UAA Faculty Senate Agenda
September 4, 2009
2:30 – 4:30 p.m. – LIB 307 (Lew Haines Room)

I. Call to Order

II. Roll

2009-2010 Officers:

	Genie Babb , President		Hilary Davies, Chair, UAB
	John Petraitis, 1st Vice President		Patt Sandberg, Chair, GAB
	Katherine Rawlins, 2nd Vice President		Anne Bridges, Past President
			Robert Crosman, Parliamentarian

2009-2010 Senators:

	Alberta Harder		Gabe Garcia		N. Bhattacharyya
	Angela Dirks		Heidi Mannion		Paola Banchero
	Bruno Kappes		Hilary Davies		Rena Spieker
	Carrie King		Jeanne Eder		Robert Boeckmann
	Chad Farrell		Jim Powell		Sally Bremner
	Christine Gehrett		Jodee Kawasaki		Sam Thiru
	Daniel Anteau		John Olofsson		Sue Fallon
	Dave Fitzgerald		Karla Jones		Susan Modlin
	David Meyers		Kate Gordon		Tim Hinterberger
	Deborah Tobin		Kenrick Mock		Toby Widdicombe
	Diane Erickson		Leanne Davis		Tom Ravens
	Ed McLain		Lou Nagy		Toni Croft
	Eric Hirschmann		Mariano Gonzales		vacant
	Eva Kopacz		Mark Fitch		
	Fred Pearce		Mark Schreiter		

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-2)

IV. May 1, 2009 Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 3-6)

V. Officer's Reports

A. President's Report

B. First Vice President's Report

C. Second Vice President's Report (pg. 7)
Ratify appointments/Elect members to committees & boards

VI. Boards and Committees

A. Graduate Academic Board

B. Undergraduate Academic Board (pg. 8)

C. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

D. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology (pg. 9)

E. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA

F. Nominations and Elections Committee

G. Diversity Committee

H. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee

I. IUAC- Evaluation of Deans & Directors Update

J. Library Advisory Committee

K. Professional Development Committee

L. Student Academic Success Committee (pg. 10-11)

VII. Old Business

A. Accreditation update

VIII. New Business

A. UAA Program Review Process Revision (Dean Liszka) (pg. 12-17)

B. Task Force on Faculty Evaluation Discussion (Letitia Fickel) (pg. 18-27)

C. Goals for Faculty Senate 2009-2010
2008-2009 Goal Summary (pg. 28-29)

IX. Reports

A. Chancellor Fran Ulmer

Annual Budget Meeting Submission [Not Approved by BOR] (pg. 30-36)

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

Confucius Institute http://greenandgold.uaa.alaska.edu/faq/20090731_UAA_Confucius_Institute.pdf

H1N1 Information http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/emergency/index.cfm

B. Provost Michael Driscoll

C. Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle

D. Vice Chancellor Megan Olson (pg. 37-38)

E. Union Representatives
i. UAFT
ii. United Academics

X. Informational Items & Adjournment

UAA Faculty Senate Summary
May 1, 2009
2:30 – 4:30 p.m. – LIB 307 (Lew Haines Room)

I. Call to Order

II. Roll

2008-2009 Officers:

X	Anne Bridges, President	X	Hilary Davies, Chair, UAB
X	Genie Babb, 1st Vice President	X	Patt Sandberg, Chair, GAB
X	Larry Foster, 2nd Vice President	X	Bogdan Hoanca, Past President
		X	Robert Crosman, Parliamentarian

2008-2009 Senators:

X	Beth Graber	X	Gail Johnston	X	Peter Dedych
X	Bruno Kappes		Heidi Mannion	X	PT Chang
X	Carol Coose		Herminia Din		Randy Magen
E	Carrie King	X	James Powell	X	Raymond Anthony
X	Chad Farrell	X	Jeanne Eder	X	Robert Boeckmann
X	Christine Gehrett	X	John Olofsson	X	Robert Crosman
E	Daniel Anteau	E	Judith Moore	X	Robin Wahto
E	Dave Fitzgerald	E	Katherine Rawlins	X	Sally Bremner
X	David Meyers		Kenrick Mock	X	Sam Thiru
	Diane Erickson		Maria Ippolito	X	Susan Mitchell
X	Ed McLain	X	Mark Fitch	X	Terri Olson
X	Eva Kopacz		Mark Schreiter	X	Tom Ravens
X	Fred Pearce	X	Maureen O'Malley		Toni Croft
X	Gail Holtzman	X	N. Bhattacharyya	X	Wayne Edwards

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-3)

Approved

IV. April 3, 2009 Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 4-7)

Table the summary of these minutes until the first meeting of the year.
Motion withdrawn
Shelley Theno name misspelled.
Approved the amended minutes to include additional minutes from President Hamilton's presentation.

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Fran Ulmer
http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/fran-answers-questions.cfm
UAA received a 7 million dollar donation from an anonymous donor
6 million of the 7 million will be used for scholarships and endowments
Student Opportunity Scholarship (SOS)
1 million dollars will be going to the ISB Building so it will be fully functional in the Fall
Thank you to the anonymous donor!

B. Provost Michael Driscoll

Wonderful faculty leadership: Anne Bridges, Bogdan Hoanca, Genie Babb, Hilary Davies, Patt Sandberg
Student success task force is working on recommendations
Procedures for reviewing Graduate Programs have been developed and are on the agenda
Accreditation team is doing well and making progress
PBAC has completed its work
After talking to the Deans and Directors, will bring back budget information in the Fall
During promotion and tenure files, saw interesting ways to use IDEA in faculty evaluations
Operating Budget occurred yesterday
Thanks to aviation group for their recent presentation

C. Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle
Unable to attend

D. Vice Chancellor Megan Olson (pg. 8)
Hooding Ceremony and Commencement will both be occurring this weekend

E. Union Representatives
i. UAFT
ii. United Academics

VI. Officer's Reports

A. President's Report (pg. 9-10)
Distinguished Service Awards
Senator- Pat Sandberg
Faculty Member- Nancy Andes
Community Member- Mike McCormick
Community Member- Lara Volden
Update on goal achievements for AY 08-09

B. First Vice President's Report
No report

C. Second Vice President's Report (pg. 11-16)
No report

VII. Boards and Committees

A. Graduate Academic Board
Curriculum and Purge List (pg. 17-20)
Approved

End of Year Report (pg. 21)
MOTION: Approve the concept of the attached Doctoral Program Criteria (will be emailed)
Approved with 3 abstentions

B. Undergraduate Academic Board
Curriculum and Purge List (pg. 22-27)
Approved

Additional Motions (pg. 28)

End of Year Report (pg. 29-30)
MOTION: Change of Grade
The deadline for the submission of grade changes shall be extended to the final day of the next full semester (fall or spring) following when the original grade was assigned.
Approved unanimously

MOTION: Academic Petitions
Students must be admitted to a degree or program before a petition may be submitted and one of the signature levels verifies this admission, as well as verifying that supporting documents match the petitioned course. Further, there must be at least two different approval signatures (faculty and Dean/Director) on the form. If the petition is received in the Office of the Registrar and the student is not admitted to the referenced degree or program, the course or request are not specific, or do not match the transcript received, the petition will be denied and returned to the student for resubmission at such time as they are admitted to their program of study and/or the course detail corrected.
Specific language and instruction may be helpful if added to a future version of the curriculum handbook.
Approved unanimously

C. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

D. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology
MOTION: The Academic Computing, Distance Learning, and Instructional Technology committee (ACDLIT) recommends the Faculty Senate adopt the Distance Education Faculty Handbook. It is a living document and will be reviewed and updated yearly.
http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/facultysenate/upload/DE_Faculty_Handbook_V12.pdf
Approved unanimously

E. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA (pg. 31-32)

F. Nominations and Elections Committee

G. Diversity Committee (pg. 33-35)
End of Year Report (pg. 36)

H. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee

I. IUAC- Evaluation of Deans & Directors Update (pg. 37-40)
IDEA Instrument's use in Faculty Evaluation of Deans (pg. 41-42)

J. Library Advisory Committee (pg. 43-45)
End of Year Report

K. Professional Development Committee

L. Student Academic Success Committee (pg. 46)

VIII. Old Business

A. Constitution and Bylaws Revisions approved by UAA faculty (pg. 47)

B. Accreditation Update (pg. 48)
http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/accreditation/2010.cfm

C. Task Force on Faculty Evaluation (pg. 49-50)

D. Concerns raised on the Writing Center funding being cut
Will be discussed in the Fall

E. Suggestion from the floor that we keep the Administrative Reports in the beginning and continue to use the timer

F. Presentation of thank you and wedding gift to Christine Tullius (Lidren)

IX. New Business

A. Welcome New Senators and Adjourn the 2008-2009 Senators

B. Inauguration of the new Faculty Senate President Genie Babb
Presentation of plaque, gavel, and gift to Anne Bridges

X. Informational Items & Adjournment

A. Robert J. Boeckmann as Co-Chair of the Provost's Task Force on SDIS/IDEA Transition offers the following Information Item:
The Senate thanks the Provost for taking the initiative to ease the transition from the SDIS to the IDEA evaluation process. One aspect of this is to increase student participation rates for the IDEA faculty evaluations. During the summer a working group will identify means to increase student participation and report back to Faculty Senate at the September meeting.

Meeting adjourned

President's Report:

Retreat:
On August 19, the annual Faculty Senate Retreat was held in the Student Union Den. Chancellor Ulmer and Provost Driscoll gave overviews of the past year's achievements and the coming year's opportunities and challenges. In addition, three important issues that will concern us in AY09-10 were discussed: (1) proposed updates to Promotion and Tenure policies; (2) Accreditation timeline and duties; and (3) institution of the new Faculty Senate Academic Assessment Committee (FSAAC).

We were pleased that so many people were able to attend the Retreat (we had a record RSVP figure of 70!). If you didn't turn in an evaluation, there's still time. Your feedback on what worked and didn't work in the Retreat is invaluable to helping us plan for next year. Christine Lidren has the evaluation form.

Senate Goals:
Here are the goals for last year (AY08-09):
• Increase Communication – between Senate, other governance groups, administration, faculty and students
• Support the accreditation process
• Support the Faculty Evaluation Task Force
• Continue improving IDEA and faculty evaluations
• Continue updating the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws
• Advocate for research and graduate programs

Thanks to the leadership of AY08-09 President Anne Bridges, we made progress in each area. Since many of these tasks are ongoing, I respectfully submit that we continue to work on these goals in AY09-10, modified and expanded as follows:

• Sustain communication between Senate and other governance groups, administration, various campus entities (such as the Bookstore), faculty, and students.
• Support the accreditation process
• Give focused attention to and detailed feedback on the proposals submitted by the Faculty Evaluation Task Force.
• Develop strategies for increasing the student response rate on IDEA
• Support the new FS Academic Assessment Committee
• Update the Constitution and By-laws to include the new FS Academic Assessment Committee
• Support the search to fill positions in the Office of Research and Graduate Studies

If you have suggestions about these goals, or would like to propose additional goals, please contact me, and we will discuss your proposals in October.

October meeting:
President Hamilton will attend our Senate meeting in October.

2nd Vice President's Report Faculty Senate: Sept. 4th, 2009

Summary: UAB and GAB still need members from Faculty Senate!

Long version:

Thank you to everyone who has been returning my pestering phone calls and emails recently about committee service; as I mentioned at the retreat, I will be your "committee roster fairy". Most committees are now well-stocked with senators.

The only exceptions are the UAB and GAB, which are still in need of Faculty Senate at-large members. So I am still in search of Senators who are willing to serve on one of these committees. Please contact me immediately if you are interested.

Also drop me a line if you want to move yourself in any way amongst the committees. Thanks!

-- Katherine Rawlins

Committee Co-Chairs: Angela Dirks and Dave Fitzgerald

Committee Members:

✓ Angela Dirks, co-chair	✓ Dave Fitzgerald, co-chair	✓ Amy Green
✓ Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya	✓ Gail Johnston	✓ Bruno Kappes
✓ Carrie King	✓ Mariano Gonzales	✓ Ed McLain
✓ Christine Gehrett		

Scheduled Meeting Date:

- Friday, September 18, 2009 in RH 112 from 2:30 PM to 4:00 PM

Report:

- Committee co-chairs met on Friday, August 28th, 2009, to discuss potential committee goals for academic year 2009-2010. Upon review of NWCCU accreditation requirements and the UAA Strategic Plan, we developed a preliminary list of goals. These suggested goals will be emailed to committee members prior to the first committee meeting for their comments and input.

Student Academic Support and Success Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 24, 2009
GHH CAFÉ room

Persons in attendance:
Michael Buckland, Connie Fuess (by telephone), Shannon Gramse, Alberta Harder, Tracy Leithauser, Linda Morgan, Kamal Narang, John Olofsson, Karen Parrish, Galina Peck

Absent: Trish Jenkins

Item 1
Approval of Minutes from March 27, 2009 Meeting

The minutes from the meeting on March 27, 2009, were approved.

Item 2
New Member Introduction

Tracy Leithauser is a new member of the SASS Committee from the Consortium Library.

Item 3
Final Updates on 2008-2009 Goals

Karen Parrish submitted the final report on the Reading Across the Disciplines Survey. She reported that there will be a review of the course content of PRPE A107 as a result of the survey.

Connie Fuess provided an update on the Student Success Task Force's work. In particular, there is a focus on the first-year experience of students.

Linda Morgan reported that a student group led by Carey Gray conducted three focus groups on student advising experiences. This project will be continued in 2009-2010. Linda also would like to put information about college readiness from the 2007-2008 SASS report into document form for advising purposes.

Item 4
End of Year Business

Shannon Gramse and Alberta Harder will co-chair the SASS Committee in 2009-2010. Shannon will write the final committee report for 2008-2009 and submit it to the Faculty Senate.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
Next Meeting: Friday, August 28, 2009, 2:30-4:00 in GHH CAFÉ room

Student Academic Support and Success Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 28, 2009

Persons in attendance:
Paola Banchero, Michael Buckland, Connie Fuess (by telephone), Shannon Gramse, Alberta Harder, Trish Jenkins, Tracy Leithauser, Linda Morgan, Kamal Narang, Karen Parrish, Galina Peck

Absent: John Olofsson

Item 1
Distribution of Minutes from April Meeting and 2008-2009 Final Report

The minutes from the meeting on April 24, 2009, and the final report for 2008-2009 were distributed.

