I. Call to Order

II. Roll- (P=Present; A=Absent; E=Excused)
2010-2011 Officers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petraitis, John</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Davies, Hilary - Chair, UAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha</td>
<td>1st Vice President</td>
<td>Moore, Judith - Chair, GAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Narang</td>
<td>2nd Vice President</td>
<td>Babb, Genie - Past President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010-2011 Senators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abaza, Osama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Magen, Randy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banchero, Paola</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mannion, Heidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauer, Stephanie</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meyers, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gonzales, Mariano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boege-Tobin, Deborah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mock, Kenrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Trina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nagy, Lou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cates, Keith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pence, Sandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosman, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert McCoy (Fall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies, Hilary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Morris, Kerri (Parliamentarian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Leanne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schreiter, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennison, Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, Tara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Din, Herminia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speiker, Rena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirks, Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thiru, Kanapathi “Sam”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Wayne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vandever, Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallon, Sue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vugmeyster, Liliya (Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell, Chad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widdicombe, Toby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitch, Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-3)

IV. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 4-8)

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Fran Ulmer (pg. 9-10)
   FAQs [http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/faq/index.cfm](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/faq/index.cfm)

B. Provost Michael Driscoll

C. Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle

D. Vice Chancellor Megan Olson’s Report (pg. 11-12)

E. CIO/Associate Vice Provost Rich Whitney

F. Associate Vice Provost Bart Quimby- Academic Petitions Memo (pg. 13)

G. Union Representatives
i. UAFT
ii. United Academics

VI. Officer’s Reports
A. President’s Report (pg. 14-16)

B. First Vice President’s Report (pg. 17)

C. Second Vice President’s Report

VII. Boards and Committees
A. Undergraduate Academic Board (pg. 18-19)
   i. Curriculum
   ii. Motion
      MOTION: “The definition of "faculty initiator" in the Curriculum Handbook will use the
definition of faculty from the Faculty Senate Constitution (see below) except in the special
cases listed.

   Faculty Senate Constitution Article III. Membership Section 1. Those eligible for membership
in the Faculty Senate shall be tenure-track or term faculty members with a .5 F.T.E. or greater, non-
administrative assignment, and who hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate
Professor, or Professor. Faculty members on any type of Sabbatical leave are not eligible to serve as
members of the Faculty Senate and must relinquish the position.

   Faculty Senate Bylaws b.
   Functions and Responsibilities of the Undergraduate Academic Board (b) review and recommend
any changes in existing undergraduate degree and undergraduate certificate programs, which have
been initiated by program faculty; (c) review and recommend any new undergraduate degree or
undergraduate certificate programs, which have been initiated by faculty.

   Special Cases: There may be special circumstances where a program has no tenure-track or term
faculty. In these cases, an adjunct faculty member who has been approved to teach a course or has
special expertise in the content area of the program may initiate course and program curriculum
changes under the sponsorship of a tenure-track or term faculty member as defined above. It is
recommended that the initiating faculty member and the faculty sponsor sign the CAR/PAR.
New programs must be initiated by tenure-track or term faculty as defined above. An adjunct
faculty member who has expertise in the area may be consulted by the faculty initiator(s).

B. Graduate Academic Board (pg. 20)
   i. Curriculum
   ii. Motion
      MOTION: We encourage Faculty Senate to consider feedback from the community campuses
via the ad hoc committee on community campuses on this motion regarding the definition of
“faculty initiator”.

C. General Education Review Committee

D. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

E. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology (pg. 21-26)

F. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA (pg. 27)
G. Nominations and Elections Committee

H. Diversity Committee (pg. 28-29)

I. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee

J. Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee (pg. 30)

K. Library Advisory Committee (pg. 31)

L. Professional Development Committee- in abeyance

M. Student Academic Success Committee (pg. 32)

N. Academic Assessment Committee- handbook will be reviewed under new business

O. Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity (pg. 33)

P. Ad Hoc Committee for Community Campus (pg. 34)

Q. Ad Hoc Committee for Research

R. Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations- did not meet this month

VIII. Old Business
   A. CAFE Update

   B. First Reading- Academic Assessment Committee Assessment Handbook (pg. 35-54)

   C. Letter from President Gamble regarding Chancellor Search (pg. 55-56)

IX. New Business

X. Informational Items & Adjournment
   A. Report on Faculty Promotion and Tenure (pg. 57-58)
I. Call to Order

II. Roll- (P=Present; A=Absent; E=Excused)
2010-2011 Officers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Petraitis, John- President</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Davies, Hilary- Chair, UAB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha-1st Vice President</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Moore, Judith- Chair, GAB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Deborah Narang- 2nd Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Babb, Genie- Past President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010-2011 Senators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Abaza, Osama</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Magen, Randy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Banchero, Paola</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mannion, Heidi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bauer, Stephanie</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Meyers, David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mock, Kenrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Boege-Tobin, Deborah</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Morris, Kerri (Parliamentarian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Carter, Trina</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Nagy, Lou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Cates, Keith</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pence, Sandra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Crosman, Robert</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Robert McCoy (Fall)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Davies, Hilary</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Russ, Debra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Davis, Leanne</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Schreiter, Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dennison, Elizabeth</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Smith, Tara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Din, Herminia</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Speiker, Rena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dirks, Angela</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Thiru, Kanapathi “Sam”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Edwards, Wayne</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vandever, Jan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Fallon, Sue</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Vugmeyster, Liliya (Spring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Farrell, Chad</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Widdicombe, Toby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Fitch, Mark</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Landen, Paul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-3)
Approved

IV. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 4-8)
The statement “AA will be spelled out…” is currently under the Student Academic Success Committee, but should be listed under the Academic Assessment Committee.
Approved

V. Reports
A. Chancellor Fran Ulmer
FAQs http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/chancellor/faq/index.cfm
Unable to attend

B. Provost Michael Driscoll
GO Bond was passed
Accreditation Report will be in front of the commission in January
Faculty Alliance is working to make sharp, focused, easy-to-read document from the Academic Master Plan
Working on task force for new college
Distributed memo on creation of task force on Technology-Aided Instruction
C. Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle
   GO Bond was approved

D. Vice Chancellor Megan Olson (pg. 9-10)
   Beth Rose attended for Megan Olson

E. CIO/Associate Vice Provost Rich Whitney (pg. 11-12)
   Unable to attend

F. Union Representatives
   i. UAFT
   ii. United Academics

VI. Officer’s Reports
   A. President’s Report (pg. 13)
      MOTION: Move into executive session with only faculty senators for 15 minutes.
      2nd Mari Ippolito
      For 24
      Against 5
      Approved

   B. First Vice President’s Report (pg. 16-17)
      Written report submitted

   C. Second Vice President’s Report
      Wayne Edwards now serving on UAB

VII. Boards and Committees
   A. Graduate Academic Board (pg. 18)
      i. Curriculum
      Approved

   B. Undergraduate Academic Board (pg. 19-21)
      i. Curriculum
      Approved

      ii. Motions
      Motion 1: Add the Faculty Senate definition of faculty to the curriculum handbook.
      The intent is to clarify “faculty initiator” in the curriculum handbook, making it consistent with the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws.

      Faculty Senate Constitution
      Article III. Membership
      Section 1. Those eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate shall be tenure-track or term faculty members with a .5 F.T.E. or greater, non-administrative assignment, and who hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Faculty members on any type of Sabbatical leave are not eligible to serve as members of the Faculty Senate and must relinquish the position.

      Faculty Senate Bylaws
b. Functions and Responsibilities of the Undergraduate Academic Board
   (b) review and recommend any changes in existing undergraduate degree and undergraduate
   certificate programs, which have been initiated by program faculty;
   (c) review and recommend any new undergraduate degree or undergraduate certificate
   programs, which have been initiated by faculty.

2\textsuperscript{nd} Kerri Morris

MOTION (Genie Babb): Extend discussion to the December meeting.
2\textsuperscript{nd}: Bhatta
For 31
Against 5
Approved extension- will be brought back to the December Faculty Senate meeting

Motion 2: References to 500-level courses in the Curriculum Handbook
The intent is to have consistent wording associated with professional development (500-
level) courses in the Curriculum Handbook.

Page 25
e. Professional Development Courses
A500-A599: Courses with these numbers are designed to provide continuing education for professionals at a post-baccalaureate level. These courses are not applicable to university degree or certificate program requirements, are not interchangeable with credit courses, even by petition, and may not be stacked with any other course.

Page 29
Courses that are at the 500 level may not be stacked with any other course.

Page 38
E  Professional Development Courses
A500-A599: Courses with these numbers are designed to provide continuing education for professionals at a post-baccalaureate level. These courses are not applicable to university degree or certificate program requirements, are not interchangeable with credit courses, even by petition, and may not be stacked with any other course.

Page 41
Professional Development Courses (A500-A599) - Designed to provide continuing education for professionals at the post-baccalaureate level. These courses are not applicable to university degree or certificate program requirements, are not interchangeable with credit courses, even by petition, and may not be stacked with any other course. (See Box 3. Course Number, above for further information).

Page 43
F  A500-A599 level (professional development) courses may not be stacked with any other course.
2\textsuperscript{nd}: Judith Moore
Unanimously approved

Motion 3: The following catalog changes are considered minor changes, and do not have to be reviewed by UAB:
Minor changes:
   Contact information, location, web address
   1. General discipline information
Motion 4: Proposed wording for programs who have MATH program requirements.

MATH A____ or any MATH course for which MATH A___ is in the prerequisite chain.

Rationale: In programs with specific mathematics requirements (e.g., MATH A105), students can meet those requirements with either
(a)  a course specifically required by the program (e.g., MATH A105) or
(b)  a higher-level mathematics course (e.g., MATH A200) that has the specifically-required course (e.g., MATH A105) in its pre-requisite chain.

This change will allow students who have taken MATH A200 to use this course in a program that requires MATH A105 without going through the petition process.

