



Faculty Senate
UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

UAA Faculty Senate Agenda
September 2, 2011
2:00 – 5:00 p.m. Library 307

I. Call to Order

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

2011-2012 Officers:

	Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha – President		Davies, Hilary- Chair, UAB
	Boeckmann, Robert - 1 st Vice President		Modlin, Susan - Chair, GAB
	Fitzgerald, Dave - 2nd Vice President		Petraitis, John - Past President

2011-2012 Senators:

	Abaza, Osama		Ghrett, Christine		Nagy, Lou
	Boege-Tobin, Deborah		Green, Amy		Orley, Soren
	Burke, Tracey		Harder, Alberta		Pence, Sandra
	Campbell, Elizabeth		Ippolito, Mari		Pfeiffer, Karl
	Carter, Trina		James, Elizabeth		Predeger, Betty
	Cates, Keith		Johnston, Gail		Rawlins, Katherine
	Davies, Hilary		Kappes, Bruno		Russ, Debra
	Dennison, Elizabeth		Kim, Sun-il		Schreiter, Mark
	Din, Herminia		Kopacz, Eva		Siemers, Cheryl
	Dirks, Angela		Landed, Paul		Skore, Tom
	Edwards, Wayne		LaRue, Sharon		Smith, Tara
	Embler, Pam		Magen, Randy		Stone, Jennifer
	Fallon, Sue		Miranda, Francisco		Thiru, Sam
	Foster, Larry		Mock, Kenrick		Vandever, Jan
	Fox, Deborah		Modlin, Susan		Vugmeyster, Liliya
	Garcia, Gabe				
	Garton, Susan				

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-3)

IV. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 4-10)

V. UA President, Pat Gamble
45 minutes for presentation
45 minutes for Q & A

VI. Reports

- A. Chancellor Tom Case
- 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. Union Representatives
 - i. UAFT
 - ii. United Academics
 - G. CAFE Update
<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafe/>
- VII. Officer's Reports**
- A. President's Report (pg. 13-64)
 - B. First Vice President's Report
 - C. Second Vice President's Report
 - i. Faculty Senate and Committee Membership (pg.65-67)
 - D. Past President's Report
- VIII. Boards and Committees**
- A. Graduate Academic Board
 - i. Curriculum
First meeting is September 9th
 - B. Undergraduate Academic Board (pg. 68)
 - i. Curriculum
 - C. General Education Review Committee
First meeting is September 9th
 - D. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee
 - E. Academic Assessment
 - F. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology (pg. 69)
 - G. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA
 - H. Nominations and Elections Committee
 - I. Diversity Committee (pg. 70-72)
 - J. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee
 - K. Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee
 - L. Library Advisory Committee

M. Professional Development Committee- in abeyance

N. Student Academic Success Committee

O. Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity

P. Ad Hoc Committee for Community Campus

Q. Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations

IX. Old Business

X. New Business

X. Informational Items & Adjournment

A. Faculty Technology Center (FTC) and Emedia Services memo from John Dede (pg. 73)

UAA Faculty Senate Summary

May 6, 2011

2:00 – 5:00 p.m. **Library 307**

I. Call to Order

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

2010-2011 Officers:

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

2010-2011 Senators:

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

III. Agenda Approval (pg. 1-5)

Approved

IV. Meeting Summary Approval (pg. 6-11 of May 2011 Faculty Senate materials)

Comments from the provost: Contains a list of items that needs to be changed

Approved

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Tom Case

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

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

U of A Highlights <http://edit.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/facultysenate/upload/highlights-04222011.pdf>

Not able to attend due to JBER commencement

B. Provost Michael Driscoll

Provost Driscoll addressed the following in his oral report.

