

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

I Call to Order – Marsha Sousa

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

A. Roll Call

Members Present:

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

Members Absent:

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

Others Present:

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

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #156

The minutes were approved as distributed with one small change to “Master Academic Plan” correct it to “Academic Master Plan” (AMP).

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed, although allowance was made for the fact that the chancellor will be phoning in. John Monahan may also possibly phone in to participate in a discussion item on distance ed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved:

1. Motion to Approve a Ph.D. in Indigenous Studies
2. Motion to Approve a Certificate in Pre-Nursing Qualifications

B. Motions under Consideration:

1. Motion to Amend the Mandatory Placement Policy (writing sample)

C. Motions Disapproved: none

III Public Comments

Dana Thomas brought up several items:

- 1.) He plans to bring a revision of the probation policy for students before the Curricular Affairs Committee; and,
- 2.) He's working on a question from a department chair and dean on how to remove a student from their major. There is no policy at this time. General Studies is where they would likely be placed. What is the department's responsibility toward such students? They may not have taken a class in their major in over two years, so it's a reasonable question to ask. Please give feedback to Amber T. and Falk H. (Curricular Affairs) and himself.
- 3.) Core Revitalization and Assessment Committee has some open forums are coming up. There is a survey out there for faculty to complete (on SurveyMonkey online). Recommendations from the committee regarding what the major learning outcomes from the core should be, and the holistic assessment of the core, are due to come to the Senate in April.

Linda Hapsmith, Academic Advising Center, reminded everyone about the March 6 deadline for nominations for the Feist/Schamel outstanding undergraduate advisor award. Please encourage students to nominate faculty. 474-6980 is their fax number for the nomination forms. The rural campuses are asked to participate as well. Linda mentioned the awards, which include lunch with the Chancellor. The form is online at:
<http://www.uaf.edu/advising>

Linda also announced that on Monday, March 30, (from 11 a.m. to 3 p.m.) is the Major Mania event here at the ballroom. It's being held in conjunction with Admissions' Inside-

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

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

IV A. President's Comments – Marsha Sousa

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. President-Elect's Report – Jonathan Dehn

Jon has been having extra meetings with the Faculty Alliance and the SAC and RAC committees to get the Academic Master Plan into some sort of format we can look at, and a majority of the credit for progress made on this should go to the Provost. The criteria are crystallizing. The scope of the document has become larger than originally envisaged because they're trying to cover all three campuses with the plan, which has been a challenge. They may not have something ready by the next senate meeting, but they're trying. All documents worked on so far are online at the SAC and RAC web site.
<http://www.alaska.edu/swacad/sac.htm>

V A. Chancellor's Comments – Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers spoke online from Juneau. The focus of his remarks was on the spending side as it's been the issue in Juneau. Last week the House finance subcommittee on the university budget gave us a negative surprise by reducing the governor's budget request. It now goes to the full finance committee. Reductions the subcommittee made at the system level include a cut of \$800,000 which was new money for K-12 outreach, which for UAF was the summer research academy engineering money (and associated programs). They cut a million dollars, which was all the money for energy engineering and climate change, which included their Cooperative Extension money. They cut \$900,000 of the \$1.8 million for health programs; and they cut \$1 million for facility maintenance and operations from UAA's budget. What's left in there as a change from the current year is \$9.1 million in salary increase money (the general fund portion of pay raise money) which represents 60% of the total cost for pay raises. They left in \$825,000 for facility maintenance and operations, half of which comes to UAF. This totals a 3.6% net increase from the previous year.

Pete Kelly (our lobbyist) and Wendy Redman were both caught by surprise with the cuts. They had thought they would hold at the governor's level of budgeting. Sometimes, though, the full finance committee has the subcommittee do the cutting, and then they come in and replace the money. Opportunities for testifying before the full finance committee were mentioned. We're not likely to get much more or much less, based on the governor's budget.

Regarding President Obama's stimulus package, it has significant opportunities for UAF—and signals change in the national discussion on certain issues. The word "research" is mentioned over 300 times, and the word "science" over 50 times in the appropriations bill, which gives the sense of changing national priorities. The bill includes funds for the Alaska Region Research vessel, \$150 million of construction funds for the Toolik Lake site and for the Alaska Volcano Observatory. There are also a lot of dollars available for research and facilities projects (i.e., through NIH, National Science Foundation, NASA, NOAA, etc.).