Motion 4: Proposed wording for programs who have MATH program requirements.

MATH A____ or any MATH course for which MATH A___ is in the prerequisite chain.

Rationale: In programs with specific mathematics requirements (e.g., MATH A105), students can meet those requirements with either
(a)  a course specifically required by the program (e.g., MATH A105) or
(b)  a higher-level mathematics course (e.g., MATH A200) that has the specifically-required course (e.g., MATH A105) in its pre-requisite chain.

This change will allow students who have taken MATH A200 to use this course in a program that requires MATH A105 without going through the petition process.

2nd: Genie Babb
Unanimously approved

Motion 4: Proposed wording for programs who have MATH program requirements.

MATH A____ or any MATH course for which MATH A___ is in the prerequisite chain.

Rationale: In programs with specific mathematics requirements (e.g., MATH A105), students can meet those requirements with either
(a)  a course specifically required by the program (e.g., MATH A105) or
(b)  a higher-level mathematics course (e.g., MATH A200) that has the specifically-required course (e.g., MATH A105) in its pre-requisite chain.

This change will allow students who have taken MATH A200 to use this course in a program that requires MATH A105 without going through the petition process.

2nd: Genie Babb
Unanimously approved
L. Professional Development Committee- in abeyance

M. Student Academic Success Committee (pg. 28)

N. Academic Assessment Committee-Assessment Handbook (pg. 29-48)

O. Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity
   Late reports posted on the governance website

VIII. Old Business

A. Ad Hoc Committee for Community Campus (pg. 49)
   Charge: To facilitate communication among faculty at all campuses of UAA, and to act
   as a liaison among UAA Faculty Senate and all faculty members through campus
   forums.
   Amendment: Debbie Narang
   2nd: Paul Landon
   Unanimously approved

B. Ad Hoc Committee for Research (pg. 50)
   MOTION: That an Ad Hoc Committee on Research should meet to explore whether the
   Faculty Senate needs a standing committee focused on campus-wide faculty research.
   Unanimously approved

C. Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations (pg. 51-52)

D. Accreditation Update http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/accreditation/

E. CAFE Update

IX. New Business

A. Letter to President Gamble regarding Chancellor Search (pg. 14-15)

B. (4:00) EPortfolios- guest speaker Dr. Terrel Rhodes of the American Association of
   Colleges & Universities
   Power Point given, will be posted on the Governance website

X. Informational Items & Adjournment

A. Announcement: December meeting will be in RH 211

Meeting adjourned
Dear Board of Regents,

We are very proud of the national attention UAA faculty and students are earning for their accomplishments.

Mat-Su College Professor Ping-Tung “PT” Chang received a Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) U.S. Professor of the Year award. Professor Chang, who has been teaching at Mat-Su for 22 years and has a scholarship in his name, is known for his ability to help students who are “afraid of” math succeed. Mat-Su Director Talis Colberg and I, along with others from UAA, attended the ceremony honoring Professor Chang in Washington, D.C.

Four UAA students — Amy Voss, Robin Ford, Charles Beattie and Melanie Clairmont Parrett — won Fulbright awards in 2010, placing UAA among the 2010 top producers of Fulbright awards of all universities and colleges that offer undergraduate and master’s degree programs.

Our students are gaining national prominence in athletics as well. For the first time in UAA and the Great Northwest Athletic Conference (GNAC) history, one school has won both Cross Country Championships — UAA’s men and women are the GNAC Champions!

Our women’s basketball team premiered at No. 13 in the USA Today/ESPN Division II Top 25 preseason poll. With this ranking, UAA has now been in the poll for 50 straight weeks — the fourth-longest streak in Division II history.

Thanksgiving week, UAA hosts the Carr’s Safeway Great Alaska Shootout. We hope you are able to join us for the games and watch our spectacular athletes in action!

UAA also continues to gain national recognition for service to students in the military. For the second year in a row, UAA was named a Military Friendly School by G.I. Jobs magazine, putting us in the top 15 percent of universities and colleges nationwide.

Construction of the Health Sciences Building continues to progress. In anticipation of its opening, existing health programs and units in the College of Health and Social Welfare, the College of Arts and Sciences and the Community and Technical College will be integrated into a new college. This reorganization, along with the new Health Sciences Building, will help us strengthen our efforts to meet the needs of the largest growth sector in Alaska’s economy: health care. We are thrilled that Proposition B passed with nearly 60 percent of the vote on Nov. 2. We look forward to serving our students and community for many years with the new community arena and athletic facility!

Sincerely,

Fran Ulmer
Chancellor
**STUDENT SUCCESS**

International studies major Tsugumi Kozuma received a scholarship from the Export Council of Alaska.

Basketball players Taylor Rohde and Hanna Johansson were named the respective men’s and women’s GNAC Players of the Week after strong performances at Disney’s Tip-Off Classic in Anaheim.

**FACULTY AND STAFF SUCCESS**

Ronald Spatz, dean of the Honors College and Undergraduate Research and Scholarship, received the 2010 Governor’s Award for the Humanities. He earlier received the Governor’s award for the Arts.

Jan Harris is the PI for a major public service award addressing workforce development associated with the University of Alaska Statewide Health Agenda.

Institute for Circumpolar Health Studies Director Dr. David Driscoll received funding from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality to partner with Southcentral Foundation to study patient-centered medical home care services at Alaska Native Medical Center.

Dr. Andre Rosay, UAA Justice Center, is partnering with the Office of the Governor and the Council on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault to establish baselines in case outcomes and recidivism.

**PROGRAM SUCCESS**

College of Education accreditation was continued with special congratulations because no areas of improvement were cited by the Unit Accreditation Board of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

ANSEP celebrated its fifth anniversary.

**PUBLICATIONS**

ISER: Wind-Diesel Systems in Alaska: A Preliminary Analysis (October 2010); The Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend: A Case Study of Implementation of a Basic Income Guarantee

Alaska Justice Forum: Unmet Legal Needs in the U.S. and Alaska; Correlates of Gun Ownership in Anchorage and the Mat-Su Borough, Summer 2010

**DEVELOPMENT**

Green and Gold Gala raised nearly $30,000 in its inaugural event for the UAA Alumni Association scholarship fund. Alumni of Achievement Dana Stabenow, Gloria O’Neill and Linda Leary were honored.

Celebrity Chef Invitational raised $90,000 for UAA’s Culinary and Hospitality Program.

Communities and Campus

**COMMUNITY CAMPAUSES**

Kenai Peninsula College

Construction of KPC’s Kachemak Bay Campus classroom and office building continues to be ahead of schedule with anticipated occupancy in late March/early April.

Mat-Su College

Welcomes new Assistant Director Dr. Brian McLean.

Mat-Su College “Carbon Crew” represented UAA in a worldwide energy conservation competition among colleges known as the Great Power Race. The Crew also participated in a cleanup of local dump sites on “Global Work Day 10/10/10.”

Prince William Sound Community College

PWSCC is collaborating with community colleges in four other states to form a consortium on issues of oil response that includes expanding workforce development training in key areas.

PWSCC housing is being completely remodeled for students.

Kodiak College

KoC is working with the Kodiak Island Borough School District and the Kodiak Electric Association to create a certification program in Wind Turbine Technology.
Alumni Relations
The Office of Alumni Relations wants you to be aware of these fabulous UAA Seawolf Athletic discounts available to all UAA Alumni who are members of the UAA Alumni Association. Not a member? Join Today. Go to uaaalumni.org. Many benefits, one small cost: $35 per year.

Alumni Athletic Event Discounts Available to Alumni:

- **Hockey Discount** – UAA hockey tickets are 17.75-24.00. Members of the UAA alumni association receive $5.00 off discount on hockey tickets. Go to [www.goseawolves.com](http://www.goseawolves.com) click on tickets or call Mary Beth Wooden, Seawolf Athletics ticket manager – 907-786-1293.

- **Wells Fargo Sports Complex Sporting Events** – volleyball, men’s and women’s basketball and gymnastics tickets are $8.00. You receive a $2.00 discount with your UAA alumni association membership card.

- And, for the **Anchorage Community** - We have the “kids under 12 free” tickets for all remaining home hockey games.

Other recent activities of Alumni Relations include:

- ‘Feed a student and wish them luck’ -- Final Late Nights hosted by the Alumni Relations and the UAA Alumni Association. Join us, on Monday, December 6th in the Student Union at 9:30pm. Feed a student and wish a student well on their finals!

School of Engineering Alumni & Community Celebration, Great Success!  
The alumni and friends open house was a great event, with a wonderful turnout of about 100 people! It was terrific to hear President Gamble’s enthusiastic comments about engineering, noting that even though we are looking at a flat budget “we are not going to throttle back on Engineering”. People were in good spirits and appreciated the thanks for their involvement, contributions, and the focus on alumni participation. The event was a fun way of keeping our community partners involved with our success.

Annual Giving  
Have you connected? Go to [http://connect.ualaska.edu](http://connect.ualaska.edu) today.

UAA Annual Giving’s micro-site has been up and running since September and the site has been a smash hit with our growing online community! Over 1,000 people have connected with UAA by updating their contact information, sharing great memories of their time at UAA, answering our polling questions, participating in events on campus and reconnecting with their university.

Go the Social Seawolves tab: Learn more about the events, lectures and performances taking place on campus everyday! You can also find important information about membership with the Alumni Association.
Go to the Support a Seawolf tab: Join over 3,390 alumni and friends who have chosen to make a charitable gift to UAA. You can make a difference in the lives of UAA’s students.

Go the Seeking Seawolves: tab: Reconnect with your university! Update your contact information today and you will be entered into a drawing to win a free Nook e-book reader!

We urge you to check in frequently! Lots of new events, giving challenges and alumni and friends to (re)connect with!

Don’t forget! Update your contact information by Dec. 1, 2010 and you’ll be entered into a drawing to win a free Nook e-book reader!