Item 2
New Member Introduction and Committee Roles

Paola Banchero is a new member of the SASS Committee from the Department of Journalism and Public Communications. Paola is also a member of the Faculty Senate. Shannon Gramse and Alberta Harder will co-chair the SASS Committee in 2009-2010.

Item 3
Proposed Meeting Schedule

- September 25
- October 23
- November 20
- January 22
- February 26
- March 26
- April 23

Item 4
Discussion of 2009-2010 Goals

Committee goals for 2009-2010 were discussed. Members were asked to submit possible goals during the upcoming week in a working e-mail so that the list of goals for 2009-2010 can be finalized at the September SASS meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
Next Meeting: Friday, September 25, 2009, 2:30-4:00 in GHH CAFÉ room

Draft for REVISED TRIAL UAA GUIDELINES for Academic Program Review

August 31, 2009

Purpose for the revision:

- All academic programs and units at UAA are required by Board of Regents Regulation R10.06.010 to engage in program review.
- The current program review process (Appendix A) is thought to be too cumbersome of a process.
- The goal is simplify the program review process.

Outline of the proposal:

The review process will involve 3 levels of review:

1. First level. An initial review with a set of questions and data that meets the minimum requirements for program review set out by BOR R10.06.010 (see Appendix B). These include:
    a. Demonstration of mission alignment of the program with appropriate university, college, or school missions and strategic plans;
    b. Description of the role the program plays in supporting other academic programs; any partnerships with outside agencies, businesses, or organizations; specific workforce development and employment opportunities; sources of extramural support and funding; high demand job designation.
    c. Incorporation of the results of program assessment, and an opportunity for comment on the results;
    d. The following sets of data, provided to the program, with the opportunity for comment on positive or negative trends:
        i. 5 year SCH production trend
        ii. 5 year degree or certificate awards trend
        iii. 5 year majors trend
    e. Initial reviews in later years may include the following data: instructional cost/ SCH, instructional FTE to SCH ratios.
2. Second level. A program may be selected for more detailed evaluation on the recommendation of the dean of the college. The justification will be based on issues of performance, mission alignment, and so forth.
3. Third level. The Deans and Directors review the totality of program reviews. Together they select the UAA programs that will undergo a more thorough analysis over the academic year. Programs not selected for a more detailed analysis are finished with this process for the academic year.
    a. Deans and Directors, together with the Provost, determine what questions will be answered by the detailed evaluation and identify the data that need to be collected, the timeframe of the review, and the membership and leadership of the team performing the review.
    b. The findings of the review team are presented to the dean. A formal meeting is arranged with the Provost to review findings and recommendations of the review process. An action plan is prepared for the program.

Note: Programs that have recently undergone special accreditation review may be exempted from the more thorough analysis, and the results of the accreditation will be used in lieu of the more detailed analysis, if required.

To be sent to Program Chairs and Faculty: Initial Evaluation of Programs

PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

1. Program Mission and Alignment
Please review the missions of UAA and your college. Describe in one page or less your program mission, and its alignment with these other missions.

2. Supporting Role
Briefly describe the role the program plays in supporting other academic programs; any partnerships with outside agencies, businesses, or organizations; specific workforce development and employment opportunities; sources of extramural support and funding; high demand job designation.

3. Program Performance
Comment on the following data sets provided. Please provide clarifications or explanations for any positive or negative trends indicated by the data:

Data provided:
5 year SCH production
5 year majors
5 year degree awards
OAA program assessment (summary?)

Please return this initial program evaluation to your college Dean or Director by TBA.

Appendix A

C. Process

1. Each chancellor shall be responsible for setting an academic program review process in place at his/her campus or unit. Results of the process shall be utilized for budgeting and planning purposes of the unit and shall be reported to the Board of Regents upon their request.
2. Exceptional reviews shall be conducted in accordance with an expedited process developed by the chancellor and approved by the president on an ad hoc basis to meet the needs of the campus.

Program Review (Special and Cyclic) – Determination of programs for review for 2009-10

Data Sets:

1. OPRA data sets provide detailed information in the form of the accreditation template, academic unit profiles, trend books, special reports and white papers. All are available on the website:
   http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/opra/
   Password is IRADM227
2. Departmental reports on assessment of student learning outcomes are available from OAA, with the most recent reports posted at: http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/assessment/assessmentmaterialsbyprogram.cfm
3. Additional data may be gathered from university, local, state or national sources and cited in the review. Include analyses of any data cited in the review.

   Other considerations: Evidence of teaching effectiveness; student success; contributions to mission, Institutional Learning Outcomes, GER outcomes, core themes, input from advisory committees, etc.

Program Review Procedure (Recent procedure – Open for redesign)
The Program Review process provides the most thorough examination of the condition and functioning of an academic program or unit. It is mandated by the UA Board of Regents and must be completed on a 5-year cycle or may be initiated at any time by a dean or director. Each review must include:

1. A self study, written and reviewed by the faculty, which addresses the points in this guideline.
2. Review of the self study and evaluation of the program or unit by a committee of experts, some of whom come from outside the department, and from outside of the university. The committee is proposed by the Dean and appointed by the Provost.
3. Dean or Director evaluation of the unit.
4. An action plan developed by the Dean and the Provost, after review of all submitted materials and in consultation with appropriate faculty and administrators. The plan deals with recommendations and any issues that are indicated in the Program Review.
5. Departments follow up at a determined time with reports on the implementation of the action plans.

A self-study is prepared by the program under review which includes information and discussion of **items 1.0 to 6.0** below. The self-study should be analytical rather than informational. Important explanatory documentation should be referenced but not included in the study. The faculty, review committee and dean's analyses of the performance, support, and plans for the program are the highest priority.

The calendar and deadlines for the reviews are established by the provost as reviews are commissioned and as review committees are appointed. [Program reviews for programs with special accreditation are conducted simultaneously with development of the accreditation self-study whenever possible.]

Self Study Outline: (Open for redesign)

1.0 Program Profile

Material provided for the program profile should include the departmental AUP, the most recent outcomes assessment report and a narrative that briefly describes any of the following that are applicable:

1.1 A list of degrees or certificates covered in the review, their goals, audience served and any needed notes on their alignment with the university and college missions (match between program outcomes and institutional outcomes, program activities and the priorities of the strategic plan).

1.2 Documentation on the student demand for the program and the local or state needs met by the program.

1.3 Special departmental characteristics, including statewide responsibilities, accreditation requirements, state or professional licensing standards, special funding, collaborative arrangements or commitments to constituencies outside of the university.

1.4 Recommendations from the last program review and a summary of the evaluations and comments from the annual audits submitted by the dean since the last review.

1.5 A description of progress in the UA adopted performance metrics: Graduates in High Demand Areas, Retention, Student Credit Hours (SCH), Research Expenditures, University Generated Revenues, Program Assessments, and Enrollment Management Planning.

1.6 A description of experience with distance or alternative delivery methods.

1.7 Descriptions of interactions with other academic programs on campus (support for other majors, support needed from other disciplines, general education)

1.8 Descriptions of interactions with other academic programs elsewhere in the university system (collaborative programs, etc.).