There is a significant increase in student financial aid over two years, increasing PELL grants by \$500, and fully funding the waitlist for the PELL grant program. There's substantial money for development that UAF will be able to apply for. Some money could go through the state government, if the governor takes advantage of it and applies for it. In short, bad news on the state funding level, and good news on the federal level.

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

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

The chancellor ended his comments by encouraging faculty, particularly rural faculty, to please testify on Tuesday or Wednesday and help turn votes in the House finance committee.

B. Provost's Remarks – Susan Henrichs

Not available due to travel schedule.

VI Governance Reports

A. Staff Council – Juella Sparks

The new SC representative orientation for 15 members was held with their last meeting in February. Juella mentioned that with regard to the supervisory training, faculty are not required to take it. They are only encouraged to take trainings. The question has repeatedly been raised to the HR training advisory group, of which she is a member.

Staff Alliance returned from Juneau after three days of advocacy. One of the requests that came up at the very first meeting she had with a local legislator, was for them to make it clear how difficult multiple appropriations for the university are to deal with rather than a single appropriation for the university. This was heard repeatedly during their visit.

Before they and a student coalition got there to Juneau, a UAA group of engineering students were already there advocating for engineering in Anchorage. The UAA presence of faculty, staff, and students were there in full force. Juella invites our faculty to join with staff to create their own PAC because Anchorage is “eating our lunch”, as one legislator put it. Juella steps down from SC in May, but is willing to work with everyone even after SC because she sees the need for something to be done on a larger scale.

Jennifer R. asked Juella to reconcile both of her statements—where she said that legislators requested one appropriation rather than multiple ones for the university, with her statements for faculty to join staff in forming a PAC for UAF. Juella responded that Staff Alliance has been asked to unify their approach to lobby for one appropriation to the system rather than multiple appropriations. But Anchorage doesn't have that intent and lobbies for themselves. If multiple appropriations are continued, then forming a PAC is needed.

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

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

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

B. ASUAF – Brandon Meston

Not available for comments.

C. UAFT/UNAC

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

VII Guest Speaker

A. Karl Kowalski, Executive Director, OIT User Services

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

This fall a small group attended EDUCAUSE to look at IT developments for universities and their faculty. He's created a lead staff development position (Josef Glowka and Dana Greci are on the hiring committee). This new position will help bridge the gap between the IT and instructional worlds for UAF.

Falk H. asked how much consideration has been given to the idea of tenure and promotion criteria being revised, adjusted or taken into account, to give credit to faculty for using those types of tools. There need to be incentives for use of technology in the classroom. Karl talked about this being one of the recommendations from the Chancellor's IT transition team,

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

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

Jon D. brought up the point of how tempting it is to look at new technology and try new things, but we need to get our accepted technology working (like audio/video) now before we move forward. There might be more support from faculty were the services currently available from OIT working better than they are. Better balance with the technology we have before trying new things – walk before we fly. Karl acknowledged the truth of that comment. He notes that a lot of our technology does not work as well as it could because infrastructure has not kept up. There's still some real old technology in the buildings – IAB, for example. The gift of bandwidth from GCI is going to slam into some really old technology infrastructure in some of our buildings. Our research institutes may not be able to make full use of it because of that fact. There's a \$10 million backlog in old wiring to catch up with and Karl hopes that the stimulus package will help address some of these needs for upgrading older buildings. If a faculty wants to utilize technology in their teaching, they are putting a mechanism in place to assist with that effort and support it.

Marji I. spoke about teaching rural students at off-campus sites and those limitations. Blackboard, telephone and fax are what she relies on heavily –Blackboard is barely available for some of the rural areas. Perhaps we should be looking at technology that will work on the existing infrastructure. Karl mentioned his 20 years in Kotzebue and is aware of the limitations. One idea that came from the IT transition committee concerns the use of a federal subsidy to support K-12 schools and libraries infrastructure for IT, but it has tight restrictions on use by higher ed groups. In fact, right now postsecondary higher ed can not use the same infrastructure. When Fran Ulmer was Lt. Gov, he worked with her on getting a waiver to the federal e-rate rules to allow bandwidth to be used in the evenings for education. But when it got passed, by that time the telecommunication companies started putting in dial-up and that made using the waiver for the bandwidth null and void. The IT transition team talked about now being the time to talk to the Alaska Regulatory Commission – UAF should work with them for using the bandwidth for delivery of postsecondary education in the villages. He thinks they would be receptive to the ideas, but it needs a grassroots effort.