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

The Annual Giving Phonation has raised over $96,000 and over 1200 donors. If anyone is interested in coming by and saying hi to the students we are happy to have you. Please call Julia Martinez, Senior Dir of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving, 786-1278.

###
November 5, 2010

To: Deans and Campus Directors

From: T. Bart Quimby, Associate Vice Provost
Shirlee Willis-Haslip, Interim Registrar

CC: UAA Academic Boards

Subject: Academic Petitions

Academic petitions are used to adjust requirements for students enrolled in programs. Deans and Directors have been delegated final authority over petitions for individual students that deal with requirements for the majors within their colleges. Petitions for exceptions to university academic policies, or that deal with general university or general education requirements must be approved by the office of academic affairs.

Another type of petition deals with groups of students who encounter specific circumstances. These are often called “blanket petitions” since the students are not individually identified. Blanket petitions effectively alter academic program requirements, but are not reflected in the catalog or other publications describing the programs they affect. They complicate advising and potentially lead to increased errors in degree audits and progress reports from Degree Works.

In order to ensure that UAA publishes accurate information and abides by the requirements that we establish we must restrict the use of blanket petitions to those situations where other alternatives are not effective. To help guarantee that blanket petitions are clearly defined and appropriately justified, the following procedures are to be followed:

1. All blanket petitions that are currently on file will be honored for students graduating under catalogs that are in effect on or before the 2009-10 catalog. They will not apply to subsequent catalogs.

2. New blanket petitions will require approvals of the Dean or Campus Director, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Registrar.

3. Proposed blanked petitions must contain the following information:
   a. Specific information regarding what catalogs are impacted by this petition (normally a single catalog).
   b. Strong justification for why this petition is necessary and explanation that shows all other options have been considered.
   c. Plan of action for correcting curriculum for next year’s catalog.
   d. End date for petition/how long it is in effect.

4. The petition should be submitted on department letterhead and include the signatures of the Department Chair and College Dean.

5. Petitions should not allow one course to satisfy multiple requirements or overlap with another petition (i.e. a petition to use A for B, should not be followed by a subsequent petition asking for C to now satisfy A).

6. Petitions must be written in a manner that is clear, that can be programmed into Degree Works, and that may be applied uniformly during degree audits.

All students who are not admitted in the years during which blanket petitions apply must meet the program requirements of their catalog, or petition individually for adjustments to those requirements.
In my duties as Faculty Senate President I have done the following since the last meeting of UA’s Faculty Senate:

- Communicate with President Gamble about Faculty Senate’s interest in moving forward with identifying Chancellor Ulmer’s replacement. President Gamble recently released an invitation for comments to the university community.
- Met once with Provost Driscoll to discuss items of importance to faculty, including eMedia, promotion and tenure. Provost Driscoll provided a summary of promotion and tenure decisions from 2009-2010.
- Met with USUAA about e-portfolios.
- Had a monthly meeting with leaders from ITS Director Whitney, University Technology Council co-chair Kathleen Voge, and ACDLITC co-chairs Angela Dirks and Dave Fitzgerald. Discussion focused eMedia and instructional technology.
- Along with 1st VP Bhattacharyya and Past President Babb, represented UAA faculty in a two-day meeting and a ½ day meeting of Faculty Alliance to revise the Academic Master Plan.
- Recommended that Bruno Kappes represent UAA faculty on a statewide taskforce on the definitions/coding of distance education courses.
- Attended the initial meeting of the Technology-Aided Instruction Taskforce, a faculty-led groups that will offer clarity on what technology and technology support faculty want for their teaching.
- Chaired two meetings of Faculty Senate Executive Board. Two other meetings were cancelled. Discussions focused on policies about blanket petitions, Chancellor search, and due-dates for end-of-semester grades.

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

- Attended the November budget meeting of the Board of Regents. Except for public testimony and a dialog between Mayor Sullivan and the BOR, the rest of the meeting was in executive session. Past President Babb gave public testimony about the Chancellor search.
- Coordinated and chaired a two-day retreat of Faculty Alliance to reformat the AMP.
- Coordinated and chaired a half-day retreat of Faculty Alliance to reformat the AMP.
- Submitted a report from Faculty Alliance to the BOR (see attached draft).
- I will be attending the SAC and BOR meetings next week in Fairbanks, giving an oral report to BOR about progress on the AMP.
After the September BOR meeting, Faculty Alliance accepted President Gamble’s invitation to revise/reformat the Academic Master Plan. With considerable efforts to rearrange our teaching and research schedules, Faculty Alliance devoted five days of focused work to the AMP, meeting for three days in Fairbanks during October, one day in Anchorage during October, and two more days in Anchorage during November. We anticipate giving President Gamble a draft in early December. Given the amount of time spend on the AMP, all other business of Faculty Alliance, including participation in SAC meetings, has been put on hold.

The three Faculty Senates, however, have done several things semester.

UAS’s Faculty Senate:

- Formed an ad hoc research committee that is charged with clarifying processes involved in securing research funds, increasing the number of faculty applying for funds, and promoting undergraduate/graduate research at UAS.
- Is looking at the feasibility of an Honors Program at UA,
- Supported efforts by the Faculty Senate’s Sustainability Committee to secure funding for free or significantly reduced bus passes for full and part time students
- Supported Strategic and Assessment Planning at UAS

UAF’s Faculty Senate:

- Formed an ad hoc research advisory committee, and is in the process of making it a permanent committee of the Senate.
- Continued to careful review UAF core curriculum and its link to accreditation with NWCCU. This review will be completed in the coming year.
- Moved forward with program review procedures, recently recommending the removal of the program for a BS in Statistics due to low enrollment. A focus on Statistics can still be had but under a BS in Mathematics. Hopefully new program review will be streamlined under the new procedures that UAF is testing this year.
- Addressed inconsistencies in the catalog (which is now only available online to save printing costs and improve accuracy through regular updates) regarding minimum requirements for core baccalaureate classes to a "C", not a "C-". This keeps UAF in line with policies at the other MAUs and clarifies issues regarding the plus-minus grading system adopted at UAF recently.
- Edited the UAF Faculty Senate constitution slightly to move away from the rigid application of Roberts Rules to more accurately reflect the practice of the Senate and the tone of collaboration rather than confrontation.
• Met with Peter Lewis the Fairbanks North Star School Superintendent. Many good linkages were made there to better prepare students for UAF as well as for UAF to take advantage of opportunities in the community.
• Arranged for President Gamble will speak at the December meeting of Faculty Senate.

UAA’s Faculty Senate:
• Formed a new ad hoc research committee to facilitate research by faculty, staff, and students,
• Formed a new ad hoc committee to better serve our community campuses,
• Formed a new ad hoc committee to improve the methods by which student evaluate their instructors,
• Supported efforts for UAA’s accreditation with NWCCU,
• Began a study on the prevalence of academic dishonesty at UAA, and began planning for ways to deal with dishonesty, including the use of plagiarism-detection software,
• Clarified in all relevant materials that – according with BOR policy -- 500-level courses do not apply toward any degree,
• Clarified in relevant materials that when satisfying certain program requirements, some higher-level classes MATH courses can serve as substitute for lower-level MATH pre-requisites.
• Revised curricula for 42 undergraduate courses and 16 graduate courses,
• Added 11 new undergraduate courses and 1 new graduate course
• Revised/updated one undergraduate program (Dental Assisting) and one graduate program (Clinical-Community Psychology).
• Co-hosted two-days of presentations by a nationally-recognized expert – Dr. Terry Rhodes for the American Association of Colleges and Universities -- on electronic portfolios as means of showcasing, assessing, and promoting learning by students.
This is going to be a short report. Business Alliance meeting was cancelled. The major highlight of this period was the two days of meeting of the Faculty Alliance on November 18th and 19th. We worked on repackaging the old academic master plan and morphing it into the new academic master plan.

With best wishes for a good holiday.

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. CAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>HIST A346</td>
<td>History of Native Peoples of United States and Canada (3 cr) (3+0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del</td>
<td>HIST A381</td>
<td>American Women’s History to 1870 (3 cr) (3+0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>HIST A382</td>
<td>American Women’s History (3 cr) (3+0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. CBPP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>CIS A375</td>
<td>E-training Design and End-User Support (3 cr) (2+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>CIS A385</td>
<td>Multimedia Authoring (3 cr) (2+2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. CHSW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>SWK A498</td>
<td>Advanced Community-Based Research (3 cr) (1+4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>HS A499</td>
<td>Senior Thesis in Health Sciences (3 cr) (0+9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor in Public Health, Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. COE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>EDSE A482</td>
<td>Inclusive Classrooms for All Children (3 cr) (3+0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. KPC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>ET A240</td>
<td>Computer Systems Interfacing (3 cr) (3+0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chg</td>
<td>ET A241</td>
<td>Digital Control Systems (3 cr) (3+0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UAB Motions

Faculty initiator definition
MOTION: “The definition of "faculty initiator" in the Curriculum Handbook will use the definition of faculty from the Faculty Senate Constitution (see below) except in the special cases listed.

Faculty Senate Constitution Article III. Membership Section 1. Those eligible for membership in the Faculty Senate shall be tenure-track or term faculty members with a .5 F.T.E. or greater, non-administrative assignment, and who hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Faculty members on any type of Sabbatical leave are not eligible to serve as members of the Faculty Senate and must relinquish the position.

Faculty Senate Bylaws b.
Functions and Responsibilities of the Undergraduate Academic Board (b) review and recommend any changes in existing undergraduate degree and undergraduate certificate programs, which have been initiated by program faculty; (c) review and recommend any new undergraduate degree or undergraduate certificate programs, which have been initiated by faculty.

Special Cases: There may be special circumstances where a program has no tenure-track or term faculty. In these cases, an adjunct faculty member who has been approved to teach a course or has special expertise in the content area of the program may initiate course and program curriculum changes under the sponsorship of a tenure-track or term faculty member as defined above. It is recommended that the initiating faculty member and the faculty sponsor sign the CAR/PAR.

