 2011

2:30 – 4:30 p.m. **Library 307**

I. Call to Order

II. Roll- (P=Present; A=Absent; E=Excused)

2010-2011 Officers:

	Petratis, John- President		Davies, Hilary- Chair, UAB
	Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha-1 st Vice President		Moore, Judith- Chair, GAB
	Deborah Narang- 2nd Vice President		Babb, Genie- Past President

2010-2011 Senators:

	Abaza, Osama		Fitzgerald, Dave		Magen, Randy
	Banchero, Paola		Foster, Larry		Mannion, Heidi- Gloria Tomich
	Bauer, Stephanie		Garcia, Gabe		Meyers, David
	Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha		Gonzales, Mariano		Mock, Kenrick
	Boege-Tobin, Deborah		Gordon, Kate		Morris, Kerri (Parliamentarian)
	Carter, Trina		Harder, Alberta		Nagy, Lou
	Cates, Keith		Hinterberger, Tim		Pence, Sandra
	Crosman, Robert		Hirschmann, Erik		McCoy, Robert (Fall)
	Davies, Hilary		Hoanca, Bogdan		Russ, Debra
	Davis, Leanne		Ippolito, Mari		Schreiter, Mark
	Dennison, Elizabeth		Johnson, Gail		Smith, Tara
	Din, Herminia		Modlin, Sue		Spieker, Rena
	Dirks, Angela		Kappes, Bruno		Thiru, Kanapathi “Sam”
	Edwards, Wayne		Kawasaki, Jodee		Vandever, Jan
	Fallon, Sue		Kim, Sun-il		Vugmeyster, Liliya (Spring)
	Farrell, Chad		Kopacz, Eva		Widdicombe, Toby
	Fitch, Mark	E	Landen, Paul		

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-4)

IV. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 5-9)

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Fran Ulmer

FAQs <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/faq/index.cfm>

Chancellor’s Report <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/upload/Chancellors-Report-201001.pdf>

U of A Highlights

B. Incoming Chancellor Tom Case

C. Provost Michael Driscoll

D. Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle

E. Vice Chancellor Megan Olson’s Report (pg. 10-12)

F. CIO/Associate Vice Provost Rich Whitney

- G. Union Representatives
 - i. UAFT
 - ii. United Academics

- H. CAFE Update
<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafe/>

VI. Officer's Reports

- A. President's Report (pg. 13-15)
- B. First Vice President's Report (pg. 16-55)
 - i. Ad Hoc Committee for Fisher Report
<http://www.alaska.edu/files/pres/FisherReportMemo.pdf>
<http://www.alaska.edu/files/pres/FinalFisherReport.pdf>
- C. Second Vice President's Report

VII. Boards and Committees

- A. Undergraduate Academic Board (pg. 56-61)
 - i. Curriculum
 - ii. Motions

Joint UAB/GAB Items:

 - Purge List (pg. 62)
 - GER Purge List (pg. 63)
- B. Graduate Academic Board (pg. 64)
 - i. Curriculum
- C. General Education Review Committee
- D. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
- E. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology (pg. 65)
E-Learning Faculty Focus Group Report
<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/facultysenate/upload/ACDLITC-DE-Focus-Group-Report-2011FINAL.pdf>
- F. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA (pg. 66)
Strategic Guidance and FY12/FY13 Operating Budget Development Process Memorandum
<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/facultysenate/upload/BPFA-March-Memo.pdf>
- G. Nominations and Elections Committee
- H. Diversity Committee
- I. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee
- J. Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee (pg. 67-68)
MOTION:

Resolved, upon the recommendation of the Faculty Senate's Institutional & Unit Leadership Review Committee and the ad hoc Community Campuses Committee, that the periodic survey of faculty addressing the leadership of their respective units be expanded to include the faculty at UAA's three community campuses.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty at all three community campuses have requested this action.
2. If approved, the Institutional & Unit Leadership Review Committee and the ad hoc Community Campuses Committee will jointly draft the necessary Faculty Senate Constitution and By Laws changes.
3. Given the use of survey results by the Office of Academic Affairs, these Committees will consult with the Provost on how best to implement the survey process at the community campuses.
4. This motion is required because the necessary Constitution and By Laws changes cannot be implemented in a manner timely enough to permit the Committees to begin working on the expanded survey process.

K. Library Advisory Committee (pg. 69)

L. Professional Development Committee- in abeyance

M. Student Academic Success Committee (pg. 70)

N. Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity

O. Ad Hoc Committee for Community Campus (pg. 71)
Constitution & Bylaws (pg. 72-76)

P. Ad Hoc Committee for Research

Q. Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations

From last Faculty Senate meeting:

MOTION: The *Faculty Handbook* (currently being revised) will include the following addition on pages 16-17). "For all courses for which they are instructors, the sole responsibilities of faculty as to IDEA course evaluation distribution/collection are 1) to complete the "Course Objectives" section of the FIF (Faculty Information Forms) and 2) make IDEA evaluations available to students by activating their courses on Blackboard in a timely manner. See <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/facultyservices/idea-faculty-student-evaluations.cfm> for additional information on IDEA course evaluations."

The Presidents of UNAC and UAFT have been contacted and UNAC's Carl Shepro has approved of this change.

MOTION: Each semester, all Blackboard courses which are not already available will be made available on the day before the default open date for IDEA Course Evaluations.

MOTION: A series of reminder e-mails will be sent to all students enrolled in one or more courses starting on the day before the default open date for IDEA Course Evaluations reminding students evaluations are available and encouraging them to complete evaluations.

Justifications:

- Only 40% of faculty are making IDEA evaluations available to students sending an inconsistent message to students about the importance of completing course evaluations. (The remaining faculty are not making courses available on Blackboard.)
- Over 20% of faculty are not receiving prompts to complete Faculty Information Forms (FIF's) due to problems such as full or inactive e-mail accounts.

- UNAC was approached by UAA with the suggestion that faculty be sanctioned for low IDEA response rates. UNAC strongly opposes this approach to attempting to increase IDEA response rates.
- Research studies indicate that multiple prompts increase survey response rates.

MOTION: UAA retain use of the long form of IDEA Course Evaluations.

Justifications:

- The long form provided useful information during the recent accreditation process and is more informative as to faculty teaching effectiveness.
- The long form averages slightly higher response rates nationwide.

VIII. Old Business

A. Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (pg. 77-78)

MOTION #1: Accept the Provost's revisions on "Relationship between FEGs and Unit Guidelines."

MOTION #2: Accept the Provost's revisions on "Scholarship requires results; not just activity" with the following modification: make examples in lines 420-454 more consistent with the requirement for "outcomes" which result in "evidence" such as "products, artifacts, and creative works."

MOTION #3: Accept the Provost's revisions on "Differentiation of Teaching, Research, and Service."

MOTION #4: Forward to the Provost a summary of comments received by the Ad hoc Committee from the faculty regarding the FEGs during February 2011.

PROPOSED MOTION #5: Faculty Senate accepts the current iteration of the FEGs (with suggested modifications) with the provision that the Faculty Senate conduct a thorough review of the FEGs five years after the FEGs have gone into effect and revise as needed.

IX. New Business

X. Informational Items & Adjournment

UAA Faculty Senate Summary

March 4, 2011

2:30 – 4:30 p.m. **Library 307**

I. Call to Order

II. Roll- (P=Present; A=Absent; E=Excused)

2010-2011 Officers:

P	Petratis, John- President	P	Davies, Hilary- Chair, UAB
P	Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha-1 st Vice President	P	Moore, Judith- Chair, GAB
P	Deborah Narang- 2nd Vice President	P	Babb, Genie- Past President

2010-2011 Senators:

P	Abaza, Osama	A	Fitzgerald, Dave	P	Magen, Randy
P	Banchero, Paola	P	Foster, Larry	E	Mannion, Heidi
E	Bauer, Stephanie	P	Garcia, Gabe	P	Meyers, David
P	Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha	P	Gonzales, Mariano	P	Mock, Kenrick
P	Boege-Tobin, Deborah	P	Gordon, Kate	P	Morris, Kerri (Parliamentarian)
A	Carter, Trina	P	Harder, Alberta	A	Nagy, Lou
P	Cates, Keith	P	Hinterberger, Tim	P	Pence, Sandra
P	Crosman, Robert	P	Hirschmann, Erik	-	McCoy, Robert (Fall)
P	Davies, Hilary	P	Hoanca, Bogdan	P	Russ, Debra
E	Davis, Leanne	P	Ippolito, Mari	P	Schreiter, Mark
P	Dennison, Elizabeth	P	Johnson, Gail	P	Smith, Tara
E	Din, Herminia	E	Modlin, Sue	E	Spieker, Rena
P	Dirks, Angela	P	Kappes, Bruno	P	Thiru, Kanapathi "Sam"
P	Edwards, Wayne	E	Kawasaki, Jodee	X	Vandever, Jan
E	Fallon, Sue	P	Kim, Sun-il	X	Vugmeyster, Liliya (Spring)
P	Farrell, Chad	P	Kopacz, Eva	A	Widdicombe, Toby
P	Fitch, Mark	P	Landen, Paul		

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-4) Approved

IV. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 5-10) Approved with deletions

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Fran Ulmer

FAQs <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/faq/index.cfm>

Chancellor's Report <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/upload/Chancellors-Report-201001.pdf>

U of A Highlights (pg. 11-14)

4 Chancellor's went to Juneau this month for legislative visit

Advocate for what is in the Board of Regent's red book

Gratitude for all support given

B. Incoming Chancellor Tom Case

Experience with CBPP has allowed him to learn about governance

Fully intends to honor that to the best of his ability

Has begun to meet with governance groups and community campuses

Trying to meet with groups to understand where we need to work together

Let him know if you are veering of course in the future

C. Provost Michael Driscoll

Thanks for kind words expressed at last meeting and great working relationship we have together.

IT Executive Council- had meeting to talk about it recommendation from McTaggart, Fisher Report, and other internal report.

Health College Reorganization Open Forum occurred. Will be asking groups of people to work on filling in some of the details in creating reports.

2 documents will be coming out soon:

Guidance for Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC)

Cabinet Strategic Guidance

D. Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle

Unable to attend

E. Vice Chancellor Megan Olson's Report (pg. 15-16)

Campus-wide and Community-wide

April 14th 4-7

F. CIO/Associate Vice Provost Rich Whitney

Unified directory project is moving along; your department will be contacted soon.

Will be posting notice about project coming out.

IT Services listened to PBAC about faculty being able to get to call center without waiting-only if they are presently in the classroom.

G. Union Representatives

i. UAFT

ii. United Academics

Karl Shepro gave report; topics include:

Dependent audit

Joint Health Care Committee met to talk about health plan

H. CAFE Update

<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafe/>

VI. Officer's Reports

A. President's Report (pg. 17-18)

March 2010, the Faculty Alliance realized they had been kept in the dark about the Academic Master Plan. SAC and the Chancellor's Cabinet will have joint meetings, and since faculty have a representative on SAC, faculty will be included in the discussions.

B. First Vice President's Report (pg. 19-21)

i. Ad Hoc Committee for Fisher Report

<http://www.alaska.edu/files/pres/FisherReportMemo.pdf>

<http://www.alaska.edu/files/pres/FinalFisherReport.pdf>

C. Second Vice President's Report

Angela Dirks for CTC will volunteer for Faculty Senate Service Awards

VII. Boards and Committees

A. Undergraduate Academic Board (pg. 22-25)

i. Curriculum

Unanimously approved

John will set up an informal discussion with the PHYS courses and all those parties involved.

ii. Motions

MOTION: Remove the first motion and treat the entire UAB motions as a packet.

2nd: Mark Fitch

Unanimously approved

3 UAB motions

2nd: Bogdan Hoanca

Unanimously approved

~~**MOTION: Retain current language in the Curriculum Handbook**~~

~~**Page 15, Section 5.3. Purge List:**~~

~~A purge list is compiled annually for courses not offered successfully in the previous four academic years. If a course has not been successfully offered in the previous four academic years, then that course will be purged from the catalog unless the department responsible for the course provides a clear justification for retaining the course in the catalog. This justification must be submitted to UAB/GAB for review.~~

MOTION: Replace " The list of GER courses will be provided to UAB by the OAA each spring" by "The list of GER courses will be provided to UAB by Enrollment Services each spring"

Page 15, Section 5.3. GER Course Purge List.

UAA policy states that a course may not remain on the GER list if it has not been offered successfully at least once during the past four semesters, excluding summer. The list of GER courses will be provided to UAB by Enrollment Services each spring. Review of the GER list will be done annually by UAB in the spring semester.

Catalog Issues: ENGL/COMM wording in program catalog copy

MOTION: Proposed catalog copy change for programs which have ENGL A111 as a specific major requirement

ENGL A111 or ENGL A1W- Written Communication GER.

Rationale: In programs with ENGL A111 as a specific major requirement, students can meet that requirement with either

- a. ENGL A111 or
- b. Transfer course which meets Written Communication GER

Rationale: This change will allow use of transfer course work which meets Written Communication GER standards without going through the petition process.

MOTION: Proposed catalog copy change for programs which have COMM A111, A235, A237, or A241 as a specific major requirement.

Oral Communication Skills GER.

Rationale: In programs which list Oral Communication Skills GER, students can meet those requirements with either

- a. COMM A111, A235, A237, or A241 or
- b. Transfer course which meets Oral Communication GER

Rationale: Many programs currently have a specific requirement which mirrors that Oral Communication GER (Requires COMM A111, A235, A237, or A241). Students who transfer in a communication class which meets GER but not specifically one of those courses must complete a petition.

B. Graduate Academic Board (pg. 26)

i. Curriculum

Unanimously approved

ii. Motions

None

C. General Education Review Committee

D. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

E. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology (pg. 27)

F. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA (pg. 28)

G. Nominations and Elections Committee

H. Diversity Committee (pg. 29-32)

I. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee

J. Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee (pg. 33)

K. Library Advisory Committee (pg. 34)

L. Professional Development Committee- in abeyance

M. Student Academic Success Committee (pg. 35)

N. Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity (pg. 36)

O. Ad Hoc Committee for Community Campus (pg. 37)

P. Ad Hoc Committee for Research

Q. Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations (pg. 38-39)

MOTION: The *Faculty Handbook* (currently being revised) will include the following addition on pages 16-17). "For all courses for which they are instructors, the sole responsibilities of faculty as to IDEA course evaluation distribution/collection are 1) to complete the "Course Objectives" section of the FIF (Faculty Information Forms) and 2) make IDEA evaluations available to students by activating their courses on Blackboard in a timely manner. See <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/facultyservices/idea-faculty-student-evaluations.cfm> for additional information on IDEA course evaluations."

The Presidents of UNAC and UAFT have been contacted and UNAC's Carl Shepro has approved of this change.

MOTION: Each semester, all Blackboard courses which are not already available will be made available on the day before the default open date for IDEA Course Evaluations.

MOTION: A series of reminder e-mails will be sent to all students enrolled in one or more courses starting on the day before the default open date for IDEA Course Evaluations reminding students evaluations are available and encouraging them to complete evaluations.

Justifications:

- Only 40% of faculty are making IDEA evaluations available to students sending an inconsistent message to students about the importance of completing course evaluations. (The remaining faculty are not making courses available on Blackboard.)
- Over 20% of faculty are not receiving prompts to complete Faculty Information Forms (FIF's) due to problems such as full or inactive e-mail accounts.
- UNAC was approached by UAA with the suggestion that faculty be sanctioned for low IDEA response rates. UNAC strongly opposes this approach to attempting to increase IDEA response rates.
- Research studies indicate that multiple prompts increase survey response rates.

MOTION: UAA retain use of the long form of IDEA Course Evaluations.

Justifications:

- The long form provided useful information during the recent accreditation process and is more informative as to faculty teaching effectiveness.
- The long form averages slightly higher response rates nationwide.

No action taken on above motions.

VIII. Old Business

A. Ad Hoc Committee for Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

PowerPoint shown

Committee go back and look at any comment that are relevant to what the Provost did

B. Academic Assessment Committee Assessment Handbook Update (pg. 40)

MOTION:

Quality program/academic assessment requires faculty to question themselves and their practices. Academic assessment is solely for the purposes of a program's internal reflection and improvement. As such, the results are not appropriately incorporated into an administrative review of academic programs. We respectfully request that program review not include assessment plans and reports but requires the program to report on their compliance with the assessment process and allows faculty the option to summarize their efforts or accomplishments.

Motion 2nd

Motion (Kerri Morris): Postpone this item until the next meeting.

2nd: Eva Kopacz

Unanimously approved

IX. New Business

X. Informational Items & Adjournment

Meeting adjourned

UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT FACULTY SENATE REPORT- APRIL 2011

Administration

Events

- April 30 - Graduate Degree Hooding Ceremony at 10:00 am at the Wendy Williamson
- May 1 - Commencement Ceremony at 3 pm at the Sullivan Arena.

Alumni Relations

The 2011 UAA Homecoming dates are set! Mark your calendars for Friday, September 30 through Saturday, October 8, 2011.