1.8 Other appropriate data supplied by the department.

2.0 Faculty

2.1 Headcount and qualifications of faculty members and an assessment of their abilities to offer quality programs.

2.2 Evidence of teaching effectiveness

2.3 A profile of the productivity of the faculty, including teaching, service, research and creative activities, and administrative responsibilities for each of the past five years. Address SCH, sections taught, and enrollment numbers, class size and student faculty ratio. May be found in the AUP tables 5 and 10.

2.4 Summarize service activities and discuss significant accomplishments of faculty as reported in annual activity reports.

2.5 Discuss research and creative activities and accomplishments of faculty as reported in annual activity reports. Include proposals submitted, proposals funded (number and amount), projects completed, articles published, papers presented, performances and other pertinent data.

3.0 Students

3.1 Indicate the number of majors and annual number of graduates by program for each of the past five years, their GPAs and credits at graduation. (AUP data tables 7, 8, & 10)

3.2 Evidence of student success in achieving their educational goals, engagement in academic and community activities,

3.3 Address employment demand for and placement rate of graduates of professional programs. (This may be informal data gathered by the programs from advisory groups or directly from US Department of Labor reports on graduates.)

3.4 Address the quality of graduates. (Criteria used by the program should be clearly defined, measured and reported in the plan for assessment of educational effectiveness, or Outcomes Assessment Plan.)

3.5 Address enrollment barriers, limits and trends and attrition values and trends.

4.0 Program revenue and expenses – AUP Table 9

4.1 Discuss productivity and efficiencies. Include amounts and trends in costs per student credit hour (SCH) for the past five years for direct instruction (IN program code), Instructional support (ID), and Academic Support (AS). Comment on AUP data.

4.3 Discuss amounts and trends in revenue received per student credit hour (SCH) for the past five years from tuition, fees, and sponsored activities. Comment on AUP data.

4.2 Compare cost per student credit hour (SCH) to other programs. (Similar programs at UAA are in the AUP Data Tables for reference. Use programs in peer institutions if information is available.)

5.0 Program Support

5.1 Adequacy of library holdings, facilities, network and instructional technology, laboratory and other equipment, including practices used for equipment maintenance and replacement.

5.2 Adequacy of professional development for faculty and staff and for staff/student support.

5.3 Other.

6.0 Qualitative Information

6.1 Evidence of student outcomes achieved, as assessed through the program's continuous improvement process. Reports should include program outcomes, and, for each outcome, the indicators, data collected, targets, faculty recommendations and actions taken to improve educational effectiveness or address issues raised by assessment. The two page assessment report and recommendations may be appended.

6.2 Results of student, alumni or employer surveys, placement on national exams, acceptance into graduate programs or other indicators of student success.

6.3 Innovations in pedagogy, professional development, application of technology, etc.

6.4 Comments from program advisory committees and a list of members of the advisory committee, the business/industry each member represents, and committee activities concerning curriculum, equipment, faculty, and program evaluation and advocacy.

6.5 Other

Program Review Procedure (continued after completion of self study)

Review committees, appointed by the Provost, review the self study prepared by the department faculty and include their own recommendations and comments regarding program strengths and weaknesses/deficiencies; and recommendations for change, growth or reduction.

Departmental faculty may prepare a response to the recommendations of the review committee that is included for the Dean's and Provost's review.

Deans/Directors prepare a response to the self study and include their own perspectives and recommendations for the Provost.

The Provost meets with the Dean/Director and departmental representatives to discuss the prior reviews and to create an action plan to deal with recommendations.

Review Expectations

The self study should not exceed 10 pages (not including attachments). An additional sheet each can be added for the committee, dean and faculty recommendations. The final outcome is a summary and action plan prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Appendix B

UAA GUIDELINES for Academic Program Assessment

Draft – July 2009

REFERENCES: **University of Alaska Regulation 10.06.01.A**
NWCCU Standard 2

Purpose: Expressed in Regents' Policy *P10.06.010. Academic Program Review.*

A. In accordance with P10.04.020, it is the responsibility of the board to review and cause the initiation, augmentation, reduction or discontinuance of programs according to the mission of the university and its constituent institutions. This includes a degree or certificate program approved by the board.

B. Each MAU will conduct assessments of all instructional, research, and service programs with respect to quality, efficiency, and contribution to mission and goals. Assessments of instructional programs will include analysis of educational effectiveness as an essential part of the ongoing continuous improvement and accreditation processes. Assessments will be conducted at a minimum of every five years. Occupational endorsements and workforce credentials approved by the president will be subject to review at the MAU level.

C. Exceptional reviews may be conducted as needed, to respond to issues including but not limited to specific academic or budgetary concerns. An expedited review process tailored to the particular circumstances shall be used for exceptional reviews.

Further details are provided in University Regulation

R10.06.010. Academic Program Review.

A. Purpose

This regulation suggests the elements each campus of the statewide system should employ in its review of academic programs.

B. Elements for Evaluation

The programs of each of the university's major units follow from its respective mission (Policy 01.01); changes in programs should be consistent with and guided by these mission statements.

The necessary elements that a unit should assess during the program review process include the following:

1. Centrality of the program to the mission, needs and purposes of the university and the unit;
2. Quality of the program, as determined by the establishment and regular assessment of program outcomes. Outcomes should be comprehensive, and indications of achievement should involve multiple measures and satisfy the properties of good evidence.
3. Demand for program services, as indicated by measures such as: credit hour production appropriate to the program's mission, services performed by the program in support of other programs, graduates produced, the prospective market for graduates, expressed need by clientele in the service area, documented needs of the state and/or nation for specific knowledge, data, or analysis, other documented need;
4. Program productivity and efficiency as indicated by courses, student credit hours, sponsored proposals and service achievements produced in comparison to the number of faculty and staff and the costs of program support;
5. Timeliness of an action to augment, reduce or discontinue the program;
6. Cost of the program relative to the cost of comparable programs or to revenue produced;
7. Unnecessary program duplication resulting from the existence of a similar program or programs elsewhere in the University of Alaska statewide system.

what would be data set for this?

TO: Genie Babb, Senate President

FROM: Letitia Fickel, Chair
Task Force on Faculty Work for Promotion, Tenure,
Post-Tenure Review, and Hiring

DATE: August 31, 2009

RE: Summary of Summer Activities & Monthly Report for August

The Task Force had a productive summer. Based on the strengths and gaps identified in the Gap Analysis Report, and using the ad hoc Committee's draft as a framework, the Task Force crafted an initial draft of our recommendations for a revised faculty evaluation process. The recommendations represent a comprehensive revision of Chapter III of the Faculty Handbook.

With the beginning of the new academic year, we began rolling-out the draft for faculty review and discussion. Due to the comprehensive nature of the recommendations, the initial draft is a somewhat lengthy document. Therefore, in an effort to ensure full consideration of the various parts of the recommendations, the Task Force has opted to structure the review and feedback sessions around a few key sections at a time. In this way, over the course of the fall, we will gather input on the entire set of recommendations in a focused and more deliberative manner.