New programs must be initiated by tenure-track or term faculty as defined above. An adjunct faculty member who has expertise in the area may be consulted by the faculty initiator(s).
Program/Course Action Request

A. CBPP
Chg BA A601 Business Statistics and Data Analysis (3 cr) (2+2)

B. CTC
Add Graduate Certificate, Career and Technical Education

Motion:

Discussion of “faculty initiator” motion from the UAB approved at the Faculty Senate
Add the Faculty Senate definition of faculty to the curriculum handbook. The intent is to
clarify “faculty initiator” in the curriculum handbook, making it consistent with the Faculty
Senate Constitution and Bylaws.

MOTION: We encourage Faculty Senate to consider feedback from the community
campuses via the ad hoc committee on community campuses on this motion regarding
the definition of “faculty initiator”.
Unanimously approved
Faculty Senate Report
Academic Computing, Distance Learning, and Instructional Technology
ACDLITC

Committee Co-Chairs: M. Angela Dirks and Dave Fitzgerald
Meeting Date: Friday, November 19, 2010 in Rasmuson Hall 207
Committee Members Present:

✓ Angela Dirks, co-chair ✓ Amy Green ✓ Bruno Kappes
✓ Dave Fitzgerald, co-chair ✓ Christine Gehrett ✓ Jack Pauli

Guests Present:
Cathy LeCompte, Associate Dean, CTC

Report:

1. Updates:
   a. eLearning Work Group - Amy Green shared a copy of the Work Group’s last meeting agenda and discussed the main topics of the meeting.
   
   b. Faculty training focus group – Amy Green indicated that all three focus groups were successfully completed and thanked ACDLITC members that helped host the events. A summary report will be available in January or February.
   
   c. ePortfolio Group – Bruno Kappes updated ACDLITC on progress to date.
   
   d. Anti-plagiarism software – A motion for anti-plagiarism software to be made available through Blackboard was approved by Faculty Senate at the last meeting. ITS is reviewing steps to make this feature available.
   
   e. University Technology Council (UTC) – Co-chairs Dave Fitzgerald and Angela Dirks shared the agenda from the last UTC meeting. Topics discussed included use of student technology fees and the FY 11 IT operating budget.
   
   f. Technology Aided Instruction Task Force – Co-chairs shared progress to date. Task Force membership is complete and initial meeting has taken place.
2. Discussion with Cathy LeCompte, CTC Associate Dean chairperson for Legislative Audit Coding Task Force
   a. After discussion, it was determined that ACDLITC would compose a position statement that outlines some of its questions concerning steps to be taken on course coding (see attached).
   b. Associate Dean LeCompte shared the proposed membership 2011 for the UA Distance Education/Expanded Access Education Committee for Collaboration. ACDLITC will request to have one of its committee member participate in the Collaboration committee to help represent UAA faculty.
ACDLITC’s Statement on the Distance Education Course Coding Initiative

Background:
One of the findings of the legislative audit on Distance Education included distance education course coding inconsistencies among the MAUs. ACDLITC member Bruno Kappes, Ph.D. is a member of the DE task force that was created to make recommendations on course coding guidelines to be followed across statewide campuses. ACDLITC was invited to participate in one of the task force meetings on November 18, 2010, to review the recommendations. Cathy LeCompte, chairperson for the DE task force, also attended ACDLITC’s meeting on November 19, 2010, for further analysis of the proposal.

ACDLITC’s Position:
ACDLITC strongly supports the goal of making “registration and the search process for distance delivered courses more student-centered” (attached memo from the Statewide Director of Enrollment Services). It is apparent that information on course attendance mode, such as distance, blended or traditional face-to-face is not always available on the course registration websites sites, nor does it accurately describe the course delivery mode. Additionally, information on equipment and facility requirement is not always available, posing a significant problem for students in remote locations.

ACDLITC’s Concerns:
While ACDLITC applauds the validity of this worthwhile effort, we have several concerns related to the strategies and the compressed timeline proposed for implementation of the new course coding. This project is a systemic change in the UA course listing process with impacts beyond distance delivered course coding. These concerns reflect areas that we believe require information that is more detailed, or areas that require further development:

1. Faculty training on coding parameters
2. Appropriate time for faculty to complete course coding and, if needed, to adjust course delivery methods to meet established parameters
3. Student training on the interpretation of the new coding scheme
4. Student advising on course offerings across MAUs in order to make appropriate course selections that meet program requirements and learner needs
5. Accreditation requirements for different programs and how they might limit course options across MAUs

We believe that these issues need to be addressed with active faculty and student advisor participation.

Attachments:
- Memo from Statewide Director of Enrollment Services titled “Registration for Distance Ed courses to become more student centered” issued on November 17, 2010.
- Presentation from Course Coding Taskforce titled “A Student-Centric and Geography-Based Design for Distance Education Coding” issued on November 2010.
A Student-Centric and Geography-Based Design for Distance Education Coding

University of Alaska
Improvements to Banner and UAOnline
November 2010

New Categories and Fields to Code

With this definition, a new way of categorizing and coding classes was created based on:

- **the amount of location-based time** required of the student;
- if a class has **meeting times** (i.e., synchronous or asynchronous);
- what type of **pacing** the class has;
- what **delivery methods** are used; and
- what **equipment requirements** there are.

New Course Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Location-based (%)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>• No physical location requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be synchronous or asynchronous, and may be instructor- or self-paced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any amount of required location-based time means the class goes into #1, #2, or #3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1% - 20%</td>
<td>Distance-based</td>
<td>• Location-based time requirements up to 20% of the course contact hours per 3 credit course (around 9 hrs of 45 contact hours).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21% - 50%</td>
<td>Blended</td>
<td>• Location-based time requirements for 21%-50% of the course contact hours per 3 credit course (6.5 to 13.5 hrs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51% or more</td>
<td>Location-dependent/traditional</td>
<td>• Location-based time requirements for 51% or more of the course contact hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Course Attributes

These new attributes have corresponding new fields in Banner, and are collected for every course, independent of course category (0, 1, 2, or 3).

- **Delivery methods**: What broadly-adopted strategy combining technology and pedagogy is being used to achieve specific learning outcomes? A delivery method is not just a technology.
- **Course meeting times**: Are there set meeting times (synchronous or asynchronous)?
- **Course pacing**: What type of pacing does the class have (instructor or self)?
- **Equipment requirements**: What standard equipment and software will students need to participate in the course? These are defined by (and attached to) the delivery method.

More About Delivery Methods

We can choose any or all of the following delivery methods to apply to a course. UA has the ability to add or discontinue the codes as it sees fit.

- **Independent Learning / Correspondence**: Self-paced course packets used to complete coursework.
- **Face-To-Face**: Traditional class instruction
- **Audio Conferencing**: Participation over a telephone audio bridge.
- **Video Conferencing**: Participation from a video conferencing site.
- **Web Meeting**: Participation over the Internet by running web conferencing software on their computer (such as eLive).
- **Live Television / UATV**: Class to be broadcast live over UATV.
- **Online / Web delivered**: Students participate through a course web site (such as Blackboard).
- **Multimedia**: Participation in the course using a variety of media formats (DVD, CD, VHS, etc.).
- **Special Technology**: Course uses special technologies that are listed in the course notes section (e.g., “course uses Skype,” or “Course requires high-speed Internet access for interactive simulations”).

Distance Education Defined

**Distance education** is planned learning that predominantly occurs in situations where a student is not required to be in a predetermined location. As a result, **distance courses** require a different course design and development, different pedagogical techniques, and communication through instructional technologies.

UA definition of distance education confirmed by SAC 5/2010.
Banner Changes Status

- New fields being added to Banner to gather the new category and attributes. **Work ongoing**
- Improvement of UAOnline; includes two new search functions and the display of new category and attribute information as part of class information. **Work ongoing**
- New data must be collected from departments and faculty. Changes will be made to the proof/scheduling process to facilitate collection. **Starting December 2010**

UAOnline Quick Search

The new Quick Search gives students:

- The option to search by traditional, distance, or both types of courses
- An open search field that provides Google-like search functionality.
- The ability to easily choose as many subjects as desired using a simple mouse click.

NOTE: Final format of this UAOnline page is still being refined. This is not final.

UAOnline Advanced Search

Part One: Top Half

The Advanced Search offers:

- All the features of the Quick Search
- Greater fine-tuning of a search and search by the new data fields.
- In general, most search fields allow choosing more than one option by using the mouse.

NOTE: Final format of this UAOnline page is still being refined. This is not final.

Part Two: Bottom Half

The Advanced Search offers:

- All the features of the Quick Search
- Greater fine-tuning of a search and search by the new data fields.
- In general, most search fields allow choosing more than one option by using the mouse.

NOTE: Final format of this UAOnline page is still being refined. This is not final.

UAOnline Search Results

Look Up Classes Page

This page is not being changed.

NOTE: Final format of this UAOnline page is still being refined. This is not final.

Search Results Page

By clicking on the course delivery method link, students can see what the equipment requirements are for that delivery method.

NOTE: Final format of this UAOnline page is still being refined. This is not final.
UAOnline Search Results
Look Up Classes Page
Since equipment requirements are centrally tied to delivery methods in Banner, the equipment requirement descriptions will have to be coordinated with all campuses.

NOTE: Final format of this UAOnline page is still being refined. *This is not final.*

What’s Next?
The high points:
- Training of all involved in the scheduling process (Banner schedulers, administrative assistants, and faculty).
- Outreach to campuses to explain and facilitate new distance education definition and data acquisition.
- Update and reprogramming of all instruments used to collect scheduling information.
- Quality assurance checks with Institutional Reporting.

Thank you.
Committee Members Attending: Mark Fitch, Maria Ippolito

1) New members
   a) Sam Thiru will be joining BPFA in the spring semester.