Homecoming is an 'all-University, all-community' celebration - - Get your event, lecture, production or program on the calendar by contacting Timea Webster, Alumni Relations, 786-1941, or email antmw@uaa.alaska.edu. Current Homecoming news and venues will be ongoing at: <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/homecoming/>

The USUAA student Homecoming dance is Friday, September 30th.

The UAA Green and Gold Alumni Gala is Saturday, October 1, 2011.

The UAA Athletics Kendall Hockey Classic is October 7 -8, 2011.

Do you know of an outstanding UAA alumnus in our community or beyond? What former students, now alumni, are you in contact with? We want to know, and possibly feature them in a coming 'I am UAA' profile. Please contact the Office of Alumni Relations, Julia Martinez, 786-1278, anjm5@uaa.alaska.edu. In addition, check out the nearly 100 profiles already created on successful and interesting alumni who are having impact in our state and beyond at: http://greenandgold.uaa.alaska.edu/index.php?option=com_content&view=section&layout=blog&id=13&Itemid=120

Annual Giving

2011 Faculty and Staff Giving Campaign

The Office of Annual Giving launched the spring 2011 Faculty and Staff Giving Campaign on March 15. If you are interested in becoming a philanthropy ambassador for your college or department to support communications about charitable giving to UAA, please let Alissa Nagel, Annual Giving Coordinator know. We look forward to sharing the joy and benefits of being a donor while building a culture of philanthropy at our favorite institution of higher education – UAA!

Becoming a donor to UAA by making a charitable gift is a personal choice, yet a powerful one. Employee giving is just one more way that the UAA family of faculty and staff are showing their commitment. Last year more than 360 employees gave to UAA. Thank you! This year, the goal is to achieve at least 400 employee donors. You can choose to support a number of UAA foundation funds to support the college, scholarship or program of your choice. Remember, it's your participation that counts most.

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.” - Margaret Mead

Win a free iPad

For a limited time, UAA alumni and friends can update their contact information and be entered to win an iPad! From now until May 6, alumni and friends who update at <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/advancement/update.cfm> (all fields are required) have a chance to win. The University looks forward to staying in touch with you!

If you have any comments or questions, please don't hesitate to contact Alissa Nagel at anaen@uaa.alaska.edu or 907-786-1010.

Development

UAA Development

UAA's fundraising goal for FY11 is \$9.3M. As of February 28, 2011, UAA had raised \$5.31M, and is on a good course to meet the goal. The fundraising totals from July 1, 2010-Feb. 28, 2011 are 18% higher than last year at this time.

April 1 11:30 a.m. Scholarship Celebration with Donors and Student Recipients

This annual scholarship celebration recognizes the generosity of donors to UAA and the impacts on the students who receive the scholarships. Speakers will include both donors and recipients. Open to scholarship recipients and donors. RSVP to Heather Karwowski, 786-1265

Estate Planning

The University of Alaska Foundation will sponsor a free seminar on estate planning with the 2010 tax law changes in consideration. Information follows:

Update Your Estate and Financial Plans for the 2010 Tax Law Changes

Sponsored by the University of Alaska Foundation

Presenters: Susan Foley, JD, Foley and Foley, Anchorage John Letourneau, CPA, Thomas. Head & Greisen, Anchorage

The experts at this seminar will help answer such questions as: How and why should you create an effective plan for your estate? Do you need a will? What effect will the new 2010 Tax Law have upon your taxes? What do the new federal estate tax provisions mean for your estate plan? Is there a place for charitable giving in your estate plan?

The seminar will be presented on Tuesday, April 26, 2011 at the University of Alaska Anchorage Campus Commons, Room 106, from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. A light supper will be served.

Parking arrangements on campus will be made for all attendees

RSVP: Space in the seminar is limited. Please call (toll free) 1 (888) 907 4823 or e-mail sdfnd@alaska.edu <sdfnd@alaska.edu> by April 15, 2011 to reserve a place at the seminar and obtain your parking pass.

University Relations

- Accolades is going to print this month.
- New newsletters publishing this month for Allied Health Sciences and University Honors College.
- New recruitment video coming out this month for the University Honors College.
- Gary Adams will be retiring in May after more than 20 years at UAA.

#



Faculty Senate President's Report
April, 2011

In my duties as Faculty Senate President I have done the following since the last meeting of UAA's Faculty Senate:

1. Represented UAA's Faculty Senate at a meeting of the Statewide Academic Council on 3/16. Topics included:
 - Revising the version of Academic Master Plan that BOR rejected in September 2010, turning that document into SAC's Operating Procedures (SACOP). A lively discussion focused on how long the SACOP (and its embedded agreements) would remain in place, and the process by which it could be modified. Discussion spilled over into the possibility for a new joint-PhD program in biomedical research. No agreements on SACOP were reached, but faculty were united in the importance of collaboration among the three MAU's to respond to state needs.
 - A draft of UAS's strategic plan. A lively discussion focused on the role of research at UAS and how prominently that role might be seen by readers of the UAS plan.
 - The flow of new program proposals from UAA that will reach BOR in June. There was concern that BOR might be leery of approving multiple programs in a single meeting. Unless mistaken, programs up for BOR approval are:
 - Children's Mental Health Grad Certificate (approved by Senate in Feb.)
 - Career & Technical Education Grad Certificate (approved by FS in Dec.)
 - Minor in Air Traffic Control (approved by FS in March)
 - Minor in Public Health (approved by FS in December)
 - A recommendation from the Fisher report to focus resources on a few high-profile programs ('halo' programs) that will then reflect favorably on the image of the rest of the university.
2. Represented faculty at a meeting of University Assembly on 3/17. Topics included
 - a report of legislative funding for UAA (especially funding for the Honors College, the Rural Alaska Nursing Network, and personnel in the Health Science Bldg),
 - a report on UAA's proposed College of Health, including (a) the goal of having the new college approved by the BOR in June 2011, and (b) ad hoc groups to focus on student success in the college, core curriculum in the college, and research in the college.
 - Discussion of building the connection between University Assembly and President Gamble.
3. Reviewed applicants for UAA's student commencement speaker.
4. Attended a meeting of UAA's Full Council of Deans and Directors. Discussion focused on approaches to increasing the diversity of UAA's faculty, and the goal of having at least 18% of faculty coming from under-represented groups.
5. Coordinated a meeting of key faculty to discuss the proposal from the Physics Department (approved by UAB) about in-person vs. e-labs for four 100-level courses. A draft proposal for an e-lab task force was shared with participants.
6. Held five meetings of the Faculty Senate Executive Board. Rich Whitney attended one meeting to discuss a proposed (but subsequently withdrawn) policy that would prohibit

faculty from automatically forwarding all of their email to a 3rd party system (like G-mail). Additional discussions focused on

- upcoming faculty senate elections.
- coordinating a meeting among key faculty to discuss PHYS labs.
- drafting a charge for a statewide taskforce on e-labs.
- the Senate response to Fisher report, and
- Provost Driscoll's modifications to the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEG) for promotion/tenure that were approved in May 2010.

In my duties as Chair of Faculty Alliance I have done the following since the last meeting of UAA's Faculty Senate:

1. Submitted to SAC and then to President Gamble the final version of the Academic Master Plan to reflect comments made by Regents in February, 2011. This final version should be published soon.
2. Chaired a conference call of Faculty Alliance. Discussion focused on
 - SAC Operating Procedures, especially the procedures that influence the importance of collaboration among the three MAU's to respond to state needs. Alliance will continue to argue for the importance of that collaboration and responsiveness to state needs.
 - lingering concern about the role of research in UAS's strategic plan. Alliance will argue that any regionally-accredited university must be engaged in research.
 - the Fisher report. Because UAS and UAF are not planning on responding to the Fisher report, Faculty Alliance might take no position on that report.
 - E-lab taskforce. Progress was made on the structure and goals of the e-lab taskforce (see next page for a current draft).
 - The audit of healthcare dependents. Alliance members heard of cases where ConSova was not accepting some forms of documents from other countries. Alliance asked representatives of United Academics if they heard of such cases.

E-lab Taskforce
DRAFT (COMMENTS WELCOMED)
Version 3: March 29, 2011

Composition: 10 members

- A current or former member of Faculty Alliance as Chair/Convener, selected by FA (in collaboration with SAC)
- Three faculty (preferably tenured) from each MAU, selected by the FS president (in collaboration with the Provost):
 - Someone with considerable experience in e-learning, preferably in e-labs
 - Someone from a discipline with lab courses,
 - Someone from a one of the MAU's community campuses (e.g., Sitka, Soldotna, Bethel).

E-lab Problem

Whereas e-learning can do some things that traditional, face-to-face classroom learning cannot do (e.g., deliver curricula to students who are geographically isolated), a large portion of faculty are concerned about the use of e-labs as substitutes for face-to-face labs. These concerns have led to proposals to prohibit certain labs from being offered as e-labs, and from accepting e-labs as transfer credits. In the next several years, department after department at each of UA's MAUs is likely to deal with issues around e-labs: offer them or prohibit them on the main campus? Accept or reject them from a community campus? Accept or reject them as transfer credits from outside UA? Rather than having department after department deal with e-lab issues anew, Faculty Alliance (at the recommendation of the Statewide Academic Council) will form an E-Lab Taskforce to provide a framework from which departments can make informed decisions about e-labs.

Charge of E-lab Taskforce

In recognition that (a) SAC reviews major revisions to programs but does not review individual courses, (b) faculty have expertise in and control over their local curricula, and (c) each MAU is separately accredited with unique realities (e.g., facilities, enrollment pressures, etc), the E-lab Taskforce will not impose on the MAUs a binding policy about e-labs; rather the taskforce will make non-binding recommendations to the Faculty Senates in the following areas:

1. Things for faculty, departments, and curriculum approval bodies to consider when making decisions about approving or prohibiting a particular e-lab from being offered at an MAU;
2. Time frames for decisions that prohibit particular e-labs from being offered, and a process (if any) whereby faculty can subsequently request approval for an e-lab before the time frame elapses.
3. The transferability of e-labs from another MAU within UA or from an institution outside UA.

When making these non-binding recommendations to Faculty Senates, the E-lab Taskforce should consult with the following:

- National guidelines on e-labs (e.g., AAC&U, AAUP)
- Various disciplinary guidelines in the on e-labs (e.g., American Psychological Association, American Geophysical Union)
- Board of Regent's policy on transfer credits
- Accreditation reports from UAA, UAF, and UAS
- Empirical data on the ability of e-labs to meet learning outcomes as effectively as face-to-face labs



Faculty Senate

UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

March 28, 2011

Report of First Vice-President to Senate Report for March 2011

1. Attended Faculty Senate Meeting on March 4, 2011.
2. Attended University Assembly on March 17 , 2011
3. Attended Library Advisory Committee Meeting on March 4, 2011.
4. **Draft Response to Fisher Report.** Conducted the second meeting of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Fisher Report on Tuesday, March 15, 2011. The meeting was conducted over e-live. We discussed the draft response to the Fisher Report. The draft response is attached. The following caveats are appropriate in this context.
 - While there is a consensus on content, there are very divergent viewpoints on the tone of the report. We need to discuss this further and get the tone right.
 - We are introducing this draft response in the April meeting as a first reading. Between this meeting and May we shall discuss further and get a consensus on the matter of the tone. We want to have a Senate Resolution for approval at the time of the Senate Meeting in May. *Do remember that if we don't have a response by the May meeting, then we will have to wait till the next Faculty Senate Meeting after summer.*

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya'.

Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya
PhD(Calcutta), PhD(UBC), CGA
First Vice-President of Faculty Senate
Associate Professor
Harold T. Caven Professor of Business
College of Business and Public Policy
University of Alaska Anchorage

Faculty Response to Fisher Report

24

25 Introduction

26 President Gamble, shortly after his appointment as President of the UA system, commissioned a report by
27 James L. Fisher, Ltd. In January 2011, President Gamble released the report to the public for comments.
28 Faculty Senate of the University of Alaska Anchorage (henceforth referred by the common acronym
29 UAA), by a resolution in the Senate Meeting held on February 4, 2011, set up an Ad-Hoc Committee to
30 draft recommendations for the faculty senate on the Fisher Report.

31 General Comments

32 Comments on Methods and Assumptions

- 33 1. A big problem with this report, is the overreliance on individual (or at least few) anecdotes to support
34 many of its recommendations. In the social sciences, there is a semi-serious proverb that "the
35 singular of data is not anecdote". That is a way to remind ourselves that while meaningful,
36 generalizable data is certainly made up of individual data points, each individual point of data is
37 merely an anecdote, and therefore not generalizable. Even when they quote numeric data,, they
38 usually rely on the figure for a single year. Given the dubious methodology their report in general
39 should be viewed with a high degree of skepticism. Of course even a broken clock is correct twice a
40 day. So some recommendations might still be supportable on the basis of common sense..
- 41 2. The assumption of "One University" is used in a very simplistic manner. This assumption of
42 centralized authority and decision making with the President and BOR ignores shared governance
43 and the authority of the chancellor and provost on each campus (as well as that of faculty) and the
44 fact that the three MAUs are separately accredited.
- 45 3. The report does not generally address how changing university programs, demographics, needs, or
46 resources in the state might impact the mission of the campuses, and accepts historical assumptions
47 regarding the role of each campus. They frame growth of UAA as a zero sum game-it must come at
48 the expense of UAF. They ask "First, how much should the UAA campus be developed in size and
49 programs and to what extent might (should) this occur at the expense of UAF?"(p.7) but fails to ask
50 whether UAA's development should be curtailed in order to maintain the status quo.
- 51 4. The report references the US News college rankings at several points. An underlying assumption in
52 the Report is that UAF and UAA need to be "highly ranked academic institutions in national higher
53 education surveys." (p. 10) Much recent research and commentary focuses on the methodology of
54 some of these national studies, particularly the US News and World Report.¹ Using ranking makes
55 sense when talking about marketing, but not when talking about the strength or weakness of
56 academic programs. The Fisher Committee's reliance on a ranking system that is widely known to be
57 flawed and gameable raises concerns about the report generally.

¹For example see The Flaw of Overall Rankings By Robert J. Sternberg published in the January 24, 2011 issue of Inside Higher Ed-available online at <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/01/24/sternberg>.

58 Other General Comments

- 59 1. As a general rule the authors of this report have a very disturbing habit of drawing conclusions based
60 on a single sample. There is a general lack of references/citations.
- 61 2. Many a times their comments are just off the cuff comments, rather than reasoned arguments. In
62 several recommendations (e.g., #7) the Fisher Committee recommends decentralization, and then in
63 others (e.g., #8) more centralization is recommended. It is difficult to tell whether the the committee
64 views the optimal organization to be one system with several colleges and universities, one system
65 with three universities that each also include a number of branch campuses, or as one university with
66 several campuses. This particular lack of clarity makes it very difficult to evaluate a number of the
67 recommendations in the report.
- 68 3. It presented much material in a manner that did not clarify underlying assumptions, made
69 suggestions concerning very complex issues that seemed overly simplistic in nature, and presented
70 numerous questions with out providing much guidance.
- 71 4. The report additionally becomes sidetracked by minutiae.
- 72 5. If we compare a University to a production situation, then graduating students and research papers
73 are its output, faculty are the direct workers, library and software and laboratories are the direct
74 overhead and rest are indirect overhead. Where is the issue of being able to attract and retain good
75 faculty?

76 Summative Evaluation

77 In our opinion the report suffers from the following deficiencies.

- 78 • The report makes a simplistic construction of the three MAU's being "one University".
- 79 • The report seems to rely on anecdotal evidence and on single samples for justification.
- 80 • A major underlying concern of the report seems to be to thwart the growth and development of UAA
81 in the name of efficient usage of resource.
- 82 • The report seems oblivious of the demographic trends of Alaska.
- 83 • A large number of recommendations are concerned with trivialities.

84 As such we reject most of the recommendations of the Fisher report. We opine that we should not throw
85 good money after bad and waste more resources in deliberating over Fisher.

86 However there are a couple of recommendation where we agree with the Fisher report. We agree that the
87 Statewide administration is bloated. We don't understand why we need to replicate the bureaucracy that is
88 the Statewide. They just add to the overhead. We recommend that the Statewide bureaucracy be dispensed
89 with and the President be provided with a retinue of support staff to assist the President.

90 We agree with the Fisher report that the Alaska Scholars program is a good program and should be
91 supported, that professional and employee related decisions are best taken in a decentralized manner and
92 that the practice of deferred maintenance is insidious.

93 We believe that the three MAU's should be free to grow and develop as they respond to their dynamic
94 environment. We particularly resent the constant refrain about how UAF must be the doctoral institution
95 and how there must not be duplication. We consider these to be false arguments.

96 The demographic trend of Alaska is such that the Matanuska-Susitna Borough will continue to eclipse the
97 demographic growth in the rest of Alaska.² Therefore we fail to understand the constant refrain in the
98 Fisher Report that somehow all research facilities must be concentrated in UAF in the name of avoiding
99 duplication. We would argue that given the vast size of the State we need to have dispersed Universities
100 which will develop and offer programs to suit their respective dynamic environments.