- *Administrative searches*

- *Chair for CAS dean committee has not been appointed*

- *Has not named an interim for COE dean*
 - *Research and Graduate Studies committee are bringing up candidates this summer*
 - *Senate motions from last month on evaluation of Community Campus Directors*
 - *Needed to communicate with community campus faculty who were dissatisfied with feedback from deans*
 - *Physics labs – wants to continue discussion to get more information*
 - *The move of E-media out of ITS*
 - *Process by which senate-approved Faculty Evaluation Guidelines would be implemented*
 - *New college of health being presented to the BOR*
- C. Vice Chancellor Bill Spindle
VC Spindle discussed the following in his oral report
- *Property recently purchased for UAA on 36th and Lake Otis*
 - *A master facilities plan with the possibility of an alumni and visitor center*
 - *Development Day May 12th*
- D. Vice Chancellor Megan Olson's Report (pg. 12-13 of May Senate materials)
Not able to attend – Kristen DeSmith was present for questions
- E. CIO/Associate Vice Provost Rich Whitney (pg. 14 of May Senate materials)
- F. Union Representatives
- i. UAFT
 - ii. United Academics
- G. CAFE Update
<http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/cafes/>
- H. UA Vice President Finance and Administration, Joe Trubacz (2:30)
- i. Web Timesheets (WTE) Update (pg. 15-17 of May Senate materials)
UA VP Trubacz reported on a pilot program for electronic timesheets.
 - *August for non-exempt staff timesheet trial*
 - *November for exempt timesheets*
 - *Faculty will be after staff*
 - *Concerns: Employees will be responsible for filling out timesheet not cost center clerks (who will be slightly removed from this process)*
- I. UA President, Pat Gamble (4:00)
UA President Gamble talked about strategic planning, including discussion of
- *Strategic Planning process – structure and implementation*
 - *5 year planning period*
 - *A clear statement of the plan's mission is listed within the first few pages*
 - *The plan is for the students and what they hope to accomplish*
 - *Structure will be formed during the summer*

VI. Officer's Reports

- A. President's Report (pg. 18-20)

Out-going Senate President Petraitis reported on the following

- *A gift was purchased for Fran Ulmer and card circulated for faculty signatures*
- *Update on Bhatta*
- *Faculty Senate website has a link of all motions passed*

B. First Vice President's Report

(See Ad Hoc Committee for Fisher Report)

C. Second Vice President's Report (pg. 21)

Faculty initiator withdrawals of athletes – consider notifying athletics or students immediately

i. Awards and Certificates

Christine Lidren was present to hand out certificates

Ted Kassier was presented with the Distinguished Service award

Anne Bridges was presented the Distinguished Service award

President Petraitis recognized UAB, GAB chairs, 1st and 2nd Vice Presidents, Past President Genie Babb, parliamentarian, Governance administration, and Emeritus recipients

EBoard presented Christine Lidren with a gift for her service

Plaques were presented to EBoard members

ii. Faculty Senate Committee Membership (pg. 22)

D. Past President's Report

Research and Grant committee meeting times this summer

VII. Boards and Committees

A. Graduate Academic Board (pg. 23-25)

i. Curriculum

Approved

B. Undergraduate Academic Board (pg. 26-32)

i. Curriculum

Revisions were also received for AET A101, AET A213, CM A495

Approved

C. General Education Review Committee (pg. 33-34)

Motion: Add the following notations on the GER list:

After Geog A111 (equivalent to GEOG A205)*;

After ENVI A211 (equivalent to GEOG A211 and ENVI A202)*

**Equivalent courses are treated as repeats. Only the credits and chronologically last grade earned are applied toward graduation requirements, prerequisite fulfillment and cumulative UAA GPA Calculation. Only the most recent course taken is used to fulfill university requirements including the General Education Requirement.*