To date we have held dialogue and feedback sessions at the Senate Faculty Retreat, three colleges/schools, and three community campuses. Approximately 160 faculty and administrators participated in these sessions. Additional sessions are scheduled for September as an all-faculty meeting sponsored by CAFE, and for colleges, campuses, schools, and departments that have expressed interest in hosting a session.

We will continue hosting dialogue and feedback sessions around different sections of the recommendations throughout October and November. Our goal is to have a final draft complete for faculty review in December. We'd like to target January for a final review by the Senate Faculty. Once a draft is endorsed by the Senate, we will forward the recommendations to the Provost and Chancellor for their review. We are still holding May 2009 as our target for final approval and adoption.

POLICIES AND PROCEEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, POST-TENURE REVIEW AND HIRING

I. PURPOSE

The mission of the University of Alaska Anchorage is to discover and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, engagement, and creative expression. We seek to be a university of distinction, recognized for excellence in teaching and learning centered on professional and craft practice, academic research and creative expression. In achieving our mission, UAA places greatest emphasis on a set of core values:

- Academic freedom and diversity
- Affordable access and high quality
- Student success and community engagement
- Innovation and creativity
- Cooperation and collaboration
- Sustainability and stewardship
- Integrity and accountability
- Effectiveness and efficiency

The following policies and procedures for the evaluation of faculty have been established to provide an equitable and fair assessment of each individual faculty member and his/her contribution to the collective institutional mission, goals and core values.

II. PRINCIPLES

The University of Alaska Anchorage is committed to excellence in the selection and continued development of faculty members. A key aspect of faculty development is the regular evaluation of faculty for retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review Individual faculty members bring different strengths, perspectives, experiences, and talents to their faculty role, and they are members of disciplinary departments with varying forms of scholarship, foci, and goals. Therefore, applying an identical set of criteria for all faculty members is unrealistic and can serve to undermine the ultimate quality of an academic unit and the institution as a whole. UAA's faculty evaluation system has been developed to recognize and honor the inherent diversity of faculty work, with the goal of supporting and encouraging faculty to bring together their unique talents into a cohesive and integrated scholarly practice. Furthermore, the system is designed to recognize and support differential emphasis and interests over the course of a faculty member's career.

The examination and evaluation of faculty work must be done within the context of the explicit goals of the institution, embodied in the mission and strategic plan. The most valuable resource the university has for enacting its mission is the time, talent, and expertise of the faculty. An evaluation system aligned with the mission provides faculty with a clear set of expectations around which faculty may focus their work and continue their professional development and achievement. In this way, individual faculty will pursue individualized professional pathways based on their unique talents that contribute to the collective achievement of the institutional mission.

The evaluation of faculty members for hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review should also occur in the context of established criteria of high-quality work, and clearly communicated expectations and responsibilities set forth by the department chair, dean, campus director or other designated administrator in a faculty member's initial appointment letter, and subsequent modifications made for annual workload agreements; the results of periodic reviews or previous promotion or tenure decisions; and the priorities of the department, unit, college, campus, and the University.

These guidelines and procedures shall be interpreted and implemented within the framework of the UA Board of Regent's Policies (P0.04.101-070), the internal governance procedures of the University of Alaska Anchorage, and the relevant Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBAs) of United Academics (UnAc) and the University of Alaska Federation of Teachers (UAFT).

III. FACULTY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Overview of Faculty Responsibilities[1]

The central tasks of the university include the promotion of learning and the expansion of knowledge. These tasks place responsibility upon faculty members with respect to their students, their disciplines, the university, and the community. In support of these responsibilities, the university seeks to foster the continued development of faculty in ways that support their effective engagement with students, as well as with local, national and international communities and colleagues. Faculty have a responsibility to their students, their disciplines, the community and the university to strive for exemplary intellectual, ethical, aesthetic, and creative achievement. Such achievements are the defining qualifications for appointment, tenure, and promotion in the professorial ranks. Individuals appointed to the faculty are expected to possess the intellectual and professional integrity associated with the exercise of academic freedom and shared governance, to show respect for the opinions of others, to maintain accepted standards of civility and professionalism, to cooperate effectively with others, and to consider the welfare of the total institution.[2]

It is expected that all faculty members will maintain currency in the developments in their fields-- whether disciplinary, multi-disciplinary, or interdisciplinary—and remain actively engaged in scholarship throughout their careers.

[1] This section is a synthesis and adaptation from a number of sources: E. Boyer (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Portland State University, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases (1996); University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University-wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure.

[2] AAUP, 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments* ; *On Collegiality as a Criterion for Faculty Evaluation*
http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/default.htm

All faculty members have a responsibility to engage in scholarly work in teaching, academic research, craft/professional practice, or creative expression, and community engagement, according to their respective appointments and positions, in order to contribute to the knowledge-base in their fields. Each faculty member is also expected to contribute to the shared governance, accreditation processes, and professionally-related service activities of the university.

The Centrality of Scholarship to Faculty Responsibilities

The faculty evaluation guidelines of UAA are grounded in a definition of scholarship that can be appropriately applied to all facets of faculty work: *Scholarship, or scholarly work, is characterized by creative intellectual work reflective of a high level of professional expertise, the significance of which can be examined and validated by others, and which supports the fulfillment of the mission of the University.*

Scholarship encompasses teaching, academic research, creative expression, professional and craft practice, community engagement and service. Scholarship takes a number of forms:

1) Discovery-- Advancement of knowledge through original research, or original creations in writing, performance, or production;
2) Integration--Synthesizing and integrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning, and new relationships between the parts and the whole, either within a discipline or across multiple disciplines;
3) Application—Assessing the efficacy of existing academic, aesthetic, creative, professional or craft knowledge within a particular context or to address a significant problem, refining its implications or using it to effect change;
4) Transformation/Interpretation—Revealing, explaining and illuminating knowledge and intellectual, creative, professional or craft processes for others.

This expanded definition of scholarship serves to encompass all outstanding faculty work that furthers the educational goals of students, faculty, academic units and campuses, the university, and the varied communities with which we are engaged. This more inclusive definition of scholarship also allows for greater recognition of diverse activities that reflect the mosaic of faculty talent that strengthens the university as a whole

Scholarship generally implies that one has a solid foundation in the professional field addressed and is current with developments in that field. However, it must be noted that significant advances often accrue when a scholar extends her or his scope of topics to engage in multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary inquiry.

The Focus on Community Engagement[3]

The University of Alaska Anchorage has been nationally recognized, receiving the Carnegie classification of "Community Engaged University in Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships." This is an elective classification UAA sought in order to recognize an important aspect of our institutional mission and sustained efforts. In alignment with the Carnegie

[3] UAA Definitions of Community Engagement, Curricular Engagement, Community-based Research, and Engaged Service. Reviewed and Revised by the UAA Faculty Senate and UAA Office of Academic Affairs and submitted by Nancy Andes, Professor of Sociology, and Director, Center for Community Engagement & Learning, May 8, 2007.

classification, UAA describes ***community engagement*** as collaborations between institutions of higher education and individuals, organizations, and institutions in their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

Community engagement expands the variety of university outreach and partnership activities of faculty and recognizes community-based research, engaged service, and curricular engagement as forms of scholarly engagement when they demonstrably meet the principles of high quality scholarship.