101 We would also like to point out that the nature of future employment is going to be knowledge based. It is
102 worth noting that the three States in the United States of America which are in black as far as State
103 Finances go are Alaska, Montana and North Dakota (Source: The map in the hardcopy edition of the Time
104 of June 28, 2010). Out of these three states, two are already taking steps to invest in higher education. A
105 report in the March-April 2010 issue of Academe states :

106 “An examination of the data for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 shows enormous variations in state
107 funding and in the use of federal funds. For example, state appropriations for higher education
108 declined 26.1 percent in Alabama (20.1 percent after inclusion of federal funds), 19.2 percent
109 in Nevada (4.3 percent after federal funds), and 16.4 percent in Virginia (9.4 percent after
110 federal funds). At the same time, ***appropriations in North Dakota increased 18.5 percent,
111 even though no federal stimulus funding went to higher education. Appropriations for
112 Montana higher education increased by 10.8 percent, jumping 30.1 percent with the
113 inclusion of supplemental federal funds.*** ” (p.10)³

²Source: Alaska Economic Trends, December 2010, Volume 30, Number 12. It is downloadable from <http://labor.state.ak.us/trends/dec10.pdf>.

³Source: 2009-2010 Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, published in Academe, March- April 2010 issue and downloadable from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/Z/ecstatreport09-10/default.htm>. Emphasis added.

114

115

Appendix: Comments on Specific Recommendations

116 Our comments are given in the following table. The table lists the recommendations made by the Fisher Committee and records our comment
117 in the corresponding columns. In some cases, we have no comments to make.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
1	UAA's current strategic plan, which needs refinement, indicates that the institution will "reinforce and rapidly expand our research mission" and that it will "build selected research-centered graduate programs." It is not clear precisely what these statements mean. They could mask wholesale changes, or instead reflect only marginal changes in the current situation. These goals need to be clarified. As a well-placed individual wryly commented, "Sometimes institutions don't accurately interpret their missions." In addition, the plan should become more pointed, i.e., timelines, costs, source of funds and accountable officers, et al.	9 & 10	Periodically refining an institution's strategic plan is certainly a good idea. However, the context for the recommendation is troubling. This recommendation follows in part from the claim that Alaska cannot financially afford two doctoral research institutions. That claim, however, is made with no clear evidence to back it up. Also, even if that claim is true, this recommendation gives little to no direct guidance on how to implement it. UAA needs to develop new graduate programs and expand existing programs, as many students cannot or do not want to leave Anchorage. However this recommendation seems to be a thinly veiled reference to reducing the research goals of UAA, which cannot but adversely impact the development of graduate programs. The comparisons that immediately precede this recommendation are not very appropriate. In the states that are mentioned there are other existing research institutions in the urban population centers. The assumption that UAF should continue to be the "system flagship" is never examined critically. We don't see objective analysis to determine the most effective and efficient use of resources allocated to higher education.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
2	<p>We recommend that the UA System: (A) respect the lessons of specialization in graduate work and research and identify a limited number of academic disciplines that will receive special resources and commitment, whether at UAF or UAA; (B) continue to focus UAF on its traditional strengths in the sciences and engineering; (C) focus advanced graduate work and research at UAA on the social and behavioral sciences and education and avoid replicating UAFs primary areas of expertise; (D) locate any future law school the state does not have one currently—at UAA; and, (E) support and expand WWAMI type programs (WWAMI is a collaborative medical school among universities in five northwestern states (Washington, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and Idaho) and the University of Washington School of Medicine) in expensive disciplines and courses of study.</p>	11	<p>This is yet another recommendation completely unsupported by analysis. This recommendation seems to assume that particular programs should only receive resources at one campus. This ignores, though, the geographic distribution of college campuses in Alaska, and that students frequently change majors during the course of their college careers. If this set of recommendations were fully implemented, a student would be penalized for, say, initially choosing to attend UAF because he or she wanted to become an engineer, only to have to choose between either moving to Anchorage or to be faced with a program with inadequate allocation of resources upon changing to an education or a social science or a behavioral science major. Note also that this recommendation would have UAA focus on the behavioral/social sciences and education, but it ignores the liberal arts entirely. This is puzzling, given that the discussion leading up to this recommendation states that UAF has not been putting substantial resources into those fields. (Also, 2B states that UAF has a traditional strength in the sciences, but the preceding discussion states that UAF has been unsuccessful at creating high-quality programs in the sciences, except for arctic and climate studies. There seems to be some incoherence there.)</p> <p>UAS is oddly missing in this entire discussion, even though one would expect this recommendation to include that university, as well.</p> <p>There has been no critical and objective evaluation of the science and engineering programs and areas of expertise to conclude that UAA should not expand its offerings. We should not be talking about "limited" disciplines unless we know for sure that such programs do not appeal to enough members of the community. Too much administrative guidance as usual.</p> <p>Also, if we hope to attract exciting PhD Scientists in some fields, they need to have graduate students to assist in their research, or else they will not be competitive in grants. So thinking of research always in opposition to UAF is not productive.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
3	<p>Despite improvements, reality is that large numbers of students begin studies at the University, but then disappear. (We note here that the high school dropout rate is also unusually high.) There may be valid reasons why UA lags national standards; if not, then the numbers we observe reflect a waste both of human and financial resources. Whichever is the case, the University needs to determine why its performance lags national norms and then, as necessary, outline how it intends to improve the situation.</p>	12	<p>Why students begin studies and then disappear is a good question. We are not sure what “actual data” Fisher et al are suggesting. One would be at a loss to figure out how to collect it besides surveying students who have left, and they are not always easy to find.</p> <p>In part we are using the wrong data. 6 year grad rates are based on first time, full-time freshmen. However the average student age at UAA is 30, only 35 % are full time. 80% work, many full time.(p. 41 of the Fisher Report).</p> <p>There are a wide variety of reasons why students drop out of UAA, e.g. financial, academic, lack of interest. Some students transfer to “outside” universities and obtain degrees there. These students are not tracked.</p> <p>Certainly, more can and should be done to support students. However, this recommendation assumes (and it is a widespread assumption these days) that ensuring college completion for every admitted student, or at least the vast majority of them, should be the goal of every postsecondary institution. Despite that, though, there is also something to be said for college acting as a sort of “quality control” mechanism. That is, if grades actually are intended to mean something, and if it is expected that it can be possible to fail a course, then one would expect that some students will not make it through what is supposed to be a rigorous experience. This is naturally even more the case at an open access university like UAA, where there are inherently fewer filters on the preparedness of entering students.</p>
4	<p>Elsewhere in this report, we argue that the University of Alaska might be well advised to focus its scarce dollars on a smaller number of programs, especially at the graduate level, many of which can legitimately aspire to national rankings. It is not clear to us that some of the doctoral programs at UAF would survive if such criteria were applied. We recommend that the President and the Board take a long look at this situation and reexamine the viability of programs including enrollment, retention, research productivity and graduation.</p>	13	<p>We question the goal of aspiring to national rankings as a goal as opposed to “useful to residents and policy in the state of Alaska.” The President and the BOR should study the enrollment and the number of Ph.Ds awarded in the various programs. For example, if less than 3 Ph.Ds are awarded in a 10 year time frame, the funding could probably be better used in other areas. If a program review is called for then it should be done by the Provost of the relevant MAU.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
5	<p>This is a difficult and often treacherous milieu. Nevertheless, we recommend that the University as an institution seek to avoid adopting official policy stances in such controversies, but instead: (A) insist on scholarly integrity and do its very best to avoid shoddy scholarship that will draw legitimate criticism; (B) seek to apply the University's considerable expertise to the analysis of similar problems; (C) via its faculty, offer prospective solutions, but not endorse those solutions; and, (D) actively sponsor discussions of relevant issues and ensure that the University remains a free and open marketplace for ideas. On occasion, it may be necessary to defend academic freedom and free inquiry when interested parties are not pleased with the results of University research, or with the expression of particular points of view. However, untrammelled scholarly inquiry and research are foundation stones of any respectable academic community and the University of Alaska should not equivocate in such situations.</p>	14 & 15	<p>This recommendation seems confused about UA's "official policy." It simply needed to say that UA should support academic freedoms regardless of the consequences.</p>
6	<p>Therefore, it is prudent for the University of Alaska to plan for the possibility that: (A) its general fund support from the State of Alaska might not keep up with price inflation; and, (B) its share of the states budget might decline. The University should explore what the University would be like if ten years from today, the "real" (after inflation) value of its state appropriation has not risen, or even declined. What activities must the University improve or discard to operate efficiently in such a world? What things must it begin to do if this will be the state of affairs in 2020? What would this imply for tuition and fees? The number of questions that must be answered is almost endless.</p>	15	<p>This recommendation simply means that the University should plan for the future. A large class of recommendations by Fisher belong to this genre—basically sound but not very profound.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
7	<p>Hence, we must recognize that a reorganization of the University of Alaska is not a cure all for whatever ails it. Even so, it is apparent that some improvements can be made. These fall into two main categories. First, as it stands, the University of Alaska is overly centralized and devotes too many resources to a command and control regulator model that should instead place more emphasis upon incentives, distinctiveness and entrepreneurial activities. Increasingly, under the authority of the President, UA Systems administrators should act as staff to the Board and provide recommendations rather than wielding final administrative authority. Second, the Universitys attempt to seamlessly integrate all post-secondary education into the same administrative structure sounds better than it actually works. UAs vocational, technical and community college activities must be accorded greater prominence and not viewed as four-year lite (the observation of a sometimes frustrated individual associated with workforce development).</p>	16	<p>UA has become too centralized, and statewide administration has grown considerably in recent years. Each MAU is distinct, and “one size does not fit all”.</p> <p>Since Alaska does not have a community college (except PWS), it is extremely important that vocational, technical, and workforce development programs be supported as well as baccalaureate and graduate programs. If we are serious about becoming more efficient, then many of the resources that are currently being used to support the UA administrative structure should be reallocated to other, higher priorities. Instead of an overarching UA administration, we would like to recommend more independence for MAUs and for individual campuses, not less.</p>
8	<p>Our point is not to concentrate all program-reduction attention on teacher education; instead, why maintain three free-standing teacher education programs, three free-standing MBA degrees, three free-standing environmental studies programs, et al? UA often talks about being one university, but shrinks from situations where one MAU will supply faculty and courses to another MAU, or one MAU will perform all of a certain type of administrative task for other MAUs. We believe it is time for the UA System to move off the mark on these issues and recommend that the President take steps to see that it occurs.</p>	20	<p>No, UA does not talk of being one University.</p> <p>If we have one university and three campus model, then we should have one Provost and one Senate and one Library.</p> <p>Three separate programs are needed. Juneau, Fairbanks and Anchorage are far apart geographically, and the programs serve the communities in which they are located. We need engineering programs at UAA as well as at UAF, as the population center is in Anchorage. The solution again is for programs to follow students. At the moment, the tail (UAF) is wagging the dog (UA).</p> <p>This statement is contradictory to Recommendation 7 which calls for decentralization.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
9	<p>The problem with this approach is less the courses required and more the comparative absence of empirical evidence that the programs “work.” Have students learned when they finish these programs and is there a measurable “value added?” Have their attitudes changed? Do they become more or less tolerant of the views of others? Are they better able to integrate and synthesize information? How do they compare to other students nationally? How do graduates from UAF, UAA and UAS compare, since they do not complete the same general/liberal education sequences? Does the “capstone” course at UAA designed to integrate knowledge make a perceptible difference? These are important questions and we strongly recommend that the University employ rigorous means to seek their answers.</p>	20 & 21	<p>This is not a recommendation, this is a series of questions. They certainly are important questions, but one has to wonder why this was numbered as a recommendation when no real suggestions are made for either how to investigate these questions, or probably more importantly) what to do with any answers that are found.</p> <p>Are these questions about programs working particular to the UA system or do they plague all universities? We don’t know of any university basing their programs on this kind of research. We would say that the jury is still out on the methodology and relevance.</p> <p>The question about comparing graduates reveals an incredible simplicity of mind when it comes to looking at programs, In the same vein, “Value added” is not a useful measurable term in this context.</p>
10	<p>We recommend that the President refashion the entire institutional research function with the UA System. If necessary, different individuals must be hired who are capable of performing sophisticated multivariate analyses and that have mastered applicable operations research techniques such as linear programming, queuing and simulations. Most of the heavy lifting in terms of institutional research should occur on the MAU campuses and experts on these campuses can be allocated specific tasks as well by the President. Relatively few central system personnel will be needed and these should focus on recording and classifying data and completing necessary reports.</p>	21	<p>There is somewhat of an irony here, in that this recommendation highlights the importance of sophisticated quantitative statistical analysis but precious few of the recommendations in the report are based even remotely on any sort of quantitative analysis at all. We do have faculty “who are capable of performing sophisticated multivariate analyses and that have mastered applicable operations research techniques such as linear programming, queuing and simulations”. We simply don’t understand their scope for application in operations research in the context of a University is anywhere as significant as the authors seem to think. We would like to note that none of the authors has a degree in Operations Research.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
11	It appears possible for a UAA student to avoid taking a laboratory science. UAF requires two laboratory science courses of every baccalaureate student, and UAS requires one course (although the UAS Catalog does not make this point clear for students). For several reasons, a laboratory science experience is an essential part of a respectable liberal undergraduate education. We recommend that UA require such on every campus.	21-22	<p>A lab science course for the GER is required at UAA. UAA, UAS and UAF all follow the GER requirements approved by the BOR (Page 61 of the UAA catalog). According to p. 82 of the current UAA catalog, all bachelor's students must take 7 credits of science, including a laboratory course. This is easily findable by simply searching for, e.g., the word "laboratory" in the PDF version of the catalog (or, if one uses a paper version, by scanning the headings in the general education requirements). Making such a claim in a recommendation leads one to wonder how in-depth the committee's research actually was.</p> <p>Also, it seems odd that after stating earlier in the report that the needs of associate's degree programs and students should not be ignored, at this point in the report "a UAA student" apparently means precisely a UAA bachelor's degree student.</p>
12	There is no writing competency exit examination. Given that high proportions of UA students transfer into the campuses where they seek to graduate, and many are mature and hence completed writing courses many years previous, it is important that they demonstrate their ability to write clearly and cogently. We recommend that UA take steps to implement such an examination. We can guarantee that citizens and employers will approve.	22	<p>A generic writing examination will not allow us to assess a student's writing ability. It is important that our students communicate well, but communication in each discipline is different. It makes a difference whether the sort of writing examination the committee would like to see involves writing for an academic audience, business writing, technical writing, multimodal composition, etc. We are not aware of any university that has a writing competency exit exam- in any event none of us had to face such an exit examination.</p> <p>We would also like to point out that recommendations 12, 14 and 15 for a writing competency exit exam, the computer literacy and foreign language requirement are cut-and-paste ideas and phrases from Fisher Report for other universities.</p> <p>See the 2005-2006 Fisher Report for Auburn University.</p> <p>It is not impressive to see cut and paste recommendations especially with no supporting data. Our GER, capstones and course standards address writing competency. The time and money required to implement a cumbersome exit exam could be spent in better ways.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
13	We are uncertain what “academic” writing is (F211, F213). Such labels suggest these writing courses somehow are not aimed at preparing students for effective writing in other situations, e.g., in business, or everyday life. We recommend different titles.	22	These courses are UAF courses. UAA has ENGL courses at the 200 level that are geared towards Literature, Technical Writing, Social and Natural Sciences, and Persuasion.
14	We recommend that UA institute a computer literacy requirement for all baccalaureate degree candidates. The vast majority of students will come to the University with computer and Internet skills, but will not necessarily be familiar with certain software programs and/or search techniques. Computer and Internet literacy has become a prerequisite for the exercise of intelligent and full citizenship and UA should ensure that its graduates have demonstrated such literacy. We note that computer/Internet literacy and library literacy are not identical.	22	This is another cut and paste from previous Fisher reports. We provide many regular and short term courses for computer skills. However, for the most part, setting up a University wide computer literacy (whatever that means) requirement would be like checking to see if students know how to walk. Like the exit exam, it would be another costly administrative headache for the University and more paperwork for students. It is difficult to imagine a student graduating with a baccalaureate degree from UAA without computer/Internet literacy skills.
15	We recommend that every baccalaureate degree recipient be required to demonstrate competency in a non-English language or culture. UA students will graduate into a world that is increasingly international. The first language of more than one-quarter of all new elementary school students in California is Spanish. In Alaska, approximately fifteen percent of the population speaks a language other than English at the dinner table. Further, language is the repository of a culture; it is essential that UA students come to grips with other cultures, preferably by means of their languages. Both the understanding of UA students and their employability will increase if they acquire facility with a non-English language at the second-year collegiate level. We recommend that UA introduce such a requirement.	22-23	This has also been discussed in the past, and is currently under discussion by a UAA Faculty Senate committee. If UA were to introduce such a requirement through the BOR, the budget implications on the various campuses would have to be considered. The Fisher Report would have been more credible if it had reported the extensive and unique cultural and language research and resources in Alaska and at UAA. We welcome recognition and support. This is one area in which UA is an international leader. The extended campuses play a crucial role in these programs. KPC is proud to host the Dena’ina research and language teaching program that began with original research here in 1989. Note also that the Dena’ina language website is cutting-edge in language instruction. Native languages and Native ways of knowing are important area of research and their results implements throughout Alaska. Also the joint UAF-UAA psychology PhD program is the only rural indigenous psychology program in the country.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
16	<p>UAS's general/liberal education program appears to be substantially smaller in requirements than UAF. The differences between the three campuses are large enough that it is not clear that one could justifiably say the programs are interchangeable. This is odd given the "one university" slogan that UA frequently promotes. Since UA doesn't have rigorous empirical evidence available that speaks to what actually works and does not work in its general/liberal education programs, it is impossible to say whether these differences are helpful or harmful for students. We recommend that UA examine the differences in programs and rigorously determine if they do make a difference in the System's ultimate product, its graduates. To ignore the differences in the programs is to suggest that it really doesn't make any difference what courses students take. One university should have one set of general education requirements.</p>	23	<p>UAA, UAS and UAF all follow the BOR GER requirements, but each MAU can add their own requirements. There is an agreement that GER requirements transfer between the MAUs.</p> <p>Since UAA, UAS and UAF are separately accredited, why do the GER requirements have to be exactly the same at the three MAUs? If one examines other states, e.g. Washington, the various universities do not have the same GERs. At some universities, each college has its own GER requirements.</p>
17	<p>We recommend that the State of Alaska make targeted investments in these areas, as they bode not only address the specific needs of Alaska, but also to attract considerable outside funding. It is plausible for the State to make such investments on an incremental, show us what you can do basis.</p>	24	<p>The report identifies "some promising avenues" for future research, and then recommends targeted investments in these area. Have they conducted a rigorous needs assessment and prioritized these areas for UA? This seems to be presumptuous. This recommendation would get the legislature involved in micromanaging UA.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
18	<p>Incentives count where research is concerned and we recommend that the University reexamine how it utilizes and distributes the indirect cost overhead recovery funds that accompany many grants that it receives. We don't have a formula to offer that magically and optimally distributes these funds amongst researchers, departments, colleges and the University. Nevertheless, the comments of some faculty suggest that increasing the distribution of funds to the actual researchers who generated the funds might induce more grant activity over time. These funds also could be used to nudge institutions (e.g., UAA) in programmatic and research directions consistent with the UA System's overall strategic plan.</p>	24	<p>This "recommendation" actually contains no meaningfully concrete recommendations. The wording is somewhat troubling in that it sounds as though some UA level committee will decide what research is appropriate at which campus.</p>
19	<p>We recommend that the Board of Regents study extending the WWAMI model to other academic areas, especially high cost, low enrollment programs within particular academic specialties or professional schools. "Buying" spots in reputable graduate programs in others state might save Alaska the expense of operating and equipping small, high-cost graduate training. Veterinary medicine, dentistry, architecture and law could be candidates for WWAMI-like programs, but only if documentable shortages exist that have inflated wage rates. It would make little sense to initiate a WWAMI-like program if Alaska already is able to obtain the individuals it reasonably needs in a particular occupation or specialty.</p>	25	<p>This could be a slippery slope and cause the University to develop a "support" oriented faculty per WWAMI-like program. A University should have the capabilities to graduate students without sending them to another program. Are we Universities or a support institution? This is doing education on the cheap and dirty. The University of Alaska must grow its own professionals. The remark "[unless] able to obtain the individuals [from outside Alaska]" referring to health care providers, veterinarians, dentists, lawyers, architects, shows lack of understanding of Alaska by the Fisher group. The following statement from the 2010 report on health care providers in Cordova http://www.cityofcordova.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/1.pdf reflects the situation concerning individuals obtained from outside: They do not intend to stay long term, and they cycle through. They do not get involved in the community and they do not spend money and support the local economy. It is almost like the mindset of health care providers is that medical stints in Cordova are meant to be temporary.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
20	<p>We recommend that UA explore the possibility of sharing distance learning courses with institutions in other states and that it give additional consideration to how it might economize by sharing resources with the Western Governor's University (WGU). WGU offers NCATE-accredited teacher education programs, CCNE-accredited nursing programs through the master's degree, and a raft of business programs through the MBA, all via distance learning. The University of Alaska should not casually cast these programs or their courses aside.</p>	27	<p>At several points the committee raises differences between courses and requirements at UAA, UAF, and UAS as a problem. With this recommendation, however, they suggest introducing yet another institution with different courses and requirements into the mix. Would such differences suddenly become non-problematic if WGU were involved? It is unclear why the committee makes multiple references to the usefulness of WGU without explaining this apparent contradiction. The suggestion to out-source academic programs to WGU is an insult to Alaska.</p> <p>WGU is an on-line college(?) with a 47:1 student to faculty ratio. Even with this unacceptable ratio, the names and credentials of its "faculty" are not published. A March 2009 report for teacher education accreditation http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2009-05/2009-05-item-19.pdf states only that "interviews and review of vitae indicate that mentors, coordinators, and administrators are qualified for their roles. They hold appropriate degrees for their work and most have previous experience in school settings.(page 10)" So what degrees do they hold? Are there any faculty? As for its curriculum, the same report states that "WGU does not have traditional courses, but instead has a series of domains, sub-domains, competencies and objectives. Many of the sub-domains (courses) were selected by lead (national) education faculty members from a catalogue of existing, internet-delivered self-contained packages to form the base of the teacher preparation program sequence.(page 14)".</p> <p>This process is described in harsher detail in the review http://www.justcolleges.com/online-college-reviews/western-governors-university-review.htm?review=147. While one might question this review, there is nothing on WGU website to counter it. The accreditation, of which it boasts, was not granted without controversy. The Academic Senate of California Community Colleges suggested political and monetary forces behind WGU accreditation, citing mainly lack of faculty: http://www.asccc.org/node/176638.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
			<p>The US Department of Education lists the following data for WGU on website http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/?q=wgu&s=all&id=433387#general</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention rate for first time students: 70% • Overall graduation and transfer-out rates: 22% (this is for finishing within 150% of normal time) • Graduation rates for Bachelor Degrees: 4 years: 20-26%, 8 years: 32% • By ethnicity, gradation rates for American Indians and Alaska Natives: 0%; highest rate is for whites at 27%. These are hardly impressive! <p>While an outside institution may supply course work, they cannot replace local faculty who understand the area where students plan to work and make their homes. We do this by providing faculty and facilities that address labor and professional needs in Alaska Such objectives can not be met by a remote college. Developing a professional in any field requires more than passing a few distance classes.. Distance education does have role in education but UA faculty are better providers of these courses than an on-line institution outside of Alaska.</p>
21	Many UAF classrooms do not contain the basic smart classroom essentials—a PC, Internet access, a projector and a large screen. Smart boards are somewhat unusual. We believe that special assessments in the form of increasing the student per credit technology fee should be considered to begin to remedy this situation.	27-28	Same applies to UAA.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
22	A system-wide harmonious student records system is an example of where a statewide approach makes sense. We recommend that the President examine why this particular version meets with so much criticism. Do any legitimate problems that exist reside in the software, how it is managed, how it is used, lack of training, or ...?	28	
23	It would take effort for one not to be impressed by the University of Alaska's massive use of technology. We recommend, however, that both the System and individual campuses spend more time evaluating what they are doing with that technology. Strong emphasis should be placed on generating rigorous empirical evidence concerning the University's use of technology and its effect upon learning and subsequent student outcomes such as retention, graduation, and job placement. The questions noted above might serve as a starting point. It is apparent that the University of Alaska already has done some of the analysis called for here; it simply hasn't done enough to justify what now is approaching a \$100 million per year expenditure.	30	We very much doubt that anyone has a demonstrated methodology to find "rigorous empirical evidence concerning the University's use of technology and its effect upon learning and subsequent student outcomes such as retention, graduation, and job placement." Educational researchers worldwide are looking at the impact of technology on education-to suggest that UA solve this issue is not realistic, except for perhaps specific UA applications of technology. It is very easy to ask superficially profound questions when you have no clue about the methodology to find the answers. Also other uses of technology(as for example the ability of increasing student access through technology) are ignored.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
24	Some of the funding for UA's technology efforts is supported by a \$5.00 per credit hour student fee (maximum = \$60 per semester). We believe there is a strong argument for increasing the size of this user fee, provided the proceeds are used directly to support and assist students. Additional "smart" classrooms (noted above) provide such an example, as would additional work stations. We also recommend, however, that UA administrators utilize student advisory committees to assist them in ascertaining how things are working and what things need to be done.	30	At UAA, the Consortium Library has several work station areas for students. It is debatable whether more are needed, as most students bring their own notebook computers/tablets/IPads /cell phones to campus. Maybe fewer computer labs are needed except when specialized software is needed. Before making such a decision, though, one presumably ought to determine whether the technology investments funded by such fees would actually be worth it. An example: one of us have taught at a university where every classroom had digital projectors funded by student technology fees imposed several years ago, but they were effectively unusable because they were early-generation projectors with a low resolution, and it was deemed too expensive to replace them even given the existing fee structure. We need to avoid trying to build a revenue stream that we then use to create that sort of problem for ourselves.
25	Finally, while UA's technology intensive distance learning efforts are much appreciated by students, it is fair to note that some knowledgeable outsiders believe that UA is not at the forefront of distance education today. "There are some outdated in their approaches and high cost in their operations." said one, who believes the President should bring in one or more acknowledged experts at institutions that either are on the cusp of new developments, or which currently operate highly successful, profitable programs. We concur.	30	Since Fisher Group did not visit KPC nor assess KPC's distance education practices and technology, it is hard to see how they can judge UA's distance programs to be outdated. One wonders if the "acknowledged experts" that the Fisher Group suggests should be brought in are the non-faculty from WGU. Also why are the "knowledgeable outsiders" kept anonymous? This recommendation does not give credit to CAFE and the folks in educational technology who run great workshops and assist faculty. Before bringing in institutional experts, we should support the programs and people we already have in place to do these things. We would also like to point out that the nursing program at UAA does use a large number of online courses.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
26	<p>In any case, a partial solution to the tension on this issue is to have the Board of Regents adopt refined, distinct institutional mission statements—a step we recommend. We note that as a doctoral, research institution, UAF must be accorded distinctive treatment, or it will fail. However, it is obvious that the majority of the state’s population and resources are located in the Anchorage metropolitan area. Hence, the real questions are: (1) how many doctoral programs should be supported at UAF? and, (2) over time, should some free-standing, distinctive doctoral programs be developed at UAA along with a variety of other graduate and research offerings?</p>	32	<p>And the question that is not asked-Why should not UAA develop into a full fledged Doctoral Institution?The questions posed by the study authors assume that the situation in Alaska continues to reflect past needs and opportunities. We should instead be questioning the underlying assumptions that have been used to make decisions concerning which programs are supported in the various MAUs. Which graduate programs should UA support? Where are they most effectively and efficiently located? The “failure” of UAF is irrelevant. You can’t design an effective system when the design is already skewed by disallowing one outcome.UAA must have enough doctoral students to attract serious research professors. We don’t want to see our career (research) opportunities limited simply because we are at UAA and not at UAF. Productive faculty will consider leaving the University if they do not feel valued by the administration.</p>
27	<p>Nevertheless, the extent to which training, course materials, supervision and evaluation are consistent across the campuses, and sometimes even inside campuses, is in doubt. This is an issue that UA must address, as it speaks to academic quality and maintenance of standards. It is possible that resolution of some of these matters might involve collective bargaining issues, but they do need to be addressed.</p>	33	
28	<p>The UAFT agreement recognizes that community college, community campus and vocational-technical college faculty are different individuals with different responsibilities. We agree and note that the differing missions and scope of these units is one of the reasons why it would be wise to differentiate further the four-year institutions (UAF, UAA and UAS) from the UAFT-oriented units, and administer them and record their results separately.</p>	34	<p>The UAFT CBA does NOT say that they are different with different responsibilities. The UAFT represents faculty on various campuses. If they think that UA needs to differentiate campuses based on union affiliation, why did they eliminate the community colleges (except for PWSCC)? Also, administrative structure should not be based on union affiliation.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
29	Further, we cannot help but note that UAF, UAA and UAS would not be savaged so much in national rating systems if their retention and graduation numbers did not include students from the community campuses who have not already earned an associate degree. We regard this as a win-win proposition for all concerned and recommend that the President move in this direction.	34	
30	We recommend that the President give very strong consideration to negotiating changes in the CBA that will provide more faculty salary flexibility among the institutions and that UAF be accorded a different set of peer institutions that more closely fits its doctoral research role.	35-36	So lets see. UAA cannot be a doctoral institution because UAF is a doctoral institution and UAF should get higher faculty salary because they are a doctoral institution. That's a very circular argument. This appears to be further justification for maintaining a situation where UAA cannot develop doctoral programs. This approach will mean that "salary flexibility" will thus be unevenly applied given that not all UAF faculty have a research component in their workload. Therefore, it does not make sense to accord a different set of peer institutions to the UAF faculty as a whole.
31	We have two recommendations with respect to the UNAC CBA. First, the President should work to increase the share of the total salary pie devoted to market and merit raises. If the State and the University truly believe in excellence, then they should reward it.	37	The difficulty, of course, is how one defines merit. Is this intended to provide power to define merit via a shared governance model, or to place all of the power to define merit in the hands of an arbitrarily selected group of administrators? Why do they not recommend rewarding the same things for UAFT faculty?
32	Second, the President should end the situation where one external salary survey (the Oklahoma State University study) applies equally to all three MAUs. As we detail below, this has worked distinctly to the disadvantage of UAF, which realistically has a very different set of peer institutions than UAA and UAS. Further, it also sometimes has resulted in a strange pattern of faculty raises that one administrator has labeled "anti-merit".	37	The University does not use one comparator for all faculty at UAA but should. Salary comparators should not be based on union affiliation