Approved

D. University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee

- E. Academic Assessment
 - i. Academic Assessment Handbook – *Second Reading* (Track Change pg. 35-56)
Clean version: <http://edit.uaa.alaska.edu/governance/facultysenate/index.cfm>
Dave Fitzgerald moves to approve the final version of the Assessment Handbook
2nd
Approved
- F. Academic Computing, Distance Learning and Instructional Technology (pg. 57-58)
 - i. Blackboard 9 Upgrade (pg. 59-60)
ACDLIT two memos from Lee Henrikson for Blackboard
 - ii. E-Learning & Technology Faculty Handbook (pg. 61-93)
Handbook has updated links
Distance education is replaced by E-Learning
2nd Bogdan Hoanca moves to approve the final version of the E-learning & Technology Faculty Handbook
Approved
- G. Budget, Planning, and Facilities Advisory Committee- BPFA (pg.94)
 - i. UAA Cabinet Strategic Guidance (pg 95-103)
Information about PBAC
- H. Nominations and Elections Committee
- I. Diversity Committee (pg. 104-107)
Comments about graduation events were mentioned with honorary recipient and native student headdress
Open house for Junior/Senior faculty went really well
- J. Faculty Grants and Leaves Committee
- K. Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee (pg. 108-109)
- L. Library Advisory Committee (pg. 110-112)
- M. Professional Development Committee- in abeyance
- N. Student Academic Success Committee (pg. 113-115)
See recommendations on pages 113 & 114
Not a formal motion, but recommendations for the future consideration
Students must log into UAOnline not Banner – Typo in report
Discussion about second recommendation
- O. Ad Hoc Committee for Fisher Report
 - i. Response of the University of Anchorage Faculty to Fisher Report (pg. 116-165)
Bhatta not present
Discussion on the tones of comments in the responses to Fisher's recommendations
Discussion of sending report to President Gamble now or in the fall

*Motion to make revisions and send it to President Gamble in May
2nd: Paul Landon
Approved*

P. Ad Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity (pg. 166-167)
The ad hoc committee administered two surveys and will present findings in the fall

Q. Ad Hoc Committee for Community Campus (pg. 168)
Constitution & Bylaws (pg. 169-173)

Correction was made to the agenda with the motion:

Resolution.

Resolved, the UAA Faculty Senate approves the Constitution and Bylaws for a Faculty Forum at each of the Extended Sites of the University of Alaska Anchorage.

*Discussion within provost offices of reaching a policy that faculty would be happy with
Senate doesn't have authority to approve the motion at each campus, directors will be responsible
Looking to have faculty senate endorse the work of the community campus committee*

~~By approving these documents, The UAA Faculty Senate endorses the legitimacy of extended sites' faculty forums and the need for communication among faculty, campus directors, administrators, and UAA Faculty Senators. The Constitution and By-Laws are umbrella documents for each extended site's faculty, and are not in competition with the UAA Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws.~~

*Motion to accept the motion with noted revisions
2nd Jan Vandever
Approved*

R. Ad Hoc Committee for Research

S. Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations (pg. 174-175)
From last Faculty Senate meeting:

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

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

Justifications:

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

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

Justifications:

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

*Postpone all three motions until fall
Weren't a part of this month's report*

VIII. Old Business

IX. New Business

A. Welcome New Senators and Adjourn the 2010-2011 Senators
Recognized Past President Petraitis for his service this past year

B. 2011-2012 Membership List (pg. 176)

2011-2012 Officers:

E	Bhattacharyya, Nalinaksha – President	X	Davies, Hilary- Chair, UAB
X	Boeckmann, Robert - 1 st Vice President	X	Modlin, Susan - Chair, GAB
X	Fitzgerald, Dave - 2nd Vice President	X	Petraitis, John - Past President

2011-2012 Senators:

	Abaza, Osama	X	Gehrett, Christine	X	Nagy, Lou
x	Boege-Tobin, Deborah	X	Green, Amy	X	Orley, Soren
	Burke, Tracey	X	Harder, Alberta	X	Pence, Sandra
	Campbell, Elizabeth	X	Ippolito, Mari	X	Pfeiffer, Karl
X	Carter, Trina	X	James, Elizabeth		Predeger, Betty
X	Cates, Keith	X	Johnston, Gail	X	Rawlins, Katherine
X	Davies, Hilary	X	Kabirian, Alireza	X	Russ, Debra
X	Dennison, Elizabeth	X	Kappes, Bruno	X	Schreiter, Mark
X	Din, Herminia	X	Kim, Sun-il	X	Siemers, Cheryl
X	Dirks, Angela	X	Kopacz, Eva	X	Skore, Tom
X	Edwards, Wayne	X	Landed, Paul	X	Smith, Tara
X	Embler, Pam	X	LaRue, Sharon	X	Stone, Jennifer
X	Fallon, Sue	X	Magen, Randy	X	Thiru, Sam
E	Foster, Larry	E	Miranda, Francisco	X	Vandever, Jan
X	Fox, Deborah	X	Mock, Kenrick	X	Vugmeyster, Liliya
X	Garcia, Gabe	X	Modlin, Susan		
X	Garton, Susan	X	Morris, Kerri		