2) PBAC Facilities
   a) PBAC Facilities did not meet during this month.

3) PBAC
   a) No update is available this month.
   b) BPFA is still tracking the development of the new criteria.

4) Classroom Apportionment
   a) Interest at this time seems to be limited.
   b) Faculty are apparently no longer concerned with the physical state of classrooms.
FACULTY SENATE DIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT FOR OCTOBER 15, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Michihiro Ama</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Nancy Furlow, Director of Alaska Native Studies</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>Sean Licka, Art History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Yong Cao, Business</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Gabe Garcia, Health Sciences</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Natasa Masanovic, Languages, 1st Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Ping-Tung Chang, Math (Matsu)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Songho Ha, History</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Susan Modlin, School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Robert Crosman, English</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Hiroko Harada, Languages</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Sudarsan Rangarajan, Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Herminia Din, Art Education</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Sun-il Kim, Computer System Engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Rena Spieker, College of Health and Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>Patricia Fagan, Languages, 2nd Co-Chair and Secretary</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Paul Landen, Psychology (Kenai)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Mary Weiss, Bethel Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultants and Representatives
Present: Marva Watson, Director, Campus Diversity & Compliance Office

* x=Present  *E=Excused  *---=Not Present

I. Introduction of new Faculty Senate Diversity Committee Members, Sun-il Kim, Ph.D, Assistant Professor of Computer System Engineering; Paul Landen, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Kenai Peninsula College. UPDATE: Rob Crosman, Professor of English, has been elected as At-Large Senator. FSDC is currently up to quota regarding Faculty Senate Membership.

II. Review of Agenda for October 15, 2010. Approved with no changes suggested.

III. Review of FSDC Meeting Minutes from September 17, 2010. Approved with no changes suggested.

IV. Reports:
National Coalition Building Institute, UAA Campus Affiliate activity. On September 26, UAA student co-leaders, Kent Spiers and Kyle Yan, conducted an empowering one-day Prejudice Reduction Workshop with fellow students. The leadership team was comprised of Mariecris Gatlabayan, Theresa Lyons, and Marva Watson.

UAA Hispanic Heritage Month. During the months of September and October, the UAA Office of Campus Diversity and Compliance organized two separate panels featuring ten UAA community guests who participated in celebrating “Our Stories.” A special thanks to Marva Watson, Director of Campus Diversity and Compliance for these two well-attended and successful events.

V. Announcements of upcoming UAA Campus Events pertaining to Diversity:

- NCBI Up-Downs, October 21
- Filipino-American History Month
  - “Brown and Fabulous,” October 21
  - “Fiesta Alaskero, from Tinikling to Hip Hop, October 29
- Kabuki Night, October 24
- Internationalization Laboratory, October 29
- Alaska Native / Native American Heritage Month Kick-Off Reception, November 1
- Marty Kalb, “Holocaust Lecture Series,” November 8-10
- Film Showing sponsored by the College of Health and Social Welfare: “America,” November 12

VI. Research Findings regarding Senior-Junior Faculty Mentorship Association: Natasa Masanovic reported the results of her investigation concerning other established university faculty mentorship associations across the country. The following list reflects the common characteristics of success:

- Full institutional support: funding and workload accommodations
- Full commitment on behalf of participating faculty members: time and labor
- Establishment of Advisory Board (incorporated into the Faculty Senate) to ensure
  - clearly established definitions of formal and informal mentorship
  - clearly defined conduct and appropriate behavior
  - training in confidentiality and proper documentation
- Presence and visibility: personal invitations in addition to general announcements, participation during New Faculty Orientations
- Provision of community liaisons

VII. Next meeting scheduled for November 19, 2010.

VIII. First FSDC meeting scheduled for Spring Semester 2011: January 21.

Joint Meeting with Diversity Action Council to be determined at a later date for Spring 2011.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Patricia Fagan
The following committee members conferred with the Provost and deans of colleges to be surveyed this academic year:

1. L. Foster & E. Kopacz conferred with the Provost and the Dean of CAS.
2. L. Foster, E. Kopacz, & T. Carter conferred with the Dean of the Library.
3. L. Foster conferred with the Dean of COE.

Topics of the above consultations included:

1. This year’s survey: schedule and task milestones.
2. Discussions on utility and accuracy of past surveys.
3. Current issues: response rates, inclusion of staff, and dean reports to their units.
4. Major concerns: faculty think results are ignored and some staff fear reprisals.

The Committee met on November 19th to review the above consultations and to discuss how the listservs for this year’s survey should be prepared. L. Foster, H. Mannion, and K. Rawlins will coordinate with CAS, COE, and the Library, respectively, on listserv preparation. Members attending this meeting included: L. Foster, H. Mannion, K. Rawlins, K. Jones, and T. Carter.

The Committee will meet next at 9:00 AM in AHS 170 on January 28, 2011.

Prepared by Larry M. Foster (Mathematical Sciences).
ATTENDANCE. Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya, Robert Boeckmann, Gina Boisclair (APU Co-chair), Daria Carle, Leanne Davis, Liz Dennison, Gabe Garcia, Steve Godfrey, Alberta Harder (UAA Co-chair), Sean Licka, Steve Rollins, Kirk Scott
Guest. Jodee Kawasaki

NEW FACULTY / LIAISON RECEPTION. The new faculty / liaison reception will be held on November 12th from 3:00 pm to 5:00 pm in CL 307. LAC members are invited to attend.

FROM THE DEAN’S LIBRARY REPORT. The cost of library acquisitions will be increasing again next year in the range of four to six percent. The accreditation meeting attended by Dean Rollins, some LAC members, and others on October 5th went well.

LP SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT. A new exhibition is opening in the Arc Gallery. One exhibition for the Arc Gallery for 2011-2012 has been finalized. Steve Godfrey has talked with Pat Leary and Chris Mizelle about the landscaping around the library.

LR SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT. The Library Resource Subcommittee met with Jodee Kawasaki, the Head of Collection Development, to learn more about resource acquisition.

LS SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT. The Library Service Subcommittee is working on ways to assist the library with publicizing resources and services.

Student Academic Support and Success Committee  
November 19, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Members in attendance:
Stephanie Bauer, Michael Buckland, Connie Fuess, Shannon Gramse, Alberta Harder, Erik Hirschmann, Trish Jenkins, Tracy Leithauser, Linda Morgan, Kamal Narang, Karen Parrish, Galina Peck, Ly Tibayan, Erika Veth

Guests: Shirlee Willis-Haslip and Gianna Ridgeway

Item 1
Approval of Minutes from October 2010 Meeting

The minutes from the meeting on October 15, 2010, were distributed and approved.

Item 2
Report on the Faculty Senate Meeting

Alberta Harder reported on the Faculty Senate meeting on November 5th.

Item 3
Discussion of Enhancements to Banner and UAOnline Registration

Shirlee Willis-Haslip, Interim Registrar, and Gianna Ridgeway, Curriculum and Publication Specialist, presented an overview of enhancements to Banner and the UAOnline registration process that are planned for Spring 2011. A discussion followed on ways to provide prerequisite and other course information during the registration process. Thanks go to Shirlee and Gianna for attending the SASS meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: Friday, January 21, 2011, 2:30-4:00 in ADM 101A
Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Integrity

November 1, 2010. 9 am – 10 am

Present: Paola Banchero (co-chair), Sally Bremner, Sam Fredrick, Scott Gavorsky, Michael Lamb, Claudia Lampman (survey coordinator), Dawn Dooley, Michael Votava (campus coordinator)

Apologies from Bogdan Hoanca, Susan Modlin, and Jennifer Stone.

Faculty Survey

Ready to go today! Claudia has IRB approval, and has tested it successfully. She will send the letter out on the Faculty list today with the survey link.

Survey reminders. A first reminder will go out in 3 to all e-mails, including all community campuses except Prince William Sound Community College. A 2nd follow-up is not usual, but we could do one a week later then close it soon after if response rate is low.

Results. Don McCabe can report quantitative results fast; qualitative results by new semester.

Student Survey

IRB submission 1st week in December (survey, consent form, and script for classroom use).

Consent form. Don McCabe will draft the IRB proposal. Claudia will edit as necessary for UAA.

Timing of survey administration. Paper surveys must go into classes the first week of spring semester. The e-mail one will go out to all students in the second week – ignore if done already.

Devise sampling strategy. Must make decisions on which GERs to sample. In case of obstacles, select more than we need. We must oversample 300-400 level GERs to get an equal distribution of students. Goal is a sample size of 500.

Draft script for class room survey. Each class must get the same information. We must anticipate questions and prepare standard answers. Paola will draft a script for review.

Scan form survey. Claudia is getting a quote for a customized scan form from Scantron.

Funding needed for the custom Scan form, mailing of completed surveys to Don McCabe, and inputting of qualitative data. John Petraitis will take our request to the Provost.

Arrange to go into classrooms to survey. After we have our sample set, we’ll contact faculty. Claudia suggested pre-testing survey on students to ascertain duration – better 10 than 15 mins.

Blackboard deployment of e-mail survey not an option. Too hassling to make available there.

Policy materials. Paola provided a brief overview of Don Mohr’s Plagiarism survey of UAA and beyond of fall 2008, and the group focused on his findings and recommendations regarding inconsistencies in UAA policy documents. It was decided that Michael Votava could some minor revisions to resolve this.

Reporting of academic dishonesty incidents and process. Michael outlined this. The Faculty Handbook states it is the faculty member’s decision on what action to take regarding adjustment of assignment grades or course failure, quite apart from the outcome of the adjudication process. The group discussed the low incidence of faculty reporting. This is a key question for the focus groups. Michael Votava thinks it’s because they think it will cause a big to-do, and indeed incidents can escalate. Of the 42 completed processes last year, 36 were found responsible. The key is having sufficient evidence of misconduct.