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
33	<p>Regardless, we recommend that the President commission a new faculty salary study that compares UAF, UAA and UAS faculty salaries to those at carefully selected peer group institutions for each MAU. UAF, UAA and UAS each should have the opportunity to participate in a new and updated selection of peer group institutions, which should reflect comparable size, missions, programs, research output, etc. The goal should be to substitute MAU-specific peer groups for the Oklahoma State University salary study and to amend the CBA as necessary. Such a new analysis should take into account of cost of living differentials and attention also should be given to differing supply/demand conditions, academic discipline, level of programs, and external market factors. Coincidentally, such a study also will present an opportunity to examine if the University has any protected class salary problems relating to gender or ethnic origin. If, after adjusting for relevant other factors, such an analysis leads to the conclusion that salary adjustments need to be made for either individuals or groups, then the President should recommend a plan to the Regents to do so and make it a priority in collective bargaining.</p>	40	<p>The data that is referenced in the lead-in to this recommendation doesn't actually support the report's claims about UA faculty salaries or rather, the data presented seems to support the claims, but the conclusion is flawed due to a questionable approach to the data. Comparing UA faculty salaries to salaries at peer institutions is good, and comparing costs of living in Alaskan cities with those elsewhere is good, but doing them separately distorts the picture. In order for the comparisons to be valid, the report shouldn't have compared salaries at UAA to universities in small cities (read: lower salaries), but then compared Anchorage's cost of living to large cities (read: higher costs of living). This is the sort of error that would result in a paper being summarily rejected from a quantitative journal; that the writers of this report considered it acceptable here raises questions about the rigor of any of the analyses in the report.</p> <p>Specifically, the Fisher Report compares Anchorage to several Western US cities, a Western US average, and a US average. It doesn't compare Anchorage's CPI to a comparable city. The Western and National averages are pushed higher by very expensive and very large urban areas. According to the data in the Fisher Report, Anchorage will not appear to be too expensive to a job candidate from New York or San Francisco, however, our cost of living would be considered outrageous to a candidate from many cities in the midwest. When Anchorage is compared to cities of comparable populations, it is a totally different story. Anchorage is approximately 30% more expensive than those comparable cities.</p> <p>In any event, if such a study is commissioned, it needs to take into account not just institutional characteristics, but also community characteristics.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
34	We strongly commend the Alaska Scholars program, but nevertheless recommend that the President probe its effectiveness along with the University's other financial aid programs. To wit, precisely how successful are all of the University's scholarship programs in terms of retaining and graduating awardees and how many awardees subsequently remain in the state if they graduate? Are there notable difference between and among the academic disciplines in terms of Alaska Scholars attractiveness and success? Would it make more sense to offer more (fewer) scholarships with higher (lower) stipends? Should an attempt be made to endow the well-regarded UA Scholars Program?	42	Any increase in student scholarship programs would be a good idea, due to the increasing cost of tuition.
35	We pose these questions in the context of what we believe should be a general examination of how the University utilizes its scarce scholarship funds. Ideally, the University will expend its limited scholarship funds strategically in order to attain specific goals. Software now exists that permits institutions to vary their scholarship and financial aid offers in order to reach certain goals, e.g., maximization of enrollment, or other magnitudes such as SAT scores, retention, graduation, etc. We recommend that UA explore such software. This would permit intelligent strategic decision-making with respect to enrollment.	42	We are somewhat sceptical about the simplistic claim that we only need to have this software and change financial aid to have higher retention and graduation rate.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
36	<p>“Bureaucratic” is an adjective often utilized by UA students to describe their interactions with the University. Many would like more variety and improved quality in the food selections they may choose from; more and less expensive parking; and, more responsive financial aid service from individuals “who sometimes regard us as adversaries.” These are items that UA should work on, though in truth these complaints differ little in tenor and amount from those one hears on nearly any state university campus. If there is a difference here, it is that the University’s retention and graduation rates are sufficiently low (see below) that the University really does need to determine why so many of its students drop out.</p>	43	<p>As we mentioned in our comments to the previous recommendation, we are somewhat sceptical about the simplistic claim that we only need to have this software and change financial aid to have higher retention and graduation rate.</p>
37	<p>In general, students typically spoke in favor of strictly designated fees, whether for additional computer work stations, more Internet bandwidth, additional on-campus entertainment, or intercollegiate athletics. We recommend that the President explore such possibilities with student leaders and determine what, if any, designated fees students might favor in order to improve the quality of their lives at the University.</p>	43	<p>Student fees should be used in the area for which they are intended.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
38	<p>A host of factors can be deduced to account for the disappointing retention and graduation performance of University of Alaska students. The most important appears to be the fact that all three major MAU campuses also function as community colleges and technical institutes. As such, they enroll a wide variety of students who variously have no intent of obtaining a degree, or already know they will move, or are under prepared. Distinctive history and culture, financial pressures and the state's weather possibly all may play a role. It is clear that one reason some students depart from UA is the comparative absence of campus-based, need-based student financial aid.</p>	45	<p>The "it is clear" in the last sentence of this recommendation implies that some sort of comprehensive study has been done, but we see no reference to it in the report. Was such a survey done, or is the committee extrapolating from a small number of anecdotes here?</p> <p>Why students begin studies and then disappear is a good question. We are not sure what "actual data" Fisher et al are suggesting. One would be at a loss to figure out how to collect it besides surveying students who have left, and they are not always easy to find.</p> <p>In part we are using the wrong data. 6 year grad rates are based on first time, full-time freshmen. However the average student age at UAA is 30, only 35 % are full time. 80% work, many full time.(p. 41 of the Fisher Report).</p> <p>There are a wide variety of reasons why students drop out of UAA, e.g. financial, academic, lack of interest. Some students transfer to "outside" universities and obtain degrees there. These students are not tracked. Certainly, more can and should be done to support students. However, this recommendation assumes (and it is a widespread assumption these days) that ensuring college completion for every admitted student, or at least the vast majority of them, should be the goal of every postsecondary institution. Despite that, though, there is also something to be said for college acting as a sort of "quality control" mechanism. That is, if grades actually are intended to mean something, and if it is expected that it can be possible to fail a course, then one would expect that some students will not make it through what is supposed to be a rigorous experience. This is naturally even more the case at an open access university like UAA, where there are inherently fewer filters on the preparedness of entering students.</p>
39	<p>At the end of the day, it is apparent that UAF, UAA and UAS in many ways are not comparable to many of the state universities to which they are compared. Nevertheless, it is incumbent on the University to do more than it has to find out why the University falls short in this arena and take remedial steps.</p>	45	<p>If these Universities are not comparable, then why compare them? Also the last sentence is an example of a category of statements which are basically sound but not very profound.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
40	We strongly recommend that the President of the University of Alaska make the improvement of student retention and graduation one of his very highest priorities in the next few years. The focus should be upon discerning facts, causes and remedies. To ignore this problem is to waste the resources both of students and the State of Alaska.	45	It certainly is a widespread assumption that student retention and graduation rates are a crucial measure of the strength of a university, but this is generally phrased as an assertion without evidence (as it is in this report). However, 100% retention and graduation rates could well signal a university that expects no learning or other work from its students (aside, perhaps, from the payment of tuition). This seems to be an area where the individual campuses are best situated to examine the circumstances that are contributing to retention and graduation problems, rather than have this be a centralized task.
41	Alaskans now are among the most lightly taxed citizens in the country and changing this circumstance will neither occur quickly, nor without substantial political carnage. While such discussions occur, however, state financial support for the University of Alaska could dwindle. The University should anticipate such circumstances and begin to model less generous budgets. Unfortunately, we observe the strategic plans of UAF, UAA and UAS largely do not appear to reflect such possibilities and appear to assume, or at least hope for, worlds worthy of Dr. Pangloss.	47	We do not think the subject of taxes is appropriate here.
42	repetitive financial cuts at the margin on all programs spread mediocrity. In the long-term, we believe it would be far better that the University completely eliminate whole programs and departments in order to sustain its support for its most vital and highest quality programs.	47	This recommendation has huge implications, but as is so often the case in this document, it is woefully short on guidance. We would be interested, for example, to learn what the writers of the report consider to be the characteristics of "most vital and highest quality programs". Without such details, this recommendation is not implementable in any coherent way. Eliminating programs that were "underperforming" was under consideration in the mid 90s. One has to be careful to maintain programs that contribute to a well-rounded education.
43	We point this out because UA is not without needs and might well find it attractive to float bonds for student housing or other revenue-generating activities in the future. Suffice it to say that the UA System has the ability to do so though this would require some reallocations.	47 - 48	