Ann C. asked about what OIT resources are available for instructional design. Karl said that there are none right now. He's spoken with Alex Hwu, the interim director at the Center for Distance Ed, about ways to work with their instructional designers as OIT builds its staff development staff.

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

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

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

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

Falk H. talked about the other countries he's worked in (Costa Rica and New Guinea, for example) where internet access is free and is better or equal to what we're using here. One of the crippling components in Alaska is the business concept. We need free wireless public access Alaska-wide (the Anchorage airport illustrates the good use of this). The business model needs to support free internet. Free access facilitates business and development. We can't charge for it. Karl and others agreed.

BREAK

VIII New Business

(Note that the referenced attachments may always be found with the corresponding meeting **agenda**, rather than within these minutes. Please use the "Meetings" link at <http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov> to access these materials online. Complete copies of new proposals are kept on file at the UAF Governance Office at 314 Signers' Hall.)

- A. Motion to approve a Graduate Certificate in Construction Management, submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee (Attachment 157/1)

Larry Duffy brought the motion to the floor and Dr. Robert Perkins from Engineering described the program as workforce development targeted for graduate engineers working in construction who've not had management training. It may also benefit experienced construction managers who want to advance their management skills. Some of the courses that will comprise the 15 credit certificate have been offered as 1-credit special topics and have been well received by the students and their employers.

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

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

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

Linda H. asked about if there was any plan to offer a bachelor's degree in this area, as there is an existing A.A.S. in Construction Management. Dr. Perkins replied that UAA has a B.A. in Construction Management, but that they're looking for students with more than entry level experience in the field to enter this program.

Larry Duffy commented that this works well from a statewide perspective, usable by many people with a variety of degrees from all over Alaska, including those from UAA. Marsha asked if the courses were distance delivered. Dr. Perkins said distance classes have been offered in Anchorage, Juneau, Sitka, and here in Fairbanks. Video conferencing has worked very well.

Anne C asked about the super-tuition concept, and Larry responded about it, saying that the super-tuition will help support the program financially. This model for higher tuition is taken from professional schools (like medical schools) for high-demand, high-cost programs. Dr. Perkins added that in almost all cases the employer pays the costs of this higher tuition. The students are already in the fields, and the purpose of the program is to upgrade and accelerate their management skills for the construction field. Larry commented that employers have been pushing for the leadership and management training provided in these certificate courses for their professionals.

Jennifer R. mentioned her concern for super-tuition being used at a public institution. It doesn't seem to be an approach in keeping with making education openly available. Why take this approach rather than having the employer subsidize the cost of the course? Amber T. noted that it's a graduate program and not an open enrollment program. Larry D. commented that there are academic requirements for various programs even at the undergrad level. At the graduate level there's an application process. Larry talked about the necessary resources for this program which are more expensive than others. Individuals taking this certificate are going to make more money in a high-paying field. While there is a philosophical debate here, the super-tuition is a practical approach to paying the costs of this program. Jennifer mentioned that this sounds like a fee for service. Marji said it could just be called a fee, period, as is done in other classes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rainer moved to postpone the motion, which was seconded. Larry clarified that a wording change was being requested, which was confirmed. Dr. Perkins inquired about amending this on the floor, but this was not accepted. The vote on the motion went forward. The majority carried the motion, with five votes opposed to postponement. GAAC is asked to look at the wording in the proposal regarding the super-tuition model vs. funding and sustainability options.

B. Motion to Approve a B.A. in Film, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 157/2)

Amber brought the motion to the floor and Maya Salganek from the Theatre department came to discuss the program which combines CLA programs and courses in Theatre, English, Creative Writing, Journalism and Film. Maya talked about how the new program addresses the problem of duplications of similar courses that overlap with various departments. The FILM designator, established in 2005, was very effective in raising interest and enrollments went up dramatically. A committee with members from the affected departments came together and the result is the new B.A. in Film. There is strong interest expressed by students. It's a broad degree that should attract many students interested in multimedia. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Motion to amend the Academic Appeals Policy, submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee (Attachment 157/3)

Tim S. spoke about the motion, the purpose of which is to streamline the appeals policies, especially in terms of the deadlines involved. This will help reduce confusion among the students and different entities which have to deal with the paperwork.