UAA highly values quality community engagement as part of faculty roles and responsibilities, and as such consider it a vital component of faculty evaluation considerations. Community engagement includes:

1. *Community-based research* is rooted in a particular time and setting and calls for shared expertise. It values the participation of local community members and brings their perspectives into the research process. It includes community-responsive clinical and population-based care (for example, community-oriented primary care, academic public health practice), and participatory action research. Key differences from traditional social science research are the active inclusion of community members' perspectives and reciprocal learning. Related methodologies include applied research, technical assistance, and policy research, though these do not necessarily maintain a reciprocal relationship with community members during the research process.

2. *Engaged service* happens when faculty are engaged in service in the community in a way that enhances both their experience and the community's well being. This kind of public work and collaborative practice is linked to community-identified problems in a process of community change and development. It relies on faculty expertise and components that define scholarship, including clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique, rigor, and peer review.

3. *Curricular engagement* includes approaches where teaching, learning and scholarship engage faculty, students, and community in mutually beneficial and respectful collaboration. Their interactions address community-identified needs, deepen students' civic and academic learning, enhance community well-being, and enrich the scholarship of the institution.

Scholarly Agenda

A scholarly agenda is a faculty member's proposed program of scholarly work, outlining his/her professional and discipline-based foci, long-term goals, and proposed contributions to scholarship over a three to five year period. In this way, the agenda serves as the foundation for establishing and maintaining a productive and meaningful career. As each faculty member, regardless of rank, is primarily responsible for planning and guiding his or her own career, the development and enactment of a scholarly agenda is an essential and on-going responsibility for all faculty members. Establishing a scholarly agenda provides a faculty member the opportunity

to identify and define his or her professional goals and focus of scholarly efforts within the framework of departmental, unit, and university goals and mission. It is not designed to limit or inhibit a faculty member's academic freedom nor constrain his/her scholarship. Rather, it allows the faculty member to articulate how to direct and develop his or her unique array of talents and expertise. The scholarly agenda, therefore, should be specific regarding goals, priorities, and scholarly activities, but not a list of tasks or expected outcomes. Over the course of one's academic career, one's scholarly interests, priorities, and relative areas of emphasis evolve and change. For this reason, it is expected that faculty members will revisit and revise their scholarly agenda every three to five years.

IV. EVALUATION OF FACULTY FOR RETENTION, TENURE, PROMOTION, & POST-TENURE REVIEW

The decisions to retain, grant tenure to, or promote a faculty member are among the most vital that take place in a university. One of the hallmarks of a university of distinction is the quality of its faculty and their scholarly achievements in teaching, academic research and creative expression, community engagement, and service. With respect for forms of scholarship, vigor, flexibility, and breadth, it is expected that faculty members will exhibit highly varied profiles of scholarly pursuits and achievement. Judgments about the application of the university's criteria of quality and significance of scholarly achievement within each of the components of faculty responsibility will vary with disciplines and professional fields, and with unit goals.

Those making retention, tenure, and promotion recommendations have an obligation of stewardship to students, consumers of academic research and creative expression, the existing community of scholars and professional practitioners, and the community at-large to ensure the best faculty possible. The conscientious exercise of this responsibility requires that the university retain, tenure, and promote only those faculty members who have demonstrated a consistent pattern of high-quality scholarly achievement across the components of faculty responsibility and whose expertise and achievement have contributed to the unit goals and institutional mission.

Evaluation of Faculty Scholarship

The division of faculty responsibilities into three distinct components serves to clarify a complex evaluation process by providing a framework for the assessment of faculty scholarly work. Although these roles are specified below, it is important to remember that such clear and sharp distinctions between the components do not exist. Rather, scholarly activities should emphasize the mutually-reinforcing and integrative relationships among these components. Moreover, no faculty member will be expected to commit an equal amount of time, make equal contributions, or achieve equally in the three components of faculty responsibilities described below.

a. Teaching and Learning

Teaching well is UAA's primary mission. Teaching is challenging and dynamic enterprise that encompasses a range of scholarly activities, from classroom instruction to including students in research, from mentoring to curriculum development, from participating in faculty development

to the scholarship of teaching and beyond. Faculty members are expected to be reflective practitioners who continuously examine their effectiveness as educators. In addition, their teaching should reveal and develop diverse perspectives, encourage and facilitate inquiry, creativity, and life-long learning, and work to integrate the principles central to the vision, mission, and core values of UAA. (see Section I)

When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness is an essential criterion for advancement. Faculty must demonstrate command of their subject matter, continuous growth in the subject field, and an ability to create and maintain instructional environments that promote student learning and attainment of UAA's Institutional Learning Outcomes (see sidebar).

UAA's Institutional Learning Outcomes specify that by the time students graduate they will be able to:

- Communicate effectively
- Employ critical thinking skills
- Demonstrate skills for independent learning and inquiry, including information literacy
- Demonstrate a knowledge base in the required general education areas
- Demonstrate specific knowledge and skills in a major discipline or degree

Teaching is much more than instruction in the classroom lab, or via distance-delivery modes and technologies. The work of teaching includes curriculum writing, developing course materials, cultivating community internships, writing letters of recommendation, mentoring, planning and conducting workshops for colleagues, and so on. Every teacher combines these aspects in different ways at different times. Aspects of teaching include:

Instructing: Teaching students in courses, laboratories, field instruction, clinics, studio classes or in web-based environments; teaching participants in workshops, retreats, seminars; managing a course [student assessment, student records, learning experiences]; applying effective instructional design strategies to teaching and learning.

Building and Developing Curriculum: Developing and revising outcomes-based curriculum and assessment; shaping teaching materials, manuals, software; designing and implementing new or varied delivery modes, including web-based and new media technologies; constructing resources to support distributed education and independent learning; selecting, organizing, and providing access to information resources.

Mentoring Students: Advising for academic success and career planning; providing opportunities and supporting students' research and scholarship; providing capstone, service learning, and independent study opportunities; supervising research assistants and teaching assistants.
Advancing Teaching Excellence: Mentoring colleagues and observing their teaching; reviewing current literature and national standards in subject areas; planning and contributing to professional development activities; shaping and improving assessment methods; conducting instructional and classroom inquiry.

Advancing Student Excellence: Writing recommendation letters and/or nominating students for scholarships and awards; supporting student accomplishments such as Student Showcase, Undergraduate Research Grants, and presentations at professional conferences; chairing student committees such as graduate theses, honors, or capstone courses.

(See Appendix ?, pp ? for more information on UAA's Teaching Excellence Model)

b. Academic Research and Creative Expression

Academic research and creative expression are vital to the mission of UAA in order to advance knowledge, support teaching and learning, and promote the application of knowledge in ways that benefit our local communities and broader society. Faculty members are expected to engage in high quality, significant research or creative activities as appropriate to their positions, disciplines or fields, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the university. Research and creative expression includes all forms of scholarship--discovery, integration, interpretation and application --and their public dissemination. These activities will generally include, but are not limited to, the following:

Conducting and Disseminating Research: Conducting basic and applied research and inquiry; writing books, monographs, textbooks; writing book chapters; editing books; writing papers in refereed journals and conference proceedings; presenting papers at professional meetings; writing translations, abstracts, and reviews; successfully involving students in ongoing research.