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
44	President Gamble and the Regents should bear this in mind as they consider reorganization. System administrators portray the classic “We’re from the government and we’re here to help you,” attitude, commented a sarcastic administrator. “Sometimes they just come looking for work and problems,” commented a faculty member. We deal with recommended reorganizations of the UA System in another section. It is sufficient here to note that the major place in the UA System where commentators see inefficiency is in the UA System Central Office. Whether or not fair, this is a widely held view. .	49	Finally someone says this. How long has it taken for someone to spell “administrative bloat”? It is worth noting that the biggest need for reorganization is at statewide where many dollars are spent and few students are served.
45	We recommend that the President charge appropriate staff with the investigation of public/private partnership possibilities with respect to housing, but also with respect to a variety of other activities that might be carried out jointly (including partially privatized services, joint research and development projects, real estate developments, etc.). The President and the Board ultimately might opt not to do any of these things, but nevertheless should make themselves aware of the potential benefits and costs before it makes its choices.	50	Public-private partnerships have some advantages, but they have several disadvantages, as well, ranging from the easily measurable (e.g., the inclusion of a profit motive often drives up the cost to consumers or employees) to those difficult to measure (e.g., conflicts resulting from differences in institutional culture). It is worth noting that universities might be able to gauge the positive and negative aspects of such ventures better than many organizations, as long as they find a way to tap into the knowledge base of their own faculty, specifically those faculty with expertise in the subject.
46	UAS does not compete in intercollegiate athletics, a circumstance we do not believe should change. While intercollegiate athletic teams might improve UASs identity, community support and student recruitment, they usually bring with them a variety of problems and expenses. Their operating costs would be high and initiating teams would require major investments and general fund tax subsidies for facilities, staff and travel. This seems an ill-advised course to follow at this stage in UAS’s development.	51	

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
47	At the end of the day, however, we recommend that the respective campus chancellors keep a close eye both on programmatic expenses in intercollegiate athletics and the amount of time student athletes are unable to attend scheduled classes because of their lengthy road trips. Intercollegiate athletics have gotten more presidents and chancellors into trouble than virtually anything other than presidential houses. Vigilance, good hiring and observable interest in each university's teams will go a long way toward avoiding scandals.	52	
48	While the recipe might differ in other states, there are sound reasons in the case of Alaska to centralize programmatic approvals, technology standards and related major technology resource decisions (such as the adoption of common student, employee and financial records systems), the allocation of capital and buildings, the assessment and formulation of budget requests, the overall allocation of maintenance reserve funds, negotiation of collective bargaining agreements (though we see no reason why each MAU might not have its own CBA and be heavily involved in that negotiation) and fringe benefit programs.	53	What are these "sound reasons"? The answer to this question, and it is an important one, is unclear from the report. UA does have a System Academic Council that reviews new programs, and decides which programs to send to the BOR for approval. We do not agree it would be a good idea for each MAU to have their own CBA.
49	On the other hand, there is no persuasive reason why individual professorial and employee evaluations, nearly all hiring, college and departmental budgets, faculty promotion and tenure, disciplinary specific curricular decisions, the provision of student services, alumni activities, fund raising and most institutional research should be centralized. Individual campuses are much closer to the action.	53 - 54	We agree. UAA, UAS and UAF are separately accredited universities. It makes no sense to have faculty evaluations, curriculum, and faculty promotion and tenure reviews done at the statewide level,

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
50	<p>Note that much greater individual campus autonomy often is sensible in states that boast much larger financial and population bases and multiple large metropolitan areas. In such circumstances, competition among institutions and the development of distinctive, specialized campuses often is highly desirable. Plainly speaking, we do not believe the State of Alaska has sufficient population and resources to permit such unrestrained competition.</p>	54	<p>It is unclear why the committee draws this conclusion. This is particularly the case given that earlier recommendations seem to assume that there is enough competition between UAF, UAA, and UAS that students could easily move from the one to the other when, e.g., they change majors (see recommendation #2). Why are the campuses seen as being in close competition in those cases, but not when it comes to campuses developing their own missions? This paradox is never resolved in the report.</p>
51	<p>The command and control regulatory model that the UA System has is perceived to have adopted over the past decade is in need of clarification and modification. “The statewide people act like they’re listening, but in reality they’ve already made up their minds and they’re simply trying to look reasonable” (the telling comment of an administrator whose sentiment was oft repeated). Rather than issue obiter dicta from Fairbanks, the UA System administration henceforth should emphasize well-designed incentives (often financial, though sometimes in the form of privileges relating to processes and local decision-making) to its institutions. The institutions will respond if the incentives are intelligently designed, clear and the process is not polluted. They need not be dragooned into certain behaviors. Indeed, they will increase their entrepreneurial behavior if incentives exist for them to do so. We note in passing that entrepreneurial behavior sometimes has been in short supply in the Alaska system of higher education. In any case, institutions predictably react negatively to, and even actively subvert, fiat that seem not to recognize their individual circumstances.</p>	54	<p>It states that incentives will inspire “entrepreneurial behavior”. What exactly is entrepreneurial behavior in higher education? We always have plenty of new ideas. It is a truism to state that incentives will simply inspire behavior moving toward the direction that the incentives point. This is not entrepreneurial behavior, this is simply a rational response to a directive stimulus.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
52	Increasingly, UA Systems executive staff, under the authority of the President, should act as staff to the Board and provide them with analysis and recommendations rather than wielding final administrative authority. If all parties behave intelligently, mutual respect will follow. We note here that central board staff often have earned the respect in similar situations in other states.	54	The Fisher Report seems to recommend in two different places that the “Administration” should be the handmaidens of the Board of Regents. The result will be that that the Board of Regents, who are politically appointed individuals, would then be micromanaging the entire system. To be sure, the Board of Regents should set the overall mission and goals. However, the Fisher Report appears to see micromanagement by the BOR as a benefit and encourages it be enhanced. If this is in fact the intent of this recommendation, this is a highly problematic model.
53	One of the more productive functions that the refashioned central staff might accomplish is to encourage the development of joint and cooperative academic programs within the system. The clinical/community psychology doctoral program provides a template for such programs. Courses, faculty and support are shared and students have the ability to benefit from a much larger portfolio of resources and specialties. With appropriate incentives, we are convinced that a variety of other programs could be mounted in the same fashion. We also note in passing that this constitutes a very nice way to provide UAA with additional advanced graduate responsibilities without granting it free-standing doctoral program authority and the concomitant additional costs that inevitably would accompany such a development.	55	Where the report uses the phrase “this constitutes a very nice way to provide UAA with additional advanced graduate responsibilities without granting it free-standing doctoral program authority”, one could easily instead read “this constitutes a very effective way to deny UAA any independence with regard to doctoral program authority”. The phrasing used by the report’s authors sounds more generous, certainly, but the actual effects of both phrasings would be the same.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
54	The model we have outlined here assumes that the size of the current UA central staff may be reduced, perhaps in the target range of 60 to 80 positions (down from an estimated 200 today). Note that Virginia, which has a highly regarded public system of higher education, maintains a State Commission for Higher Education with a staff approximating 40. The Virginia system, of course, is less bureaucratic and more entrepreneurially oriented than the UA System. We recommend that the Board allocate some of these savings to the MAUs, some to the support of community college/vocational/technical education, and that some be retained to help provide incentives to encourage desired future behavior.	55	We agree that SW administration is bloated, and that many of the positions can be cut without a negative impact on operations.
55	Recognizing this, the major change we have to recommend is to accord UA's vocational, technical and community college activities much greater prominence and not viewed as "four-year lite" (the observation of a sometimes frustrated individual associated with workforce development).	55	Workforce Development and technical/vocational programs are important to the state economy. These days, these programs usually require computer/mathematics/communication skills.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
56	<p>We do not believe tuition and fees at the community colleges/community campuses/vocational/technical units should be identical to that at the senior campuses. Indeed, they should be lower. Further, the statistical results associated with the community colleges/community campuses/vocational/technical units should be reported independently of the senior colleges. This will cure a variety of external visibility and ranking problems.</p> <p>In addition, in the state's two largest metropolitan areas, formal, named community colleges should be created. In the case of Fairbanks, the Tanana Valley campus already serves some of these purposes. These campuses should permit UAF and UAA to begin slowly to increase their admissions standards and to focus student services. Note that the creation of these community college units definitely does not imply the construction of new campuses.</p>	56	<p>In 1987 Anchorage Community College merged with the University of Alaska, Anchorage due to a budget crisis. It took an enormous amount of time and energy to merge curriculum and departments. We cannot imagine splitting departments, and starting all over again.</p> <p>Standards can be imposed for programs. Many of the vocational/technical programs are nationally accredited, and have very high admission standards. The Tanana Valley Campus in Fairbanks is now named the UAF Community & Technical College. UAA has a Community & Technical College.</p> <p>Regarding tuition, at least at UAA, something related is already being done: Tuition is lower for lower-division courses than for upper-division courses. The writers of the report do not seem to evaluate whether they find this approach an acceptable policy or not. This recommendation of Fisher sets up a system of 2nd class citizens relating to faculty, students, etc. It is divisive and causes friction between departments, how courses transfer, etc. We are not sure what the problems are that they are trying to fix regarding ranking, etc. This is an example of academic elitism. They show their total lack of understanding of the system and the region.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
57	<p>The lesson of best practice advancement across all institutional types is three-fold. Members of governing boards must assume responsibility for the advancement effort; it cannot be completely delegated to presidents, no matter how pivotal a role they must play. Second, the governing board, the president, and the professional(s) in charge of the basic functions of advancementnamely alumni relations, communications (incorporating university and government relations), and fund- raisingmust work as an integrated team. Every function (alumni, public relations, et. al.) must be related in terms of attracting resources (dollars). Finally, the professionals in charge of these three principal advancement functions must be forward-thinking and broadly competent professionals who enjoy the respect of the academic community they exist to serve. The absence of any one of these characteristics will seriously weaken any institutional advancement program.</p>	59	
58	<p>New Foundation Board of Directors members should be recruited and trained to take responsibility for the fundraising performance of the University.</p>	60	
59	<p>We suggest a reorganization along the following lines: the office of the President should be the prime agent for corporate research working in close conjunction with the several campuses but virtually all other fund raising activities should be housed in the separate campuses. Typically, alumni and others do not give to systems; indeed, the UA System office is not accredited. Their prime loyalty and sense of obligation is to their individual alma maters, but we note here that whatever, thoughtful consideration should be given to Curt Simic's recommendations.</p>	61	

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
60	The key to private support is relatively simple: do it “right” and support will be forthcoming, and it has not been done “right” in Alaska. The national average for alumni giving is over 17 percent, and some institutions go as high as 60 to 70 percent. The alumni giving percentage is the prime denominator for effective planned giving, capital campaigns and even corporate support. The President and the three Chancellors must each take thoughtful note of this. There are countless publications and conferences available, and Alaska, with its extraordinary academic culture, will be an ideal place to raise support for public higher education. There is only one private institution, Alaska Pacific, and it is relatively small but has a president who appears to appreciate the methodology of fund raising.	63	UAA is an economic engine for Alaska and Anchorage. This should be stressed more, because many people think we are a drain on state resources.
61	We recommend staffing the program as necessary and then carefully monitoring the costs. As a guideline, every new dollar spent should generate additional revenues of \$6 to \$8 over time.	63	
62	We recommend the employment of an appropriate firm to conduct a feasibility study for a capital campaign. Such a study, independently and anonymously conducted, will test the University’s case for private support and help to determine the level of interest by current and prospective donors in providing funding through a comprehensive campaign.	63	More consultation? Wasted money.
63	An immediate major gifts and planned giving effort, coupled with the implementation of new processes, should lead to a prompt and positive impact on the “bottom line,” engaging alumni and friends in the future of the University while setting the stage for successive campaigns.	63	