Marsha asked for a vote and the ayes passed unanimously.

IX Discussion Item

A. New Process for UAF Accreditation – Dana Thomas (Attachment 157/4)

Hand-outs and a PowerPoint presentation are available on this topic and are posted online at the Faculty Senate meetings page.

http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty/08-09_senate_meetings/index.html#157

UAF has two years to meet a significant reporting deadline under the new accreditation process. Four slides were reviewed from the PPT presentation. The first was slide #3 on Standards. Institutional accreditation allows UAF to receive federal funding of any kind, including financial aid. It also allows students to transfer credits between institutions. It can be lost, which is a process in itself.

UAF has had institutional accreditation continually since its' start. We've had some interim focused reports, which cost us money for evaluators to come and make sure corrections were made, so it's taken very seriously. Accreditation of the university and specialized accreditation of programs (which is separate) is, ultimately, quality assurance. It's mandated by the U.S. Secretary of Education. Our accrediting body, one of six, is the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) which oversees 300+ institutions in the northwest region.

A brief history of the historical accreditation process was given. It used to involve a self-study done every ten years (our last one was in 2001), producing a report of 250+ pages, followed by a review by four external evaluators. Every fifth year an interim report was produced to update the data. All new degree programs must be approved by NWCCU before they can be offered by UAF.

A significantly different seven-year process will now be utilized, with reports due in the first, third, fifth and seventh years, and visitations in the third and seventh years. The years that the reports are due, the Board of Commissioners has a group look at them and provide feedback. This process is much more interactive than it used to be. ABET has gone this direction for specialized accreditations, and it's a national trend.

New Accreditation Standards slide was discussed. The new standards are very brief. Standard one covers core themes which are discernable components of our mission. They take into account our primary purposes and focus. The hand-out on the draft accreditation process for UAF was written by our Provost, as a proposal to UAF constituents as to how UAF will pursue this new process. It asks for feedback from the Senate on how groups will be formed and asks for committee representation.

A major task will be identifying core themes. A draft list has been included: 1.) research, creative activity and scholarship; 2.) baccalaureate education; 3.) graduate education; 4.) workforce development; 5.) community-based education; and, 6) community engagement and economic development. UAA has five core themes. This list of core themes will be the driving force behind accreditation for years to come. Dana made a distinction between values vs. a core theme. (There was a slide with the definition of a core theme.)

The septennial accreditation cycle slide was shown and described. We must complete this seven year cycle in the next two years because we are among the first group of institutions who are affected by these changes now. Standard one will effectively be written by next fall. It's very likely standing committees need to be established for the Senate that relate to this kind of work, as well. Dana urges the Senate to review this material and give the Provost feedback.

Rainer asked what impact this was going to have on the individual faculty members and departments. Is it going to be more onerous or less so than the last process? Dana answered that if a department was doing an active job of outcomes assessment and keeping up on program review, that it would be effectively the same; unless one works on a committee that is drafting reports. A brief discussion ensued on the challenges of evaluating programs and determining what constitutes change vs. improvement. Dana pointed out that the federal alternative to this whole process is a college graduating exam, just like the No Child Left Behind version. A peer review process, or a No Child Left Behind process – which would we rather buy into?

B. Distance Education – John Monahan

This discussion was postponed until the next Senate meeting. John M. was not on the audio conference.

X Committee Reports

- A. Curricular Affairs – Amber Thomas / Falk Huettmann
(Attachment 157/5)
- B. Faculty Affairs – Cathy Cahill
Minutes were available as a hand-out.
- C. Unit Criteria - Brenda Konar
No minutes were available.
- D. Committee on the Status of Women – Alex Fitts / Jane Weber
(Attachment 157/6)
- E. Core Review - Michael Harris / Latrice Bowman
No minutes were available.
- F. Curriculum Review - Rainer Newberry
No minutes were available.
- G. Faculty Appeals & Oversight – James Bicigo
No minutes were available.

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

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

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

XI Members' Comments/Questions

No comments.

XII Adjournment

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