More sanction options? The ASCA has developed an online course costing $100 that could provide a more serious sanction level. UAA’s Tara Smith offers a similar workshop for international students.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 16, 11 – 12 noon, in LIB302A.

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

Faculty Senate approved the committee’s charge at the November 5 meeting. The committee met after the November 5 Faculty Senate meeting to discuss various issues and goals, including:

1. Create a structurally unified, recognized constitution (ultimately to be submitted for approval by UAA Faculty Senate) for the community campuses’ faculty forums. Committee members would correspond with each other on existing documents pertaining to the above and discuss at the next meeting (after the December 3 Faculty Senate meeting).
2. Mat-Su College faculty are currently working with MSC administration to revise the MSC Handbook and discuss a proposed partnership with local Mat-Su high schools, called a “middle college”.
3. Have more faculty input and oversight on issues pertaining to new facilities constructed at the community campuses, particularly with the passage of the new statewide education bond measure. Perhaps have a committee member on the Faculty Senate Facilities Committee.
4. Get community campus faculty more directly involved in searches/evaluations/appointments of new campus directors and administrators.
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I. **INTRODUCTION**

**It’s not the destination. It’s the journey.** Assessment is not an end in itself; it is a process. Rather than narrowly focus on the language of specific outcomes or the details of a certain tool, the Academic Assessment Committee (AAC) looks at the overall process of assessment discussed by each program reviewed. Are the faculty actively engaged in reviewing the intent and effectiveness of their programs? Are they seeking ways to achieve programs of excellence? Outcomes assessment at UAA is best served by fostering a culture that encourages broad, goals and methodologies growing organically out of the normal teaching and assessment practices of each discipline.

In preparing assessment documents, it is important to keep in mind the overall purpose of assessment. By assessing student learning outcomes, we are trying to accomplish the following:

- Define what specific knowledge, abilities, values, and/or attitudes students in our respective programs should be able to demonstrate,
- Track, evaluate and analyze student performance on these outcomes, and
- Discuss, reflect on and take action in maintaining, reinforcing and improving student achievement through active faculty engagement in the teaching process.

Program-level discussion of assessment documents should occur before a review by AAC. All assessment plans, annual updates, and three-year reviews should be approved by the program faculty prior to submission to the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA).

AAC is an advisory and review body. The AAC’s primary purposes are to serve as a cross-campus forum for the exchange of ideas, information and advice on methods and practices of academic assessment; and to promote systematic academic assessment university wide with the understanding that a program’s faculty are the ones best suited to plan, implement and evaluate assessment of student learning outcomes.

This Academic Assessment Handbook is maintained by the AAC to describe the University of Alaska Anchorage’s process for reviewing all academic program assessments. These guidelines should be read in conjunction with departmental requirements as appropriate. The procedures and the accompanying templates have been designed to ensure the following:

- Faculty and staff are properly informed about the processes to be followed for the review of new programs, major revisions to existing programs, and ongoing program assessment.
- Faculty and staff are properly informed about the goals of and criteria for appropriate academic assessment.
- Faculty and staff are properly informed how to access support for improving their academic assessment plans and reports.
A. **AAC Charge**

The committee shall:

- Develop and maintain UAA Assessment Handbook;
- Apply the current UAA Assessment Handbook as primary criteria for evaluating all program assessment, existing assessment efforts, as well as proposed or modified programs;
- Recommend program assessment-related actions to the Senate;
- Develop institutional learning outcomes (ILO) assessments and direct the collection and analysis of that data;
- Review and recommend all requests to modify institutional learning outcomes;
- Review all requests to modify assessment policies;
- Refer all curricular and academic issues to the appropriate Faculty Senate Boards; and
- Undertake such additional tasks or responsibilities relating to program and institutional assessment as assigned by the Senate.

B. **OAA Support**

The OAA provides administrative support for the AAC. All documents are to be submitted to the OAA for distribution.

II. **PROGRAM ASSESSMENT CYCLE**

The sequence of the 3-year review cycle is shown in Table 1. An overview of the program assessment cycle is shown in Figure 1. The process consists of a yearly assessment cycle embedded within a three-year review cycle. The assessment plan is a living document that describes the program’s student learning outcomes along with instruments that will be used to measure the outcomes. The plan drives assessment activities to be conducted yearly that measure some or all of the program outcomes. All outcomes must be measured within the three-year review cycle. Data collected from the assessment instruments should be discussed and analyzed among department faculty and recommendations made to improve the program and/or the assessment plan for the following year. The AAC will conduct a review every three years; however, programs are expected to complete an assessment review cycle every year.

**Sequence for Assessment 3-Year Review Cycle**

The table below describes how the cycle for a program beginning with an annual update this fall. (No programs will actually be on this rotation). Please see the Academic Assessment website for your program’s assessment sequence and due dates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester, Due Date</th>
<th>Document Due</th>
<th>Academic Year(s) in Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010, October 1</td>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>AY10 (Fall 09 – Summer 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011, October 1</td>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>AY11 (Fall 10 – Summer 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012, October 15</td>
<td>3-year Review <em>(includes Annual Updates for 3 academic years)</em></td>
<td>AY10-12 (Fall 09 – Summer 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013, October 1</td>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>AY13 (Fall 12 - Summer 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014, October 1</td>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>AY14 (Fall 13 - Summer 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015, October 15</td>
<td>3-year Review <em>(includes Annual Updates for 3 academic years)</em></td>
<td>AY13-15 (Fall 13 – Summer 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle repeats</td>
<td>Cycle repeats</td>
<td>Cycle repeats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Sequence for Assessment 3-Year Review
Figure 1. 3-year Review Cycle
III. ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT REVIEW PROCESS

All academic programs approved by the Faculty Senate are required to document their assessment activities. The AAC recognizes that academic programs can be at differing points in their evolution, which affect their assessment (i.e. new programs, ongoing programs, suspended or discontinued programs). Academic assessment is also impacted by the number of students in a program and how many graduates are produced in a given reporting period.

The reporting of assessment activity can vary greatly. Table 2 summarizes the variation in situation and reporting requirements. All documents should be submitted to the OAA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Program Assessment Documents Required</th>
<th>Submission Date to OAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Program</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>As required by curriculum review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Revision of Existing Program</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>As required by curriculum review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Program (yearly)</td>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Program (every third year)</td>
<td>3-year cumulative review</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Program with AAC approved outside accreditation*</td>
<td>Annual Update</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Program (0 to 10 graduates in 3-year review period)</td>
<td>Memo (see Appendix B)</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Program</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>October 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If outside accreditation meets AAC requirements, see Section III. D. for requirements.

Table 2. Assessment Reporting Requirements

A. New Program or Major Revision

Proposals for new programs or major revisions to existing programs must include an assessment plan. The curriculum review process requires the submission of draft assessment plans to AAC for review. Faculty planning new programs or major revisions to existing programs should review both the UAA Curriculum Handbook and their college-level curriculum review guidelines for further information about when this review must be complete.
Faculty should submit their plans to OAA in accordance with curriculum review deadlines. AAC will put review of new programs or major revisions of existing programs first on their agenda. Faculty initiators or a qualified faculty representative for the program proposal must be present at the AAC meeting for the review. Proposals without such representation will be tabled. Programs will receive a written summary of the committee’s feedback within four weeks after the review is complete, and copies will be sent to the school or college and OAA. Program assessment plans requiring longer discussion and/or consideration will be invited to additional AAC meetings until the review is complete.

B. **Annual Update**

All active (not suspended) programs must submit an annual update (see section IV B) on their data collection and any changes to their assessment plans to OAA by October 1. These updates are not reviewed by AAC unless the department requests a special review. If a department requests a special review, then the same guidelines and timeline for submission of new program assessment plans apply.

C. **Three-Year Review**

Every three years on a staggered basis AAC will conduct a full review of the student learning outcomes assessment process for every program offered by UAA and its extended campuses. The AAC shall not be an acceptance/rejection body when reviewing programs’ academic assessment plans and 3-year reviews, but rather serve as an advisory body, offering suggestions for improvement and commendations for achievement.

1. When a program comes up for review, that program will send at least one faculty representative to the AAC to discuss the program’s academic assessment process, findings and actions.

2. Review meetings will be held between late October and late April of each academic year. The schedule for every program’s three-year rotation cycle will be available online. Additionally, by April 1st of each year, the AAC will make available the list of programs to be scheduled for a 3-year review in the following academic year. Programs will be notified by OAA.

3. College/Divisional Reviews: To facilitate increased faculty dialogue and sharing of assessment practices and results, divisions or colleges that wish to have a combined assessment review by the AAC may do so. In this way, departmental assessment coordinators could share best assessment practices with like-minded disciplines and discuss common concerns with their respective assessment processes.

4. Site Visits: To present a fuller picture of program assessment within a group of programs, divisions or colleges that wish to have a site visit by the AAC may do so; however, the appointment must occur within the regular meeting time of the committee. Site visits may not be possible for extended campuses.
5. Programs will receive written feedback and recommendations from the committee within four weeks of completion of the review with copies sent to the school/college and OAA.

D. **Exemption Process**

All programs that are suspended (not simply suspended admission) are exempt from all reporting and are not counted in UAA’s assessment compliance statistics. Departments having programs that are suspended or that do not have graduates may still submit assessment documents for special review and assistance by AAC if they wish. The same guidelines and timeline for submission of new program assessment plans apply to these instances.

There are two other categories of programs that can be exempted from assessment review:

- Programs with few or no graduates
- Programs with approved outside accreditation.

All programs with 0 to 10 graduates over the three-year cycle are exempt from three-year reporting and are not counted in UAA’s assessment compliance statistics. Active programs with 0 to 10 graduates must still submit annual updates. These departments may still submit program assessment documents for special review and assistance by AAC if they wish. The same guidelines and timeline for submission of new program assessment plans apply in these circumstances.