Producing and Performing Creative Works: Writing poems, plays, essays, musical scores; Producing radio and television productions, films, and videos; engaging in competitions, commissions, exhibitions; directing, choreographing and performing creative works, musical, theatrical, or dance; designing and arranging creative works; creating and preparing software and electronically published documents; developing electronic and print information resources that support the curriculum.

Disseminating Curriculum and Pedagogical Innovations: Disseminating creative approaches to teaching methods and techniques, including publication or presentation at professional meetings and the development of software and other technologies that advance student learning; writing grant proposals and receiving grants for the development of curriculum or teaching methods and techniques; participating in the supervision of student research or independent study, capstone projects, and the mentoring of students that leads to the presentation of research and other creative works.

Disseminating Innovations in Clinical and Craft Practice: Disseminating novel or creative approaches in clinical or craft practices, including publication or presentation at professional meetings; the development, production, and dissemination of tools, technologies, or methods that enhance clinical or craft practice.

Editing and Managing Creative Works: Fulfilling editorial assignments with scholarly and professional publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media; participating in scholarly conferences as panel organizer and/or discussant; organizing and directing scholarly conferences, symposia, and other similar activities.

Leading and Managing Funded Research, Contracts, and Creative Projects: Leading multidisciplinary projects, task forces; writing proposals to funding agencies [private, public, and internal]; managing budgets of grants and contracts; selecting and supervising staff; preparing required reports.

c. Service

Academic and professional service is essential to creating an environment that supports scholarly excellence, enables shared governance, meets the internal operational needs of the university, and enhances the region, state, and world. All faculty members are expected to engage in service activities, with increasing involvement at higher ranks. Service can take a number of forms including:

Community Engagement
Faculty members who focus on community-engaged service enhance both their scholarly knowledge and the community's well being. Community Engagement is grounded in collaborative practice and shared leadership and focuses on the application of knowledge and processes to community-identified problems and concerns. The central focus of the work is engagement in a process of community change and development.

Professional Service
Faculty members engaged in professional service use their academic training, professional expertise, and experience to serve the public or discipline, while contributing to the university's mission. The diversity of external needs, as well as faculty training and experience, leads to many different forms of professional service. These may include, but are not limited to activities such as serving on public boards, task forces or committees, providing workshops or training, or serving as a reviewer, officer, or in another leadership capacity for discipline-based organizations or associations.

University Service
University Service includes service to the department, college, and university. Faculty engaged in University Service contribute to the shared governance system and institutional development through a variety of activities including service on committees, task forces, policy advisory bodies, and the development and management of academic programs.

Directed Service
This type of service, whether performed for the department, the university, or the public at large, is explicitly defined and delineated in a faculty member's position description, requires academic credentials or skills, and is in general routinely and explicitly scheduled in terms of time and place. Such service furthers the mission of and is central to the goals of the department or unit. Typical examples are the responsibilities of librarians, counselors, academic program directors or coordinators, directors of centers, institutions, or special programs, and department chairs. In some cases, these service activities constitute a significant part of a faculty member's contributions to the university and its mission. However, not all departments, units, campuses, or colleges will include this category of service.

Quality and Significance of Scholarship[4]

In the faculty evaluation and review process, the emphasis is on the critical assessment and evaluation of the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly achievements by professional peers. Thus, the evaluation system must distinguish among the criteria that relate to the quality of a faculty member's scholarly work, as well as the equally important criterion of the significance and relevance of this body of work to the department, unit (college or campus) and institutional mission(s).

A consistent pattern of high quality of scholarship across all dimensions of faculty work is more important than the quantity of work done, as it reflects the promise of continued professional development and exemplary scholarship. The criteria for evaluating quality and significance of a faculty member's scholarship include the following:*

1. Reflects high level of discipline-related expertise

2. Establishes clear and relevant goals

3. Uses appropriate methods and resources

4. Effectively documented and communicated

5. Results in significant impact or outcomes

6. Demonstrates ethical behavior
Conforms to and promotes the established legal and ethical codes of conduct of the discipline or professional field and university, including counseling students, supervision of staff, treatment of students, staff and faculty colleagues, issues related to intellectual property rights, and the protection of human and animal subjects.

**Narrative descriptions to follow for items 1-5.*

[4] This section has been adapted from a number of sources: Portland State University, Policies and Procedures for the Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increases (1996); R. M. Diamond & B.E. Adams (1993). Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward systems for the year 2000. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; C.E. Glassick, M. T. Huber, & G.I. Maeroff (1997), Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass

Program/Course Action Request

A. CTC

Chg		Minor, Health & Fitness Leadership
Chg		Occupational Endorsement Certificate, Fitness Leadership
Chg	PEP A115	Fitness Leadership/ Group Fitness and Personal Training (3 cr) (3+0)
Chg	PEP A116	Techniques in Group Fitness Instruction (2 cr) (1+2)
Chg	PEP A117	Techniques in Personal Training (2 cr) (1+2)
Del	PEP A215	Issues in Fitness Leadership (3 cr) (3+0)
Del	PEP A216	Techniques in Fitness Instruction II (2 cr) (1+2)
Del	PEP A217	Techniques in Personal Instruction II (2 cr) (1+2)
Del	PEP A218	Techniques in Aqua Fitness Instruction (2 cr) (1+2)

B. CHSW

Add	NS A439	Spirituality in Nursing (3 cr) (3+0) (pg. 31-35)
Chg	JUST A250	Development of Law (3 cr) (3+0)

Motions:
The Undergraduate Academic Board approved the attached goals for 2009-2010.

Informational Item
Additional motions made:

The Undergraduate Academic Board approved a new way to arrange the agenda.
First reading will continue to be ordered in the way in which the curriculum submissions are received.
Second reading will no longer be arranged by college. They will keep the original order that they had during the first reading.
Minus the following exceptions:
If curriculum is perfectly clean at the first reading, it will move to the front of the line for second reading.
If curriculum revisions from the first reading are not received by the deadline and/or the faculty initiator is not present at the UAB meeting, the items are moved to the back of queue at second reading.

The Undergraduate Academic Board approves the following six UAB members to serve on GERC.

Kevin Keating	Suzanne Forster
Oliver Hedgepeth	Utpal Dutta
Deborah Fox	Kenrick Mock

Date: August 29, 2009

From: M. Hilary Davies, UAB Chair

Subj: Proposed goals for 2009-2010

GOAL 1: Update the Curriculum Handbook, as needed.

There are a few issues that may need more review during the 2009-2010 academic year. They include:

1. Digital signatures for the CARs and PARs.
2. Distance Education information linked to the Curriculum Handbook.
3. Is it permissible for a faculty member to sign the CAR/PAR in more than one capacity?
   If so, is there a limit to the number of lines that one faculty member can sign?
4. Clarification on who can present curriculum at UAB/GAB. Faculty member or faculty representative is understood. What if a person is tenured in a department but has a full-time administrative assignment?
5. Contact Hours. Examples do not seem to agree with the Summary.

GOAL 2: Continue to work with the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Registrar to review policies and procedures for their impacts on academics, to ensure faculty input and review by UAB and GAB.

GOAL 3: Work with the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of the Registrar to publish existing curriculum/academic policies.