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
64	<p>What is required, then, is a much more analytical, even hard-hearted evaluation of alumni activities and personnel. The bottom line is that either the events and the personnel demonstrably improve the University of Alaska's position, or they should be modified or abandoned. We recommend that each campus analyze its alumni events and personnel to determine the extent to which there is evidence that they actually further UA objectives, particularly alumni and fund raising. As noted below, as is often the case in "the lower 48," we recommend that each of the campus alumni officers be primarily responsible for the annual fund.</p>	66	
65	<p>Additional opportunities remain in creating focus, use of graphics and photography and in targeting future students and families as well as in cross-marketing, using print publications to drive audiences to the excellent website, among others.</p>	67	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72
66	<p>Opportunities to strengthen the System website include stronger use of photography for impact (a need in many publications, as well), a direct link to admissions information for prospective students and families (although it is likely that many would go first to the individual campus sites, which do provide such links) and more interactive features to encourage repeat visits. Many photos on the home page are run too small for maximum impact, and this is also true in many publications. Best practice is fewer photos run larger. Quality of some photos is also mediocre, with too many posed shots of people and not enough showing genuine interaction.</p>	68	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
67	Publications appearing to target potential students and families feature a secondary tagline, “Learn, engage, change” (University of Alaska Southeast). This, plus a more consistent brand and family look, might be encouraged throughout publications of constituent campuses. For out of state students, who represent a strong source of higher tuition revenue, the advantages of studying in a diverse, outdoors-oriented Pacific Rim environment could appeal to students in many disciplines.	70	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72
68	Photography is an area that needs to be addressed throughout. As noted, many photos are run too small for impact. Too many are obviously posed, showing either no or little interaction, with subjects staring directly into the camera. In others, such as the front page of the Winter 2009 System newsletter, shots of equipment appear with no people for context. Some photos could benefit from tighter cropping. An upgrade in this area would benefit the entire publications and web areas.	70	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72
69	System Newsletter. In addition to enhanced photography, as noted above, high-priority needs for this publication are reduced word counts to avoid a cluttered look and to enhance readability and a less static, more contemporary design.	70	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
70	On the front page, for example, the “Inside This Issue” sidebar is much too copy-heavy, discouraging readers from venturing inside. Simple bullets without text would be more effective. Inside features such as “Partnering with business and industry” (pages 2-3, Winter 2009 edition) similarly contain too much “gray”. Use of bolding, sub-heads and larger boxes/screens would make this spread more reader-friendly. Photos without people are uninviting and lack context, and cutlines are too small to read. Call-outs should be run larger with enhanced spacing and leading. Photos bled off the edges of the page would create a less “boxy” look while allowing for greater impact. The use of phone numbers, websites and e-mail addresses to drive readers to the relevant site at the bottom of the page is effective, but could be run one or two points larger.	70	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72
71	Even given budgetary constraints requiring two-color, the second color could be used more effectively in boxes, graduated screens, sidebars and spot color. If budget permits one color signature inside, it would enhance the graphic appearance. More illustration and graphics, in addition to photos, would enhance readability and break up copy.	71	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72
72	Generic 4-Panel Color Publication. The entire piece, however, appears cluttered, with too much copy and some point sizes too small to read easily. Either a panel needs to be added, or copy needs to be cut in length.	72	Same problem here of micromanaging- recommendations # 65- #72

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
73	Facts, Not Fiction This piece is extraordinarily effective graphically, with an attractive color palette and excellent content. If it is not presented online, it should be, perhaps as rotating images on the front page. Other uses for the “Did You Knows?” could be explored - perhaps as tent cards at System-sponsored events, on the back of business cards, as sidebars in the newsletter, etc.	72	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
74	University of Alaska at a Glance. Again, some of this information “successes in efficiency” could be presented on a rotating basis on the homepage. Copy on the back panel is crowded, and the graphic, “State Appropriation Comparison” run too small to be easily read.	72	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
75	Training Tomorrows Workforce Today. The same comments made above about point size of the font, reduced word counts and use of colored screens behind copy to break up “gray” apply to his publication. Copy reversed over some sidebars with colored screens is difficult to read because of small type and lack of contrast. While the color palette and use of second, third and fourth colors are effectively graphically, design must always support content and messages.	72 - 73	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
76	In addition, while some photos are excellent, well-composed and well-cropped, most are run too small to be effective. Use of bullets to summarize key messages is effective, particularly on the back cover, a space often wasted in publications.	73	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
77	In this and other publications, thought should be given to using them as vehicles to driving audiences to the excellent System website, permitting reduced word counts with additional information available online.	73	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
78	Most publications reviewed are those of the University of Alaska Southeast. Key messages and graphic identity need to be better integrated with those of the System to cross-market the brand. This appears to have been done effectively with campus and the System websites, but individual campus publications need to be taken to the next level.	73 - 74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
79	In regard to family look and graphic identity, the UA System logo should appear in a position subordinate to that of the individual campus identity; color palette and design template need to complement that of other campus and System publications.	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
80	With regard to messaging and targeting of key audiences, the Alaska Southeast pieces are unfocused and do not seem to target out-of-state students who might enroll because of unparalleled opportunities to live and study in a vast wilderness area that offers opportunities for recreation and fitness not easily found in “the lower 48.”	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
81	Recruiting publications targeting potential students, families and referral sources need to showcase academic programs building on Alaskas unique strengths and capabilities, creating interest and excitement among out-of-state students. In addition, outcomes should be more strongly emphasized: what can a student gain from a UA education that he or she might not obtain from an out-of-state institution? System campuses might consider adding a dedicated “outcomes” page to their websites, with a link from the System site.	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
82	Finally, the System might consider investing in a comprehensive publications audit (CASE and others will undertake these free of charge) and also reviewing CASE and other award winners in the “admissions” area to enhance its offerings.	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
83	We recommend that the System and the individual campuses generate new strategic plans that accurately reflect their respective missions, are realistic in terms of their financial implications, and clearly indicate funds sources, responsibility for implementation, and time lines for implementation and assessment.	76	Is this just a problem with terminology? Strategic plans are big-picture plans, with details such as timelines and specific implementation plans left to other sets of plans that derive from them. If the Fisher Committee is actually stating that there should be no big-picture plans to give the general outlines for the specific planning they describe here, then we find this recommendation problematic. If it’s just a terminology confusion, then this is sensible, as long as there is still a means for more general planning to take place.
84	In our view, however, before additional strategic planning occurs, it is essential that action be taken to clarify the missions of the respective institutions and that it deal explicitly with the future roles of UAF and UAA.	77	How this occurs, the process that is identified and used to accomplish this clarification, needs to be one that does not put UAA at a disadvantage. Assumptions that guide the process need to be made explicit and critiqued in an impartial manner.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
85	<p>We recommend that the President and the Board of Regents meet with the Governor, legislative leaders and citizens throughout the state to outline the full implications of the deferred maintenance challenge and to propose solutions. It is the obligation of the state to maintain its physical assets; that is clear. However, the state's willingness to invest in that obligation might increase if the UA System were to propose some substitutions of refurbished, energy efficient buildings for new construction, greater use of technology and distance learning to serve additional students, and a significant reduction in the size of the UA System office. The possibility of earmarked student fees for maintenance of classroom buildings also should be explored, provided the state at least matches student contributions. Proposals of this ilk may antagonize some parties. Nevertheless, action is needed and both the size of the deferred maintenance problem and the likelihood that the state's financial position will deteriorate in the next few years require innovative solutions and compromise.</p>	77-78	<p>Deferred maintenance is a huge issue. Students, staff and faculty appreciate a work environment that is comfortable so that they can work at maximum efficiency. We think deferred maintenance should be disallowed.</p>

Program/Course Action Request

A. CAS

Chg	ASL A101	Elementary American Sign Language I (4 cr) (4+0) (GERC)
Chg	ASL A102	Elementary American Sign Language II (4 cr) (4+0) (GERC)
Chg	ASL A201	Intermediate American Sign Language I (4 cr) (4+0) (GERC)
Chg	ASL A202	Intermediate American Sign Language II (4 cr) (4+0) (GERC)
Chg	BIOL A425	Mammalogy (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	JPC A446	Magazine Editing & Production II (3 cr) (2+2)
Chg		Bachelor of Arts, Journalism and Public Communication
Chg	MATH A105	Intermediate Algebra (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	PHYS A123L	Basic Physics I Laboratory (1 cr) (0+3)
Chg	PHYS A124L	Basic Physics II Laboratory (1 cr) (0+3)
Chg	PHYS A211L	General Physics I Laboratory (1 cr) (0+3)
Chg	PHYS A212L	General Physics II Laboratory (1 cr) (0+3)
Chg	SOC A407	Power in the Workplace: The Sociology of Formal Organizations (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	THR A195	Theatre Practicum: Performance (1- 3 cr) (0+3-9) (stacked with THR A395)
Chg	THR A329	Combat for the Stage (3 cr) (2+3)
Chg	THR A395	Advanced Practicum: Performance (1- 3 cr) (0+3-9) (stacked with THR A195)
Chg		Theatre and Dance, Bachelor of Arts

B. CBPP

Chg	ACCT A430	Governmental and Not-For-Profit Accounting
-----	-----------	--

C. CTC

Chg	AIRS A101	Foundations of the United States Air Force I (1 cr) (1+0)
Chg	AIRS A102	Foundations of the United States Air Force II (1 cr) (1+0)
Chg	AIRS A150	US Air Force Leadership Laboratory (1 cr) (0+4)
Chg	AIRS A201	Evolution of USAF Air and Space Power I (2 cr) (2+0)
Chg	AIRS A202	Evolution of USAF Air and Space Power II (2 cr) (2+0)
Chg	AIRS A301	US Air Force Leadership and Management I (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	AIRS A302	US Air Force Leadership and Management II (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	AIRS A401	National Security Affairs I (3 cr) (3+0)

Chg	AIRS A402	National Security Affairs II (3 cr) (3+0)
Add		Minor, National Defense, Strategic Studies, and Leadership: Air Force Emphasis
Chg	CA A223	Catering Management (2 cr) (1+4)
Chg		Hospitality and Restaurant Management
Add	DN A150	Nutrition Through the Life Cycle (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg		Dietetics, BS
Chg		Nutrition, BS
Chg	MILS A150	Army ROTC Leadership Lab (1 cr) (0+4)
Add	MILS A250	History of the United States Army (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	MILS A301	Adaptive Team Leadership (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	MILS A302	Applied Team Leadership (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	MILS A401	Adaptive Leadership (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	MILS A402	Leadership in a Complex World (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg		Army ROTC
Add		Minor, National Defense, Strategic Studies, and Leadership: Army Emphasis
Add	PEP A182	Technology in Health, Physical Education & Recreation (1 cr) (1+0)
Add	PEP A183	Wellness Principles (1 cr) (1+0)
Add	PEP A184	Fundamental Motor Skills (1 cr) (1+0)
Chg	PEP A262	Foundations of Outdoor Recreation (3 cr) (2+2)
Add	PEP A264	Recreation Program Planning and Evaluation (3 cr) (2+2)
Add	PEP A280	Leadership in Health, Physical Education & Recreation (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	PEP A281	Leadership in Activities for Diverse Populations (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A282	Leadership in Inactive Activities (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A283	Leadership Aquatic Activities (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A284	Leadership in Fitness Activities (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A285	Leadership in Team Activities (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A286	Leadership in Individual and Dual Activities (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A287	Leadership in Outdoor Recreation Activities (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A288	Leadership in Rhythmic Activities (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A363	Natural History Interpretation and Environmental Education (3 cr) (2+2)

Del	PEP A452	Challenges in Health and Fitness Leadership (1 cr) (1+0)
Chg	PEP A453	Health Promotion (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	PEP A454	Exercise Testing and Prescription (4 cr) (3+2)
Chg	PEP A455	Cardiac Rehabilitation and Special Populations (4 cr) (3+2)
Chg	PEPA464	Outdoor Recreation Administration (3 cr) (3+0.5)
Chg	PEP A467C	Land-Based Outdoor Leadership (2 cr) (0.5+3)
Chg	PEP A467D	Water-Based Outdoor Leadership (2 cr) (0.5+3)
Chg	PER A146	Beginning Rock Climbing (1 cr) (0.5+1)
Chg	PER A147	Beginning Ice Climbing (1 cr) (0.5+1)
Add	PER A150	Water Safety and Rescue (1 cr) (0.5+1)
Chg	PER A151	Beginning Canoeing (1 cr) (0+.5+1)
Chg	PER A152	Beginning River Rafting (1 cr) (0.5+1)
Chg	PER A153	Beginning Sea Kayaking (1 cr) (0.5+1)
Chg	PER A164	Skiing Alaska's Backcountry (2 cr) (1+2)
Add	PER A165	Avalanche Hazard Recognition and Evaluation (1 cr) (0.5+1)
Chg	PER A169	Four-Season Backpacking (3 cr) (1+4.5)
Chg	PER A181	Crevasse Rescue Techniques (1 cr) (0.5+1)
Chg	PER A246	Intermediate Rock Climbing (2 cr) (1+2.5)
Chg	PER A252	Intermediate River Rafting (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PER A253	Intermediate Sea Kayaking (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg		Bachelor of Science, Physical Education
Chg		Minor, Physical Education
Chg		Minor, Outdoor Leadership
Chg		Minor, Health & Fitness Leadership
Add		Occupational Endorsement Certificate, Outdoor Leadership

UAB Motions for Faculty Senate: April 1, 2011

1. UAB recommends the following revision to the Curriculum Handbook (Page 43) to clarify the intent of Box 13a on the CAR (Impacted Courses and Programs).

Do NOT complete Box 13a for new courses.

The intent of Box 13a is twofold:

1. To provide a list of all courses, programs, college requirements, and catalog copy that contain reference to the course under revision in the current UAA catalog. This includes the initiating department.
2. To document coordination* with impacted programs and departments.

If the course revision impacts the program catalog copy of the initiating department, a Program/Prefix Action Request must be completed and submitted with track-changed catalog copy. The current catalog copy in Word is available on the Governance website (www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance)

In order to find courses and programs impacted by this revision, use the .pdf file provided on the Office of the Registrar's website (<http://uaa.alaska.edu/records/catalogs/catalogs.cfm>). Open the link to the latest catalog and use the find function in Adobe to search for the course prefix and number. **You should fill out a line of the table for every program, course, or college requirement that the revised course appears in.**

Three or fewer lines (impacts) can be recorded directly into the table on the CAR. **More than three requires the creation of a separate coordination spreadsheet** is required listing the impacted programs or courses, the specific impact (e.g. program requirement, program selective**, credits required, prerequisite, corequisite, registration restriction), current catalog page, type and date of coordination, and the name of the department chair/coordinator contacted. An example of the Box13a. spreadsheet can be found on the Governance website at <http://uaa.alaska.edu/governance/coordination/index.cfm>.

Courtesy Coordination

Sometimes coordination with a department or program must occur even though there is no impact in the catalog. The department initiating the proposal is responsible for coordinating with each impacted program chair/coordinator, even if the impact is not found in the catalog. The term *courtesy coordination* can be used to document this type of situation. Type *courtesy coordination* in the table in the catalog page number field.

Items that are NOT entered into Box 13a.

- Do not enter the page number for the revised course itself into the table (e.g., CIS A330 course details and description are listed on page 349 of the catalog. If you are changing CIS A330 you do not have to list this impact and page number).
- You do not have to list impacts to classes that the revised class is stacked or cross listed with if you have already completed Box 12.

* Coordination is the requirement that all initiators of curriculum actions identify and notify all academic units that may be affected by the curriculum change of the precise nature of their proposal. Coordination is always expected between and among affected department chairs/coordinators and deans in Anchorage, as well as directors of community campuses.

** *program selective* - A credit course within a group of courses from which a student is required to select.

Example of Box 13a (Coordination and Courtesy Coordination)

CIS A330 (Database Management Systems)

Impacted Program/Course	Catalog Page(s) Impacted	Date of Coordination	Chair/Coordinator Contacted
BBA, Global Logistics and Supply Chain Management	132	3/25/2011	Philip Price
AAS, Business Computer Information Systems	132	3/25/2011	Minnie Yen
BBA, Management Information Systems	134	3/25/2011	Minnie Yen
Minor, Computer Information Systems	135	3/25/2011	Minnie Yen
CIS A360	350	3/25/2011	Minnie Yen
CIS A410	350	3/25/2011	Minnie Yen
CIS A430	350	3/25/2011	Minnie Yen
BA, BS Computer Science	98-99 (Courtesy Coordination)	3/25/2011	Sam Thiru

2. UAB recommends the following revision to the Curriculum Handbook (Page 45) to clarify the information required in Box 16a of the CAR (Course Prerequisites).

Identifies prerequisites which must be achieved prior to enrolling in a course. The prerequisite course (listed with prefix and number in alpha-numerical order) must be successfully completed prior to taking the course. Course prerequisites should be grouped using parenthesis and brackets similar to how you would group mathematical expressions. See the examples below.