Programs that wish to have an outside accreditation review process count instead of the three-year AAC review must apply for this exemption by October 1 of the year BEFORE their program would be up for the three-year review. Programs must document that the outside accreditation meets the requirements listed below:

**Criteria for Exemption from the Three-Year Review Based on Outside Accreditation:**

- A documented assessment process and revision cycle
- A specific assessment of all the program’s student learning outcomes
- An annual data collection
- An analysis and action based on data collection
- A regular (within at least every 7 years) review of assessment data by the accrediting body

AAC reviews applications for three-year cumulative review exemptions and recommends approval or disapproval to the Faculty Senate. **Outside accreditation does not exempt programs from annual updates.** Approval of outside accreditation as an exemption for three-year review does not exempt a program from Associate of Arts, General Education Requirements (GER), GER capstone, or ILO assessment reporting. In annual updates, programs with outside accreditation must document that they remain accredited. If programs
lose the outside accreditation, they will be required to participate in the three-year review cycle. Programs may reapply for exemption after they regain the outside accreditation.

Programs may apply to the AAC for exemption due to special circumstances that are beyond the program’s control.

IV. DOCUMENT REQUIREMENTS

A. Plan Documents

Refer to the assessment plan template in Appendix C and posted on the AAC website (located at [http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/fs-academic-assessment-committee.cfm](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/fs-academic-assessment-committee.cfm)). This template document includes instructions for crafting an assessment plan and further information on assessment plan elements can be found in Section V. A. of this handbook.

B. Annual Updates Documents

Annual updates help keep OAA informed of the progress each program is making in their assessment activities. Annual updates may be submitted in one of the two formats listed below and must address the following items:

1. Updated plan or note that current plan is on file. (either the UAA template or that of approved outside accreditation)

2. What was learned as a result of this assessment: levels of student achievement, areas of strengths, areas that need improvement? (data summary and analysis)

3. What actions have or will be taken by the program as a result of this assessment, e.g. changes in course design and delivery, changes in assignments, changes in learning outcomes, changes in assessment measures, and/or changes in program curriculum? (program recommendations)

4. What assessment activities are planned for the academic year following the year being assessed? (process recommendations)

Annual updates for programs with approved outside accreditation may include accreditation assessment plans and reports or simply summarize the program’s assessment activities and results. For all programs, items 1 through 4 help the AAC, the OAA, and the Accreditation Team analyze assessment at UAA. This analysis is used to respond to Statewide, Board of Regents, legislative, and Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) requests for information on student achievement of learning outcomes.
Acceptable reporting formats for annual updates:

- **Narrative Annual Update:** Programs may submit a 2 – 4 page narrative summary of their assessment activities for the last year.

- **Spreadsheet Annual Update:** Programs may submit their annual report using the spreadsheet reporting format that UAA used for the years 2003-present.

**OPTIONAL:** Focused Submission – Programs may choose to report on just a portion of their overall assessment process in either format:

- one or two student learning outcomes that they are tracking particularly closely for the year, or

- one core course (a capstone or seminar course) or a sequence of courses that they are reorganizing or introducing new teaching techniques and assignments, or

- a significant new measure being used (a standardized test, a portfolio, a seminar paper, a presentation).

The focused submission must address items 1-4 required of all annual updates; particularly important is to communicate why this focus is important and useful to the department—what was learned and what actions will be taken as a result.

C. **Three-Year Review Documents**

The three-year review should seek to communicate that departmental and program faculty are deeply committed to student achievement and that they are reviewing and engaged in this process of review together. Are program faculty trying to improve on what students know and how they learn? The three-year review should show this. Programs scheduled for a three-year review should ensure that the following documents are on file with the OAA by October 15.

1. A current, up-to-date assessment plan.
   - Mission statement
   - Outcomes
   - Measures
   - Process

2. All the annual updates submitted since the last review cycle (at least 3 years of annual updates).
   - Data Collection
   - Data Analysis
   - Recommendations
   - Actions on Prior Recommendations
3. A short (2-4 page) summary of the program’s assessment activities for the last three years:
   - What has been done? (process)
   - What has been learned, the level and nature of student achievement on learning outcomes? (data analysis)
   - What actions have been taken? (recommendations & actions taken)
   - What program assessment changes are planned for the next three-year cycle? (process recommendations)

The AAC provides feedback on all three-year review materials. For terms, descriptions, and guidance, refer to the tables in Section V. In their discussion of three-year reviews, the AAC will be guided by the elements listed in these tables.

D. Three-year Review Exemption Notification & Request Documents

1. Programs under complete suspension or who have 0 – 10 graduates in a three-year period are exempt from three-year reviews. A memo stating the status of the program should be submitted to the OAA as per the deadlines listed in Part III Academic Assessment Review Processes. No additional documentation or explanation is required. (See sample notification memo(s) in Appendix B.)

2. Programs submitting their outside accreditation for approval of exemption from the three-year review must submit this request no later than October 1 of the year BEFORE their program would be up for three-year review. The application packet must include a cover memo explaining the request, documentation showing the accrediting body meets the requirements listed in Academic Assessment Review Process, and documentation indicating that the program currently is accredited by this body. Programs will be notified no later than December 1 if the request is approved.

3. Programs experiencing special circumstances that prevent them from completing a three-year review should submit a memo explaining the situation and appropriate documentation to OAA as soon as possible. The AAC and OAA will work to notify such programs as expeditiously as possible concerning the approval or denial of their request.
V. **TERMS, DEFINITIONS & GUIDANCE**

The following tables explain in more detail the purpose of each element within program assessment documents. These are offered as guidance for faculty preparing program assessment plans, annual updates, and 3-year summaries and to facilitate conversation between program faculty and the AAC. More detailed discussions of methodology, issues, and examples can be found on the AAC website: [http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/fs-academic-assessment-committee.cfm](http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/fs-academic-assessment-committee.cfm)

A. **Program Assessment Plan**

These are the definitions that the AAC uses to give feedback on program assessment plans. See the Program Assessment Plan template for further instructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Statement:</strong></td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>The mission statement is comprehensible to a wide audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad statement of purpose defining your program's philosophy and often describing values and aspirations, and which supports the University's mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>The mission statement should clearly align with the mission of the college and university. Constituents should be able to see how the program supports the missions of the college and university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes program in content centered terms</td>
<td>The mission statement should identify the content that the program teaches in general terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes program in student centered terms</td>
<td>The mission statement should describe in broad terms what the student should be able to do or know on completion of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning Outcomes:</strong></td>
<td>Performance based</td>
<td>The outcomes must be written in terms of what students can demonstrate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes:</td>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>The outcomes should be sufficient to describe specific knowledge, abilities, values and/or attitudes of students in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>define what specific knowledge, abilities, values, and/or attitudes students in our respective programs should be able to demonstrate.</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>The set of outcomes should cover the intent mission statement and may include additional discipline specific outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continues below*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Achievable</td>
<td>Students can be reasonably expected to attain the outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued from above</td>
<td>Measurability</td>
<td>The outcome must be stated in a way that it is observable/measurable. In other words, data can be collected on which to form conclusions regarding the level of student attainment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures: Assessment measures are the tools faculty will use to accumulate data concerning student attainment of outcomes on which to base their programmatic decisions. A wide variety of tools can be devised to measure student performance. Measures are normally classified as being direct or indirect.</td>
<td>Description of measure</td>
<td>The description of each measure should be clear and complete to an outside observer. These descriptions are to be included in the appendix for each measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct measures involve looking at student work to examine what learning has taken place. For example, comprehensive exams, research papers or projects, portfolios, performances, and standardized tests are often used as direct measures of student learning. At least one direct measure of each outcome is necessary. Having both direct and indirect data on an outcome gives programs a broader perspective on their students’ performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Indirect measures gather perceptions of learning, opinions about learning, or reflections on learning rather than direct demonstrations of the results of learning”¹ For example, surveys, interviews, course evaluations, focus groups, and graduation rates are often used as indirect measures of student learning. Programs are not required to use indirect measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple measures are recommended for each outcome. Multiple measures of an outcome produce more reliable results. Measures can occur at differing intervals as appropriate for the specific outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ [http://www.engin.umich.edu/teaching/assess_and_improve/handbook/indirect.html](http://www.engin.umich.edu/teaching/assess_and_improve/handbook/indirect.html)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Element</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td><strong>Continued from above</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Connection to outcomes</strong></td>
<td>The measure should clearly show student performance relative to one or more outcomes. The data collected needs to be such that its interpretation is clear regarding student performance relative to the outcome. For example an assignment evaluation should be able to isolate a specific result for each outcome it is being used to measure. Course grades are difficult to use as an assessment tool because course grades are influenced by too many factors to isolate out performance relative to a program outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Influences on data collection</strong></td>
<td>The program should indicate the factors that influence the data and the interpretation of the results. This is where the program considers the reliability of the tool and the data collected. This discussion should be found in the appendix describing each measure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Faculty involvement in the assessment process</strong></td>
<td>Plan identifies the role of faculty in all aspects of the assessment process. Faculty must be involved in the development of assessment plans, the implementation of the measures, the analysis of data, the formulation of recommendations, and the actions taken on those recommendations, as well as any revisions to the assessment plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td>The timeline should produce information for the faculty of the program to make timely decisions. Timelines need to accommodate the assessment cycle, faculty workloads, and appropriate timing of measures. The schedule of data collection should be clearly articulated in the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Currency</strong></td>
<td>The plan is reviewed and/or revised regularly by the program’s faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Responsible parties</strong></td>
<td>The faculty responsible for coordination and implementation should be identified and supported in their assessment duties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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B. Annual Update