GOAL 4: Update the plan for curriculum updates together with the GAB Chair and Associate Vice Provost Bart Quimby.

GOAL 5: Support the establishment of the UAB/GAB Subcommittee on Assessment.

University of Alaska Anchorage

Annual Budget Meeting

August 4, 2009

DRAFT: Not Approved by BOR

Cabinet Strategic Guidance

- Budget building processes based on UAA 2017 and UA 2009 strategic plans
- Accreditation process requires links between analysis, planning and budgeting
- UAA will preserve and build on success of last 10 years
  - Strengthen instruction, student success initiatives and research

FY11 Operating Budget Request

- Operating Program Increments
  - Total requests submitted to PBAC - $13,271.2
  - Recommended to Chancellor's Cabinet - $7,118.2
  - Highest priority needs - $4,299.6

FY11 Operating Budget Request

- High Demand Jobs priority programs include:
  - Dietetics and Nutrition Program Expansion (Health)
  - Clinical Rotations/Health Pipeline (Health)
  - Occupational Therapy Liaison/Lab (Health)
  - Ultrasound Faculty (Health)
  - BSE/CE Faculty (Engineering)
  - Pharmacy Careers Faculty/Liaison (Health)
  - Physical Therapy Careers Faculty/Liaison (Health)
  - Human Services Faculty (Health)
  - Faculty/Job Internship Program (Engineering)
  - Process Technology – KPC (WFD)
  - Nursing Clinical Coordinator (Health)
  - Architectural/Engineering Faculty (WFD)
  - AAST Vocational Program – KOC (WFD)
  - Renewable Energy Program – MSC (Energy)

FY11 Operating Budget Request

- Total fixed cost request - $3,221.0
  - Includes:
    - Integrated Sciences Building
    - Lease Costs
    - Emergency Preparedness
    - University Advancement

UAA FY11 New Construction—Top 3 - $31.6M

- Community Campuses—8 Projects; $ 43.7M

1.	**Kenai Career and Technical Ed Ctr**	**$**	**13.0M**
2.	**Kodiak Vo-tech and Warehouse**	**$**	**15.1M**
3.	**Mat-Su Paramedic Classroom Add**	**$**	**3.5M**
4.	KPC Student Housing ($17.5M) Design	$	1.8M
5.	Mat-Su Trunk Road Entrance and Signage	$	1.1M
6.	PWSCC Lecture Hall/Classroom Add	$	2.2M
7.	Mat Su VCAL ($61M)—Design	$	6.5M
8.	KPC Homer Hesketh Island Site Planning	$	.5M

Note: 10 year New Construction Ave= $1.9M/Yr

UAA FY11 New Construction—Top 4 - $125.8M

- UAA- 9 Projects for --$152.6M

1.	**Sports Arena**	**$**	**65.0M**
2.	**Engineering Classroom Lab Research Bldg Ph I**	**$**	**50.0M**
3.	**Health Sciences Bldg Ph II (P/D)**	**$**	**7.0M**
4.	**Health Sciences Parking Struct and Bridge (P/D)**	**$**	**3.8M**
5.	Student Housing Ph II ($14.1**/$7.9**)	$	14.1M
6.	Library and Native Student Resource Center (P/D)	$	2.0M
7.	Honors College/Chester CK CRB (P/D)	$	3.8M
8.	Aviation Renewal (P/D)	$	4.5M
9.	East Campus Quad Pathways	$	2.5M

Note: 10 year New Construction Ave= $17M/Yr

Advancement Report, September 2009

Alumni Relations

•"Alumni Alerts"

AR is sending out "alumni alerts" to a variety of constituents this year. When we receive exciting news and information about one of our alums, I send out an "alumni alert" to VIPs to share the news. This effort helps to build awareness of what successes our alumni have once they leave UAA.

• **Homecoming is the week of October 9 -16 2009**. Mark your calendars!

University Advancement Personnel Updates:

Donor Relations:

Jill Fankhauser is our new Donor Relations Manager. Jill is a UAA alumna and has strong writing, donor relations and database management skills. Most recently she served as a reporter/editor for the *Alaska Star*, and has also served as the Development Coordinator for AWAIC and the Communications Manager for Food Bank of Alaska. She will be a great addition to the Advancement team.

Development Specialist:

Heather Karwowski has joined the Advancement team as a Development Specialist. Her official start date was Thursday, August 27. Heather brings great energy and a solid background in database, communications, events and research skills. In her role here, she will serve as the liaison between Advancement and the colleges to ensure accurate and timely donor acknowledgement, coordinate scholarship activities, provide event support to development officers and conduct research on prospects. She will work closely with our new Donor Relations Manager, Jill Fankhauser.

Heather has a BA in Communications, with an emphasis in PR. Her work experience includes conducting research and managing events for an executive search firm in London and serving as an events specialist for Washington State University (WSU) Campus Involvement. She has also served in a volunteer capacity as the Public Relations Director for Washington State University Student Alumni Connection, so has a strong appreciation for the importance of alumni and student relations.

Maternity Leave:

Vice Chancellor Megan Olson is on maternity leave and will be out of the office completely until October 6, 2009. She will return part-time on October 6.

In her absence, the Office of University Advancement will continue to operate in the capable hands of our leadership team, which includes two Assistant Vice Chancellors, Kristin DeSmith (University Relations) and Beth Rose (Development) and a Senior Director of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving, Julia Martinez.

Save the Date – ISB Grand Public Opening

Friday, October 16, 2009 at 4:00 pm.

Please save the date to attend the large public celebration of the opening of the Integrated Science Building. More details to come.

Development

UAA's Directors of Development are working with colleges and alumni relations staff to conduct outreach to alumni. Upcoming events, to which alumni of those colleges will be invited, include:

- WWAMI White Coat ceremony and alumni reunion
  Dena'ina Convention Center
  Saturday, August 15th
- Nursing Simulation Center Open House
  UAA Professional Studies Building
  Saturday, September 12th, 10 am – noon.
- School of Engineering Open House
  ANSEP Building
  Thursday, November 5, 2009

Development continues to work with University Relations on the creation of newsletters that integrate news of the college, an alumni highlight and development news.

University Relations

University Relations is working with colleges, the university, alumni and the Anchorage community on the continued efforts to promote UAA as the premiere Alaska institution.

- *Accolades* is in the editing stage and will be shipped to readers in October.
- The UR team, in cooperation with UAA's Copy & Print Center, just finished launching new logos and image standards for UAA. Complete information, including downloads of new logos, is available at http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/imagestandards/index.cfm.
- UR continues to work with Alumni Relations and Development on departmental/college-based newsletters (CAS, Nursing and Engineering up next).
- UR is currently working on new fact sheets for Earthquake Engineering, Confucius Institute, Biomedical Research and Climate Change Research.
- UR is overhauling and developing new Green & Gold Daily templates for faculty/staff and students. New versions of the Green and Gold will be targeted specifically to students (one version) and specifically to faculty/staff (other version).
- UR is producing a series of podcasts called, "UAA Stories," (YouTube.com channel: www.youtube.com/user/uaanchorage <http://www.youtube.com/user/uaanchorage>) video stories of what makes UAA , UAA. Check them out!