Unless a minimum grade is specified for a prerequisite class, any grade value (*including I, F, and W*) will mark the class as satisfying the prerequisite if prerequisite checking has been turned on. For instance, if a student withdrew from a class and received a W, that student would be identified by Banner as having fulfilled any prerequisite requirement for the class they withdrew from. It is always assumed that faculty may waive the prerequisite or the minimum grade requirement.

A course prerequisite which **may** be taken concurrently must also be included in this box using the additional language "or concurrent enrollment." This differs from a corequisite which should be placed in Box 16c. See the section on Box 16c for detailed information about corequisites.

Prerequisite examples:

ECON A429 (Business Forecasting)

{ CIS A110, BA A273, and [BA A377 or ECON A321]} with minimum grade of C]

EDFN A303 (Foundations of Teaching and Learning)

[EDFN A301 or concurrent enrollment] and [EDSE A212 or PSY A245]

EE A324 (Electromagnetics II)

[EE A314 or PHYS A314] and MATH A302

ENGL A311 (Advanced Composition)

[ENGL A211 or ENGL A212 or ENGL A213 or ENGL A214] with minimum grade of C

FIRE A214 (Fire Protection Systems)

FIRE A101 and FIRE A105 and FIRE A121 and [MATH A105 or MATH A107 or MATH A108 or MATH A109 or MATH A172 or MATH A200 or MATH A201 or MATH A272]

SWK A342 (Human Behavior in the Social Environment)

PSY A150 and [BIOL A102 or BIOL A111 or BIOL A112 or BIOL A115 or BIOL A116 or LSIS A102 or LSIS A201]

Final Purge List for 2011-12 UAA Catalog

SUBJECT COURSE		BANNER COLLEGE	COURSE COURSE TITLE	COURSE EFFECTIVE	LAST TERM OFFERED	Was this course carried over by request from the 2009-10 purge list?	Was this course carried over by request from the 2010-11 purge list?	COMMENTS
PREFIX	COURSE NUMBER	CODE	COURSE TITLE	EFFECTIVE	OFFERED			
Sbcrse Subject								
Code	Sbcrse Crse Number	Sbcrse College Code	Sbcrse Title	Sbcrsy Term Code Start	Sbsect Term Code			
AET	A490	CT	AET Selected Topic	199902	200403	yes	yes	Retain per Ellen McKay
ANTH	A438	AS	Tlingit and Haida Adaptations	199903	200503		yes	Purge - No response
ANTH	A457	AS	Food/Nutrition: Anthro Perspec	199903	200503		yes	stacked w/ANTH A657; Retain per David Yesner
ART	A361	AS	History of Graphic Design	199702			yes	Purge - No response
BIOL	A327	AS	Parasitology	199702	200203	yes	yes	Retain per Doug Causey
CA	A213	CT	Breakfast/Pantry Skill Develop	200301	200503		yes	Purge - No response
CA	A223	CT	Adv Foods:Buffet/Garde Manger	199702	200601		yes	Retain per Timothy Doebler
CE	A688	EN	Snow Engineering	200303	200403	yes	yes	Purge - No response
CS	A207	AS	C Programming	199702	200601		yes	OK to purge per Kanapathi Thiru
CS	A431	AS	Compilers: Concepts/Techniques	199702	200601		yes	Retain per Kanapathi Thiru
CS	A670	AS	Comp Sci for Software Engineer	199702			yes	Retain per Kanapathi Thiru
CS	A671	AS	Advanced Software Engineering	199702	199703		yes	Retain per Kanapathi Thiru
CSE	A465	EN	Network Security	200503			yes	Retain per Grant Baker
DN	A295	CT	Nutritional Care Practicum	200403	200601		yes	Purge - No response
DNCE	A234	AS	Fund of Music-Based Jazz II	200203	200401	yes		Retain per Jill Flanders Crosby
DNCE	A360	AS	Contemp Techniques & Comp Rep	200203	200401	yes		OK to purge per Jill Flanders Crosby
EE	A102	EN	Intro Electrical Engineering	199801	200601		yes	Purge - No response
EE	A314L	EN	Electromagnetics Laboratory I	200503			yes	Retain per Joseph Mixsell
EE	A407	EN	Power Distribution	200503			yes	Retain per Grant Baker
FIRE	A223	CT	Fire Investigation II	200503			yes	Retain per Robin Wahto
GEO	A456	EN	Geomatics/Civil Design	199702	200503		yes	Purge - No response
GEOL	A421	AS	Invertebrate Paleontology	200403	200503		yes	Retain per Lee Ann Munk
GEOL	A482	AS	Geologic Field Investigations	200403	200601		yes	Retain per Lee Ann Munk
GEOL	A690	AS	Graduate Topics in Geology	200401	200601		yes	Retain per Lee Ann Munk
HIST	A310	AS	Renaissance/Reformation Europe	199702	200503		yes	Retain per Bill Myers
HIST	A690	AS	Studies in History	200502	200602		yes	Retain per Bill Myers
HUM	A250	AS	*Myths & Contemporary Culture	199702	200501	yes		Purge - No response; GER course
JUST	A650	HW	Policing Theory and Research	199803	200601		yes	Retain per Andre Rosay
MA	A120B	CT	Intro to Admin Duties	200503			yes	Retain per Robin Wahto
MTP	A154	CT	Comm/Doc for Massage Therapist	200203	200503			Purge - No response
NS	A421	HW	Sexual Assault Resp Team Cert	199802	200602		yes	Purge - No response
NS	A631	HW	Women's Health & Obstetrics I	200401	200503		yes	Retain per Jill Janke
NS	A635	HW	Women's Health & Obstetrics II	200401	200501	yes	yes	Retain per Jill Janke
NS	A636	HW	Focus on Pediatrics II	200403		yes	yes	Retain per Jill Janke
NS	A682	HW	Administrative Services	199702	200501	yes	yes	OK to purge per Jill Janke
NS	A682L	HW	Admin Services Field Work	199702	200501	yes	yes	OK to purge per Jill Janke
NS	A695	HW	Practicum in Health Care Admin	199702	200503		yes	OK to purge per Jill Janke
PSY	A689	AS	Adv Psychological Assessment	199702	200602		yes	Purge - No response
SWK	A669	HW	Group Supervision II	200601	200602		yes	Purge - No response

Final GER Purge List for 2011-12 UAA Catalog

BANNER							
SUBJECT	COURSE	COLLEGE	COURSE	LAST TERM			
PREFIX	NUMBER	CODE	COURSE TITLE	EFFECTIVE	OFFERED	GER TYPE	COMMENTS
<small>Subject</small>	<small>Course</small>	<small>College</small>	<small>Title</small>	<small>Start</small>	<small>Code</small>	<small>Type</small>	<small>Notes</small>
Code	Scbrse Crse Number	Scbrse College Code	Scbrse Title	Scbrky Term Code Start	Sbssect Term Code		
RUSS	A101E	AS	*Elementary Russian I	199702	200603	Humanities	
SPAN	A101E	AS	*Elementary Spanish I	199702	200703	Humanities	
SPAN	A102E	AS	*Elementary Spanish II	199702	200701	Humanities	
SPAN	A201E	AS	*Intermediate Spanish I	199702	200703	Humanities	
HUM	A250	AS	*Myths & Contemporary Culture	199702	200501	Humanities	
HNRS	A490	HC	*Senior Honors Seminar	199703	200803	Integrative Capstone	Retain per Ronald Spatz

Program/Course Action Request

A. CBPP

- Chg ACCT A650 Seminar in Executive Uses of Accounting (3 cr) (3+0)
- Chg ECON A640 Economics of Transportation (3 cr) (3+0)
- Chg PADM A640 Dispute Resolution (3 cr) (3+0)
- Chg PADM A671 Selected Topics in Public Administration (1-3 cr) (1-3+0)

B. CHSW

- Del NS A658 Public Health Policy (3 cr) (3+0)
- Chg School of Nursing Graduate Program
- Del Master of Science, Nursing Science in Health Care Administration

C. COE

- Add EDEN Prefix

Faculty Senate Report
Academic Computing, Distance Learning, and Instructional Technology
ACDLITC

Committee Co-Chairs: M. Angela Dirks and Dave Fitzgerald

Meeting Date: Friday, March 25, 2011 in Rasmuson Hall 204

Committee Members Present:

Angela Dirks, co-chair	Dave Fitzgerald, co-chair	Amy Green
Gail Johnston	Bruno Kappes	Matt Cullin
Liliya Vugmeyster		

1. Updates:

- a. eLearning Work Group – Amy Green provided an update on the eLearning workgroup February’s meeting.
- b. Faculty Training Focus Groups – ACDLITC reviewed the draft report and discussed recommendations. The report will be shared with Faculty Senate after recommendations are incorporated.
- c. Legislative Audit Group and Gap Analysis Workgroup - Bruno reported that the coding initiative is finalized and discussions are now focused on the analysis of programs available online.
- d. ePortfolio Group – Bruno reported on preparations for the ePortfolio summer institute.
- e. University Technology Council (UTC) – UTC did not meet in March.
- f. Distance Education Faculty Handbook – Liliya Vugmeyster and Matt Cullin will change the title to “e-learning” and will provide the final copy for posting on the appropriate websites.
- g. Technology Aided Instruction Task Force – Dave and Angela discussed some of the draft recommendations to be advanced by the taskforce.

2. Next committee meeting: Friday, April 22, 2011 at 9:00 AM, RH 204



Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee

Mark Fitch, Chair

Report to Faculty Senate

Committee Members Attending: no face-to-face meeting in March

1) PBAC

- a) PBAC did not meet during March.
- b) Attached is a document sent to deans and directors when submitting their FY12 budget requests.

2) PBAC Facilities

- a) HSB construction is on schedule for move in starting in July.
- b) Summer construction projects are in various stages. The map indicating locations to avoid is still under construction. Bids have been lower this year helping the university's budget.
- c) Kenai housing
 - i) President Gamble is opposed to the university operating any student housing (location not important). He prefers public/private partnerships for this like the military uses.
 - ii) Discussion continues at the regents.
- d) Sports arena
 - i) Additional data on the traffic issues was presented. State and municipal employees were present to support UAA's case.
 - ii) No decision was made. This is expected after the legislature finishes the capital budget, so we know if the additional money will be provided.
- e) Native arts building (Anchorage)
 - i) Fund raising is underway for this building.
 - ii) Site selection is progressing. A list of sites is available for those who are interested.
- f) Statewide data collection
 - i) Statewide is collecting data on facilities maintenance from all campuses for analysis using a single software package.
 - ii) This should allow easier reporting for use in lobbying and might help with distribution decisions.

**Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee (IULRC)
Monthly Report - March 28, 2011**

Committee activities this month included:

1. Finalization of survey listservs for the Library, COE, and CAS. These listservs included both staff and faculty, and were submitted to the IDEA Center.
2. Notices announcing the survey were prepared and distributed to the faculty and staff, using the above listservs.
3. Due to administrative errors at the IDEA Center, the staff surveys were commenced two weeks early and prior to distributing the above noted announcements. Emails were then authored to the staff explaining the IDEA Center errors. With some irony, this problem has occurred before.
4. During the first week of the survey CAS's dean announced that he will leave UAA shortly. Many CAS staff and faculty thereafter assumed the survey would have little value. However, the opposite is true; the results of this year's CAS survey will be particularly useful to CAS's near term future leadership. Announcements from both the Committee and CAS's dean to CAS faculty and staff subsequently noted the need to complete the CAS survey.
5. Survey response rates, as of Monday, March 28th, are:

- CAS Faculty: 51%	CAS Staff: 52%
- COE Faculty: 70%	COE Staff: 73%
- Library Faculty: 64%	Library Staff: 42%
6. The Committee authored a motion to be offered at April's Faculty Senate meeting expanding the survey's coverage to UAA's community campuses. This motion is provided below, and is jointly sponsored by this Committee and the Senate's ad hoc Community Campuses Committee. The Committee has notified the Provost of this motion.

The Committee moved its March 28th meeting to April 1st, 11:30 AM, so that it might better analyze the still ongoing survey (ends March 29th). The Committee will also prepare for its end of year meeting (April 29th) with the Provost to discuss the management of future surveys. During the month of April, the Committee will draft its final report.

MOTION.

Resolved, upon the recommendation of the Faculty Senate's Institutional & Unit Leadership Review Committee and the ad hoc Community Campuses Committee, that the periodic survey of faculty

addressing the leadership of their respective units be expanded to include the faculty at UAA's three community campuses.

RATIONALE:

1. Faculty at all three community campuses have requested this action.
2. If approved, the Institutional & Unit Leadership Review Committee and the ad hoc Community Campuses Committee will jointly draft the necessary Faculty Senate Constitution and By Laws changes.
3. Given the use of survey results by the Office of Academic Affairs, these Committees will consult with the Provost on how best to implement the survey process at the community campuses.
4. This motion is required because the necessary Constitution and By Laws changes cannot be implemented in a manner timely enough to permit the Committees to begin working on the expanded survey process.

LIBRARY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LAC) REPORT TO UAA FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 4, 2011 LAC MEETING

- **ATTENDANCE.** Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya, Gina Boisclair, Daria Carle, Gabe Garcia, Steve Godfrey, Alberta Harder, Becky James, Ann McCoy, Susan Mitchell, Steve Rollins, and Kirk Scott were present.
Leanne Davis, Liz Dennison, Sean Licka, and Carole Lund sent apologies.
- **FEBRUARY LAC REPORT.** The February 2011 LAC report to the UAA Faculty Senate was approved.
- **FROM THE DEAN'S LIBRARY REPORT.** Dean Rollins summarized the budget request for the Consortium Library for FY 2012. The request will be presented the third week of April. The four top requests will be for fixed cost increases of about 6%, base budget funding for "after hours study facility" in the Library, base budget funding to improve library collections in support of academic programs, and replacement of grant funds to cover software tools and resources. Dean Rollins also reported that APU is starting a new graduate program in Psychology which might have implications for Library acquisitions. Gina will contact Dean Barry about the matter.
- **LP SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT.** The next art exhibit will feature the work of the Library faculty and staff. The Library as Place Subcommittee is planning the landscaping improvements around the Library and possible revisions to the floor directories.
- **LR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT.** The Library Resource Subcommittee is consulting with University Advancement and is also drafting a letter to administration in support of Library funding.
- **LS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT.** There will be a presentation by Coral Sheldon-Hess of the new Library search tool at the April LAC meeting. The subcommittee discussed how to publicize resources to both UAA and APU students. Among the suggestions was a regular and changing "Did you know..." notice on APU and UAA web sites. This should feature concerns that are prominent in specific months or seasons. The use of posters was also suggested.
- **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS.** Alberta reminded the committee that LAC membership and leadership for 2011-2012 will be discussed at the April LAC meeting.

LAST MEETING: April 1, 2011 Consortium Library Room 302A, 11:30 am – 12:45 pm. Meet in subcommittees first.

**Student Academic Support and Success Committee
March 18, 2011 Meeting Minutes**

Members in attendance:

Stephanie Bauer, Michael Buckland, Alberta Harder, Trish Jenkins, Linda Morgan, Kamal Narang, Galina Peck, Ly Tibayan, Erika Veth

Members absent: Connie Fuess, Shannon Gramse, Erik Hirschmann, Karen Parrish

Guest: David Weaver

Item 1

Approval of Minutes from February 2011 Meeting

The minutes from the meeting on February 18, 2011, were approved.

Item 2

Report on the Faculty Senate Meeting

Alberta reported on the Faculty Senate meeting on March 4th.

Item 3

Presentation about MAP-Works

David Weaver from the Office of Student Affairs described the MAP-Works program. MAP-Works, Making Achievement Possible, is a comprehensive student retention and success program designed for first year students. David is the MAP-Works Coordinator during its trial period at UAA. He explained how the program works and answered committee members' questions about it.

Additional Items

- Members of the committee worked on a draft of recommendations pertaining to the committee goals for the year. These recommendations will be included in the May report to the Faculty Senate.
- There was a request to discuss at the April meeting who should be able to serve on the SASS committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Last Meeting: Friday, April 15, 2011, 2:30-4:00 in ADM 102

Report to the Faculty Senate, April 2011
Ad Hoc Committee on Community Campuses

Committee Members: Genie Babb, Past Senate President, Senator Deborah Boege-Tobin, Kenai, Senator Larry Foster, CAS Math/Natural Sciences, Senator Erik Hirschmann (Chair), Mat-Su, Senator Paul Landen, Kenai, Senator Mark Schreiter, Kodiak, Senator Jan Vandever, Mat-Su

The committee (all in attendance) met after the March 4 Faculty Senate meeting to discuss various issues and goals, including:

1. The committee centered attention on instituting a system of reviews of community campus leadership, to be put forward in a motion for approval by the Faculty Senate. Senator Larry Foster agreed to draft a motion that would also be taken up by the Faculty Senate's Institutional & Unit Leadership Review Committee.
2. This system of reviews stated above would most likely be under a similar mechanism to the IDEA-generated evaluation used for the past four years for evaluation of Deans. Implementation of this on the Kodiak, Kenai, and Mat-Su campuses should occur together.

**CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY FORUM OF
~~MATANUSKA-SUSITNA~~ ~~KENAI PENINSULA COLLEGE~~ ~~THE BRANCH CAMPUSES,~~
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE**

The faculty of the ~~branch campuses of Kenai Peninsula Matanuska-Susitna College~~ the University of Alaska Anchorage, in order to provide a forum for and create a voice to address university-life issues including curriculum, student success, institutional development, and professional development, ~~establish~~ this constitution.

Comment [D1]: Not sure if we ever unanimously agreed to "branch campuses" or "extended sites" or "community campuses" or ???

ARTICLE I. NAME

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be the Faculty Forum of the ~~Kenai Peninsula Kodiak, Matanuska-Susitna~~ ~~Matanuska-Susitna Kenai Peninsula College~~, University of Alaska Anchorage hereafter referred to as the Forum.

Comment [D2]: Alphabetical order; feel free to modify. I also considered a generic bracket with [insert name here], if you'd rather.

ARTICLE II. PURPOSES, RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY

Section 1. The Forum shall carry out its functions subject to the statewide authority of the Board of Regents within the laws of the State of Alaska (BOR Policy 03.01).

Section 2. The purposes of the Forum are as follows:

- a. to provide official representation for the faculty of ~~Mat-Su~~ ~~Kenai Peninsula College~~ ~~Kenai Peninsula, Kodiak, Matanuska-Susitna College~~ in matters which affect the general welfare of the college and its educational programs;
- b. to serve as a forum by which information of general concern and interest to the ~~Matanuska-Susitna~~ ~~Kenai Peninsula College~~ ~~Kenai Peninsula, Kodiak, Matanuska-Susitna College~~ faculty may be freely collected, disseminated and discussed;
- c. to provide an effective opportunity for faculty to play a meaningful role in matters affecting their professional welfare and the academic affairs within the college;
- d. to communicate to faculty (and as appropriate, to staff) information which is of interest and concern to the College;
- e. to promote the exchange of ideas, active dialog, debate, and consensus building in areas that affect our institution and community;
- f. to advise the ~~MSC~~ ~~KPC~~ ~~KoC, KPC, MSC~~ Director on matters affecting academics, student and faculty welfare, and matters in which the faculty are stakeholders.

ARTICLE III. MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The Forum shall consist of all full-time faculty, both term and ~~tenure track.~~ ~~Faculty tenure track.~~ ~~Faculty~~ holding administrative positions (such as the Assistant Director of Academic Affairs) ~~and Adjunct faculty are may be not~~ eligible for membership as determined individually by each branch campus. The Forum may invite ex-officio members to join the group as appropriate. Such invitations will be defined at time of submission.

ARTICLE IV. OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the Forum shall be Chair and Secretary.

Section 2. Any faculty member, as defined in Article III, Section 1, shall be eligible to serve as an officer.

Section 3. The officers shall be elected by the full time faculty from a pool of those willing to serve.

Section 4. The term of office for the Chair and Secretary shall be one year with renewal possible.

Section 5. The Chair shall preside at the Forum meetings. The Chair shall serve as a representative of the Forum to the Director.

Section 6. If for any reason the Chair should relinquish or be recalled from office, the secretary will automatically and immediately assume the position of Chair until a special election can be held to fill the office.

Section 7. The terms of newly elected Officers shall commence at the beginning of "New Business" of the last regularly scheduled Forum meeting of the academic year.

ARTICLE V. COUNCILS AND COMMITTEES

Section 1. There shall be permanent Councils and standing committees of the Forum as well as those committees established by the bylaws as needed or by appointment of the Director.

Section 2. Forum members of permanent councils and committees shall serve voluntarily or as requested by the Director.

~~**Section 3.** Permanent councils and standing committees (with the exception of the Assessment Committee and Council of Coordinators) shall after the last meeting for the academic year shall recommend to the Director a chair person for the next academic year. elect a chair person by majority vote of its members at the first meeting of the academic year. Chairs shall serve for one to two years with the possibility of renewal. The Assessment Committee and the Council of Coordinators will be chaired by the Assistant Director of Academic Affairs.~~

Section 34. The Forum may establish any special committee it deems necessary for the conduct of Forum business.

ARTICLE VI. MEETINGS

Section 1. The Forum shall meet not less than once a month from August through May. Additional meetings may be called with a week's notice by any member of the Forum by a request to the Chair. Two days prior to any meeting, an agenda and report on items to be considered shall be provided to the Forum members. In the absence of a prior report, a list of items to be considered will be provided at the meeting; however, Forum members will not be expected to act on the issues at that time. In order to give members time to consider the issues, no vote or action will be taken until a subsequent meeting is called. An interim of at least one day is required before calling the meeting to consider the issue at hand.

Section 2. The presence of fifty percent plus one of the Forum ~~membership~~ shall constitute a quorum. To pass a motion of the quorum present, a 2/3 vote is required. Voting by proxy is allowed with written and signed permission provided to the ~~e~~Chair prior to the start of the meeting in which the voting is to take place.

Section 3. The Chair shall conduct an orderly meeting calling for discussion and vote as needed.

ARTICLE VII. AMENDMENTS

Section 1. Amendments to the Constitution may be proposed by any Forum member. Copies of proposed amendments shall be sent to all members of the Forum. A first reading and discussion of the proposed amendment will be scheduled for that next meeting of the Forum following distribution of copies of the proposed amendment. The second reading of a proposed amendment may be held not sooner than the next meeting following the distribution of copies.

Section 2. Following the second reading, the amendment shall be voted on. Amendments shall be

approved by a two-thirds vote of the quorum present. The vote shall be considered invalid if less than 25% of the voting membership responds. A Motion to Reconsider may be made only at the following meeting.

ARTICLE VIII. REFERENDUM

Section 1. Any tenure-track or term faculty member with a teaching load of at least 50% may bring a motion before the Forum by submitting a petition signed (or confirmed by email response) by a minimum of 20% of the full-time faculty prior to the start of the meeting in which the petition will be considered. ▽

- a. There must be a second to the motion for discussion to take place.
- b. The Forum must consider this motion at the meeting following the ~~submission of the~~ [submission of the](#) petition.
- c. All Forum members must be notified of the meeting to discuss the petition. All interested Forum members can be included in the discussions.
- d. This petition may include a requirement that the vote be put to members of the Forum. [Voting may be conducted via by secret ballot, secret ballot, hand rising, or by voicing yea/nay, as determined by each campus.](#)

Section 2. If a petition is submitted to rescind or amend an action of the Forum,

- a. the Forum shall, after discussion, vote on the motion. [Voting may be conducted via secret ballot, hand rising, or by voicing yea/nay, as determined by each campus.](#) ~~by secret ballot.~~ If the Forum concurs with the motion, the original action shall be considered rescinded or amended as appropriate.
- b. If the Forum does not concur with the motion, the motion fails.

Section 3. If a question is put to all eligible Forum members, voting will be [conducted via secret ballot, hand rising, or by voicing yea/nay, as determined by each campus.](#) ~~by secret ballot,~~ [will be](#) supervised by the officers of the Forum and will be passed by a simple majority of those responding. The vote will be considered invalid if less than 50% of the faculty responds.

ARTICLE IX. EFFECTIVE DATE OF ENACTMENTS

Section 1. Recommendations passed by the Forum shall be forwarded to the Director.

Section 2. The Director shall act to approve or disapprove the recommendations of the Forum within 15 working days of the date it is submitted. The reason(s) for disapproval shall be conveyed by the Director in writing to the Forum within 15 working days of the date of the disapproval.

Section 3. Approval of a Forum action by the Director constitutes approval of the enactment. Actions of the Forum may not be partially approved nor may they be approved as modified or amended by the Director, but will be resubmitted to the Forum for further discussion and action.

Section 4. Any action approved by the Forum and disapproved by the Director's Office may be submitted to an ad hoc committee upon a two-thirds vote of the Forum. Up to three members may be appointed by the Forum whose task shall be to formulate further recommendations to the Forum and subsequently the Director's office.

Section 5. If the Forum and the Director's Office are not able to resolve the impasse, then the Forum, upon a two-thirds vote, may elect to forward its previous action through the University of Alaska governance structure as provided for under Regents' policy.

**BYLAWS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FACULTY FORUM OF
THE BRANCH CAMPUSES OF THE ~~MATANUSKA-SUSITNAKENAI PENINSULA~~
~~COLLEGE,~~
UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE**

Section 1. Article I. (Membership)

A. General membership:

- (1) The ~~KPCMSC~~ Faculty Forum of each branch campus of the University of Alaska Anchorage shall consist of all full-time faculty, both term and tenure track, and other faculty holding coordinator status within the college. Faculty holding administrative positions (such as Assistant Director of Academic Affairs) and adjunct faculty may be eligible for membership as determined individually by each branch campus. The Forum may invite ex-officio members to join the group as appropriate. Such invitations will be defined at time of submission. ~~are not eligible for membership.~~
- (2) Membership for all qualified faculty is assumed without qualification.

Section 2. Article II. (Officers)

A. Election of Officers:

- (1) The Faculty Forum shall, at the final meeting of each academic year, elect a Chair to act as the primary spokesperson for the ~~Alliance~~Forum and to facilitate general meeting activities.
- (2) The Faculty Forum shall, at the final meeting of each academic year, elect a ~~s~~Secretary to serve as recorder for the next academic year. The ~~S~~ecretary will take and maintain the meeting minutes which will be maintained as a permanent record. The ~~s~~ecretary will serve in succession to the Faculty Forum Chair if the Chair is unable to execute the duties of the office.
- (3) Election of officers shall be by ~~secret ballot, hand rising, or voicing yea/nay as determined by each branch campus~~secret ballot.
- (4) The terms of the newly elected officers shall commence at the beginning of the "New Business" of the last regularly scheduled Forum meeting of the academic year.

Section 3. Article III. (Councils and Committees)

~~A. A. Permanent councils and standing committees of the Forum may be established as needed:~~

- ~~(1) by the Bylaws.~~
- ~~(2) by appointment of the Director.~~
 - ~~(1) Council of Coordinators~~
- ~~(2) Instructional Council;~~
- ~~(3) Academic Dispute Resolution~~
- ~~(4) Assessment~~
- ~~(5) CAFE~~
- ~~(6) Enrollment Management~~
- ~~(7) Educational Technology~~
- ~~(8) Faculty Professional Development~~

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: A, B, C, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.75"

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: List Paragraph, Numbered + Level: 2 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1.25"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

- ~~(9) Library Advisory~~
- ~~(10) Such committees as may be established by Bylaws~~

B. The following Administrative Committees shall include full time faculty representation: through the Forum as needed and established:

- ~~(1) by the bylaws.~~
- ~~B. (2) by appointment of the Director.~~

- ~~(1) Enrollment Management~~
- ~~(2) Finance~~
- ~~(3) Innovations~~
- ~~(4) Scholarship and Honors~~
- ~~(5) Student Government~~
- ~~(6) Student Media~~
- ~~(7) Sustainability~~
- ~~(8) Petition for Refunds Review~~
- ~~(9) Technology Council~~
- ~~(10) United Way~~
- ~~(11) Special Events~~

Comment [t31]: FYI – These are MSC's

- Councils and Committees:
- (1) Council of Coordinators
 - (2) Instructional Council,
 - (3) Academic Dispute Resolution
 - (4) Assessment
 - (5) CAFE
 - (6) Enrollment Management
 - (7) Educational Technology
 - (8) Faculty Professional Development
 - (9) Library Advisory
 - (10) Such committees as may be established by Bylaws

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", First line: 0.25", No bullets or numbering

Comment [t32]: FYI – These are MSC's

- Admin Committees:
- (1) Enrollment Management
 - (2) Finance
 - (3) Innovations
 - (4) Scholarship and Honors
 - (5) Student Government
 - (6) Student Media
 - (7) Sustainability
 - (8) Petition for Refunds Review
 - (9) Technology Council
 - (10) United Way
 - (11) Special Events

Five Motions in Response to the Provost's Revisions of the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines

Proposed by the Ad hoc Committee on the FEGs for consideration at the 4/1/11 Senate Meeting

At the **May 7th 2010** meeting, the Faculty Senate approved the new **Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEGs)** and made **three** recommendations for revision. On January 25, 2011, the Provost sent out his revisions to the FEGs along with a cover letter summarizing the recommendations he had received and the rationale for his revisions. Below we have given each Senate recommendation (in red), the Provost's summary of his revisions in response to the recommendation, and a proposed motion to **accept** or **accept with modifications** the given revision at the **April 1st 2011** Faculty Senate meeting. In addition, we have included two more motions relating to the FEGs.

(Provost Driscoll's cover letter summarizing his revisions can be found at

<http://edit.uua.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/promotion-and-tenure-task-force/upload/FEG-Comments-and-Changes.pdf> .

The actual revisions can be found at

<http://edit.uua.alaska.edu/academicaffairs/promotion-and-tenure-task-force/upload/FEGs-Revisions-by-Provost-January-25-2011.pdf>)

FIRST RECOMMENDATION:

5/7/10 FS MOTION (Christine Gehrett): We support the FEG's attempt to capture the range of faculty activity and create an inclusive rubric for all. **However, clarification is needed as to the exact nature of the relationship between the FEG and individual unit guidelines.**

Approved

PROVOST'S 1/25/11 COVER LETTER:

Relationship between FEGs and Unit Guidelines

The need to better define how the UAA-wide FEGs will relate to and impact guidelines established by academic units (e.g., departments, schools, colleges) was mentioned by the Faculty Senate and has arisen in several other conversations. Additional text was added on page 1, lines 21-24 to explain the expected process for unit guidelines. A phrase was added to page 5, line 123 to indicate that unit guidelines must conform to University guidelines. A footnote was added to page 5, line 124 to refer readers to details later in the document. Text was changed and additional text added on p. 34, lines 1152-1161 to further specify the expectations of conforming unit guidelines.

PROPOSED MOTION #1 FOR 4/1/11 FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Accept the Provost's revisions on "Relationship between FEGs and Unit Guidelines."

SECOND RECOMMENDATION:

5/7/10 FS MOTION (Rob Crosman): **We recommend that the characterization of research include products, shared generally or subject to peer-review (as determined by the individual units).**

25 For, 2 Against

Motion Approved

PROVOST'S 1/25/11 COVER LETTER:

Scholarship requires results; not just activity

The Faculty Senate and some administrators said that the FEGs needed to be clearer in indicating that demonstrating scholarship requires results and that activity is not enough. Results were defined in various ways,

e.g., as products or artifacts that are disseminated or exhibited in some manner and subject to critical or peer review. The point was also made that the precise nature of the dissemination, products/artifacts, and review should be defined at the unit level within the broad guidance of the FEGs.

Changes in the document make use of the concepts of “outcomes” which result in “evidence” such as “products, artifacts, and creative works”. Text has been added on Page 8, lines 216-217, page 10 line 296, page 11, footnote to line 313, and page 14 lines 406-409. Modifications and additions have been made to the text on page 18, line 551 including a new footnote. These changes emphasize that scholarship should result in appropriate evidence and that the evidence is what is to be used to evaluate a faculty member’s work.

PROPOSED MOTION #2 FOR 4/1/11 FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Accept the Provost’s revisions on “Scholarship requires results; not just activity” with the following modification: make examples in lines 420-454 more consistent with the requirement for “outcomes” which result in “evidence” such as “products, artifacts, and creative works.”

THIRD RECOMMENDATION:

5/7/10 FS MOTION (Robert Boeckmann): We support the inclusion of activities that integrate teaching, research, and /or service, and we agree that sometimes boundaries between these components are difficult to draw. **However, we believe that the FEG doesn’t give enough guidance on what distinguishes the three areas. We recommend the addition of clear guidance concerning the components of the workload. We also believe that individual disciplines should have the final say in how those components are defined and evaluated.**

**25 For, 4 Against
Motion approved**

PROVOST’S 1/25/11 COVER LETTER:

Differentiation of Teaching, Research, and Service

The Faculty Senate asked for additional guidance to help distinguish among teaching, research, and/or service, while supporting the inclusion of activities that integrate all these components. The Faculty Senate also said that individual disciplines should have the final say in how teaching, research, and service are defined and evaluated. An administrator said that the FEGs do not say enough about opportunities for integrated activities.

Text has been added in a footnote to page 10, line 313 to highlight and expand the clear direction given in page 10, lines 303-316, that a single activity may produce results in multiple workload areas and that the nature of the results are the basis for evaluation.

PROPOSED MOTION #3 FOR 4/1/11 FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Accept the Provost’s revisions on “Differentiation of Teaching, Research, and Service.”

PROPOSED MOTION #4 FOR 4/1/11 FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Forward to the Provost a summary of comments received by the Ad hoc Committee from the faculty regarding the FEGs during February 2011.

PROPOSED MOTION #5 FOR 4/1/11 FACULTY SENATE MEETING: Faculty Senate accepts the current iteration of the FEGs (with suggested modifications) with the provision that the Faculty Senate conduct a thorough review of the FEGs five years after the FEGs have gone into effect and revise as needed.