Accreditation Steering Committee Minutes
Tuesday, January 24, 2012
8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.

Members present:
Alexeev, Vladimir; Barnes, Brian; Carroll, Jennifer; Cooper, Amy; Druckenmiller, Patrick; Gerlich, Bella; Hartmann, Anita; Henry, David; Homer, Deb; Jacobsen, Gary; Juday, Glenn; Koch-Goddard, Claudia; Manchester, Jesse; Patil, Shirish; Pinney, Pete; Thomas, Dana; Veazey, Dave; Weflen, Arvid. On audio: Anahita, Sine; Duffy, Larry; Hecimovich, Derylee.

Update on Commission visit with chancellor, provost and vice provost on Jan. 11

Bulk of information was on outcomes assessment of academic programs and services – only 60% of our academic programs closing the loop and using the info to improve student learning – they are raising the bar and pointed out specifically the library – CRCD and CLA also need improving – UAF may have been too frank with the self-assessment – waiting for written response – as soon as the response is received, Dana will share it with the steering committee.

May have dean's be responsible, or a visit could happen this fall – hoping for a year 3 or year 5 response instead.

Commission is pushing on higher ed outcomes in reaction to federal pressure. - Possibility of federal control

Expectation is 100% of the academic programs are reporting on outcomes assessment regularly, using it for change and change is documented. It doesn't have to be changing the whole curriculum; it can be on a small scale e.g. changing a reading assignment. This responsibility lies with the faculty according to standards.

We (Provost's Office) ask for centralized reporting for collecting, documenting and posting.

Commission also brought up the need for refinement with Connect and Engage but added Prepare to the group. Asked us to look at the indicators particularly in those three as they see some overlap. We will need to clarify the distinction of these three themes and how they integrate.

We won't post the response from the Commission but steering committee will get a hard copy, but asked not to scan it or post it.

Mission Statement

Current working draft: UAF integrates teaching, research, and engagement with an emphasis on the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples to prepare students for leadership and careers.

Circumpolar should stay in the statement as it differentiates Alaska being North relative to New York or Minnesota being “North” to those in the southeast U.S..

Accreditation Steering Committee may give input to change the mission statement. It needs to be kept short.

Dave – “educate global citizen's for life leadership and careers”
Glenn – citizen defines nationalities in a legal sense, learning because it's a human thing to do.

Decision made to use “educate” instead of “prepare”.
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Brian Barnes initiated discussion regarding higher education and its impact on income and reasons for education.

Should the word “citizenship” be included? Faculty Senate/Core Revitalization Committee decided against it.

Dana will take the current statement to the Faculty Senate:

> UAF integrates teaching, research, and engagement with an emphasis on the circumpolar North and its diverse peoples to educate students for leadership, careers, and lifelong learning.

**Revising Core Themes**

**Current Revision**

Research: To create new knowledge, insight, technology, artistic and scholarly works, with an emphasis on the circumpolar North and its peoples.

**Objectives and Indicators**

Rubric

Commission took an issue with the rubric.

Read recommendation number 2 from the Commission…tie Core Themes to objectives, in addition, to planning and budget which is another form of PBB. Commission says we are doing too much for too many.

Please look at indicators; we have time now to collect data over the next few years. We will report in Year 5.

One objective missing: Document and preserve cultural, historical and natural history related to the circumpolar North and its peoples (Dana’s draft after the meeting)

Sine suggests not using collect since it may be a sensitive word also the phrase “native artifacts”

Do we have very clearly missing objectives?

We can come up with indicators of achievement that cut across the themes e.g. undergraduate research.

Possible matrix can be used to visually map out the bridges/integration with objectives/indicators. Especially important with budget tied into the objectives.

**Closing:**

Please read peer-evaluation response.

Think about objectives and indicators carefully. What is missing? Fewer indicators would be good. Simplifying the collection of some indicators would be good as well.
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Possible way to simplify: Use a small set of online indices to get the UAF publication list indicator. CES and others may not be represented; supplementation may be necessary to satisfy some units.

Indicators don’t have to be perfect; they just have to be indicators.

Come next time with statements: “let’s add this objective, let’s delete this objective” etc.

Please share the conversation on objectives and indicators widely, including advisory groups (get this in their minutes) and your peers, and bring back suggestions to the Committee. Think about these themes, objectives and indicators from a 1000 foot perspective.

Form subgroups next meeting.