These are the definitions that the AAC uses to give feedback on annual updates when they are submitted as part of the program’s 3-year review. See the spreadsheet or narrative annual update template for further instructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Update Element</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Assessment Activities:</td>
<td>Recommendations implemented</td>
<td>Programs need to show they have taken action on the recommendations. Faculty should discuss prior recommendations and what they did to implement them and the results of their actions. This discussion in concert with the latest round of data collection may lead to new recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary:</td>
<td>The effects of the recommendations have been determined</td>
<td>Explaining the results of actions taken closes the assessment loop. Programs must demonstrate the results of the recommendations they have implemented. If the results take longer to be observable, this should be explained and a date determined as to when the recommendation can reasonably be evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary:</td>
<td>Collected according to plan</td>
<td>Data collection should be fully implemented as described in the plan. Problems can be explained if they occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Summary:</td>
<td>Organized in a fashion which ties to the program outcomes and can be understood by an outside evaluator</td>
<td>The summary of data should be easy for outside reviewers to understand. Data should cover the period for the prior academic year and can include as much trend data as applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continues below
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Update Element</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis:</strong> An interpretation of the data collected. This section should tell what the collected data indicates about student abilities relative to program outcomes. This analysis should contain the collected views of the program faculty.</td>
<td>Meaning of data</td>
<td>Analysis should be driven by the data. It should explain what the results mean. Disparity in scores for measures of the same outcome, changes in trend data, and other interesting phenomena should be discussed. The interpretation of data is the basis for formulating recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of data</td>
<td>Programs should describe limitations of the results based on the experience of collecting the data. This discussion should lead to improvements for the assessment process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final analysis reviewed by faculty</td>
<td>Faculty discussion of results and analysis is fundamental to the assessment process. Evidence of faculty involvement in the final analysis must be included in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance relative to outcomes</td>
<td>Student attainment of learning outcomes should be evaluated in light of collected data in the analysis submitted for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations:</strong> Recommendations show what changes the faculty would like to make based on the analysis of data in order to help students better meet the program outcomes.</td>
<td>Enhance student attainment of outcomes</td>
<td>Program improvement recommendations should be directly linked to the data collected and the analysis thereof. They should clearly connect to the program’s student attainment of learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance assessment process</td>
<td>Assessment process improvement recommendations should flow from the analysis of data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current recommendations</td>
<td>Faculty discussion of recommendations is fundamental to the assessment process. Evidence of faculty involvement in the crafting the recommendations must be included in the report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of recommendations can be determined</td>
<td>The program should identify how the recommendation will be evaluated to determine if it was effective at enhancing the attainment of student learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. 3-Year Review Summary

This 2 – 4 page summary should discuss the following elements, but does not need to repeat every item from the three annual updates it summarizes. This summary should examine the past 3 academic years as a whole. These are the definitions that the AAC uses to give feedback on 3-year review summaries. See Chapter IV Document Requirements, item C for more information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Element</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> This section should discuss the assessment activities of the program over the past three academic years.</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>This element should describe the assessment work of the program faculty. What has been done?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues or concerns</td>
<td>This element should explain how the process worked or did not work. What challenges influenced the process of assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis:</strong> An interpretation of the data collected. This section should tell what the collected data indicates about student abilities relative to program outcomes. This analysis should contain the collected views of the program faculty.</td>
<td>Student performance relative to outcomes</td>
<td>What has been learned, the level and nature of student achievement on learning outcomes? What trends, indications, themes can be identified through this data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of data</td>
<td>Programs should describe limitations of the results based on the experience of collecting the data. This discussion should lead to improvements for the assessment process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continues Below*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Element</th>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations &amp; Actions Taken:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Recommendations show what program improvements the faculty would like to make based on the analysis of data in order to help students better meet the program’s student learning outcomes. This should discuss actions taken over the previous academic years and explain how the effects of those recommendations are currently being measured.</td>
<td>Recommendations implemented</td>
<td>Programs need to show they have taken action on the recommendations. Faculty should discuss prior recommendations and what they did to implement them and the results of their actions. This discussion in concert with the latest round of data collection may lead to new recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effects of the recommendations have been determined</td>
<td>Explaining the results of actions taken closes the assessment loop. Programs must demonstrate the results of the recommendations they have implemented. If the results take longer to be observable, this should be explained and a date determined as to when the recommendation can reasonably be evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Recommendations:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Recommendations show what changes the faculty would like to make based on the analysis of data in order to help better assess student achievement of the program’s student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Current recommendations</td>
<td>What program assessment changes are planned for the next three-year cycle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance assessment process</td>
<td>Assessment process improvement recommendations should flow from the analysis of data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of recommendations can be determined</td>
<td>The program should identify how the recommendation will be evaluated to determine if it was effective at enhancing the attainment of student learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VI. APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Link / Embedded Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>BOR Policy – Academic Program Review</td>
<td><a href="http://www.alaska.edu/bor/policy-regulations/">http://www.alaska.edu/bor/policy-regulations/</a> (see Chapter 10.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sample Annual Exemption Memos</td>
<td><img src="SampleMemos.pdf" alt="PDF" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Program Assessment Plan Template</td>
<td><img src="ProgramAssessmentPlanTemplate.doc" alt="Word" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Annual Update Narrative Template</td>
<td><img src="AnnualUpdateNarrTemplate.doc" alt="Word" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Annual Update Spreadsheet Template</td>
<td><img src="AnnualUpdateSprdshtTemplate.xls" alt="Excel" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 23, 2010

FROM: Patrick Gamble, President

RE: UAA Chancellor Search

Today officially begins the start of the selection process to replace Chancellor Fran Ulmer at UAA. Her able and productive service to our university system and to the citizens of Alaska during a decade of UAA growth will be a lasting legacy. Her determined concern for UAA students, faculty, and staff has distinguished Fran as a true champion of higher education in a way Alaskans will long remember.

Our aspirations for UAA’s continued institutional growth and greatness in the face of challenging years ahead will depend on a singularly important decision. We must select a chancellor who will lead a major portion of the U of A into a somewhat uncertain fiscal future. To that end, I hope to solicit your initial inputs on this matter. Let me begin by presenting my thoughts on the attributes and credentials I would like to see in a new UAA chancellor.

We need strong organizational leadership coupled with university executive experience; an individual who will inspire the confidence of the community, the regents, and the president. We need someone with a keen, well rounded intellect, an unwavering belief in the efficacy of shared governance, and a leader who actively promotes the value of academic and research integrity. We need someone committed to taking good care of our people...the entire UAA family throughout Alaska. We need a thoughtful diplomat who will willingly listen first, and who can then deal wisely and effectively with our Board of Regents, the legislature, the media, the community of Anchorage, and a myriad of governance groups. We need a strategic innovator with operational talent; an individual who can plan, budget for, and efficiently manage the equivalent of a medium-sized Alaskan town with all its attendant complex components. We need a leader who is a team player and who clearly understands the importance of setting the right kind of personal example, such as putting service before self. We need a person who believes in the value of loyalty to all those served. Finally, we need a role model who understands how to address competing interests through a willingness to compromise in our
pursuit of institutional excellence, except when that compromise involves personal character and integrity. Those are attributes and characteristics I believe are essential.

What kind of leader do you believe we need in the next chancellor? How can we maximize the probability of successfully arriving at a timely selection that satisfies the majority of our requirements and expectations?

Please send me your comments and suggestions. If you actually have a candidate name to offer at this point it’s not too early to advise me of your recommendations.

I am mindful that the last formal, national UAA chancellor search in 2003-2004 cost $250,000 and took eight months. I am equally mindful that all three of our current chancellors, who I personally consider exceptionally talented leaders and working partners, were not selected through an extended and costly formal search process. Considering these past experiences I believe we should remain open minded about a method that will lead to the best outcome for UAA and the state.

Thank you for your involvement and support in this selection process. I value your opinion and look forward to your timely reply.

PKG
Report on Faculty Promotion and Tenure
2009-2010
August 2010

1. Fourth Year Reviews
   • 11 fourth year reviews
     ➢ 2 Bipartite Academic
     ➢ 9 Tripartite Academic
     ➢ 4 College of Arts and Sciences
     ➢ 3 College of Business and Public Policy
     ➢ 2 Consortium Library
     ➢ 2 College of Health and Social Welfare
   • 1 negative file, 1 file negative at chair and peer level
   • Negative file appealed unsuccessfully

2. Promotion to Professor
   • 10 total reviews
     ➢ 5 College of Arts and Sciences
     ➢ 2 College of Business and Public Policy
     ➢ 2 Community and Technical College
     ➢ 1 Consortium Library
     ➢ 2 Bipartite Academic
     ➢ 2 Bipartite Vocational
     ➢ 6 Tripartite
   • 8 files positive at all levels
   • 1 file denied
   • 1 file promoted- negative at three levels

3. Tenure Only
   • 5 total reviews
     ➢ 2 College of Education
     ➢ 1 College of Business and Public Policy
     ➢ 1 School of Engineering
     ➢ 1 Consortium Library
     ➢ 4 tripartite
     ➢ 1 Bipartite Academic
   • 4 files positive at all levels
   • 1 files negative at UFEC level

4. Promotion and Tenure
   • 23 total reviews
     ➢ 1 Bipartite Vocational
     ➢ 6 Bipartite Academic
     ➢ 16 Tripartite
     ➢ 10 College of Arts and Sciences
     ➢ 3 School of Engineering
     ➢ 1 College of Business and Public Policy
     ➢ 5 College of Health and Social Welfare
1 College of Education
1 Community and Technical College
1 Consortium Library
1 Kodiak

- 14 files positive at all levels
- 6 files with negative reviews at UFEC
- 1 negative file was pulled at Provost level prior to chancellor review
- 1 negative dean level
- 1 negative all levels except chair

5. Emeritus Files
- 3 files
- 3 awarded
- 3 tripartite
- 3 College of Arts and Sciences
- Yes at all levels

6. Post Tenure – 6th year
- 16 total reviews
  - 16 Tripartite
  - 8 College of Arts and Sciences
  - 5 College of Business and Public Policy
  - 2 College of Health and Social Welfare
  - 1 Consortium Library
- 1 file negative at dean level