C. Ad-Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity

Recommendation: The Ad-Hoc Committee for Academic Integrity has asked the Faculty Senate E-board to reauthorize our existence for the coming academic year so that we can do the following:

1. Prepare an executive summary of the findings of our recent survey on academic dishonesty at UAA. We want to share this via a link in Green and Gold before the Faculty Senate retreat, and provide it as background for focus groups of students, faculty and administrators to be convened in September
2. Create of a slide presentation to report survey results to the Faculty Senate retreat in August. This work will include a thematic analysis of faculty and student comments submitted as part of the online surveys.

D. Ad Hoc Committee for Community Campus

Recommendation: By approving these documents, the UAA Faculty Senate endorses the legitimacy of extended sites' faculty forums and the need for communication among faculty, campus directors, administrators, and UAA Faculty Senators. The Constitution and By-Laws are umbrella documents for each extended site's faculty, and are not in competition with the UAA Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws.

E. Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations

Recommendation: The ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on IDEA Course Evaluations should continue during the 2011-2012 academic year.

Recommendation: The ad hoc Faculty Senate Committee on IDEA Course Evaluations should plan faculty and student forums for the Fall Semester, 2011, to discuss faculty and student concerns and suggestions relevant to the use of IDEA Course Evaluations at UAA.

Motion to approve all Ad Hoc Committee motions

2nd: Dave Fitzgerald

Approved

X. Informational Items & Adjournment

Adjourned

UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT FACULTY SENATE REPORT- SEPTEMBER 2011

Alumni Relations

- The Green and Gold Gala is scheduled for Saturday, October 1, 2011 at the Hotel Captain Cook.
 - Table and ticket sales are available now. You can contact Advancement, Betty Hernandez at 786-1733 or RSVP your needs at <http://greenandgold.uaa.alaska.edu/gala/>
 - The Gala ceremonially kicks off Homecoming 2011 - - an 'all-University', 'all-community' celebration.
 - We encourage university alums, faculty and staff to attend. All proceeds support the UAA Alumni Scholarship fund. Because of the success of last year's Gala, the Alumni Association was able to award 18 scholarships to UAA students.
- Gala invites in print are available. You can contact Betty Hernandez at 786-1733.
- The Gala will also recognize the three new 2011 Alumni of Distinction awardees. Read about these distinguished community members at http://greenandgold.uaa.alaska.edu/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=7798:UAA-Alumni-Association-announces-2011-Alumni-of-Distinction-award-recipients&Itemid=66

Annual Giving

The busy fall is upon us and so is activity to encourage and invite constituent audiences to support UAA with a charitable gift. Activity this fall includes:

- Fall phonathon - The Office of Annual Giving is gearing up to hire more than a dozen UAA students to be call ambassadors, who reach out to thousands of UAA alumni to connect and give the opportunity to support the University. Last year nearly 2,000 alumni made a charitable gift to UAA and this year we aim to meet or exceed that goal.
- Alumni who choose to make their first charitable gift to UAA this fall could have the gift doubled! A generous UAA alum has challenged other alumni to make a gift to the new UAA Bookstore Scholarship (administered by the UA Foundation). Dollar for dollar, a new gift to UAA by an alumnus will be matched, thus doubling the impact of their gift and helping UAA students with the high cost of books.
- A campaign to connect with UAA alumni will continue this fall as we utilize email to reach out to engage alumni who live in Alaska, the Lower 48 and beyond. Last year's successful 'Update your Contact Information' campaign will be renewed and conducted this fall. As a result of the campaign last year, thousands of UAA alumni re-connected with their alma mater, updated their contact information so the University can stay in touch and shared with us stories on why they appreciate and value their degrees from UAA.
- Faculty Staff Giving - - Last year's main campus campaign achieved a 14% participation rate in giving to UAA. The Mat-Su College recently shared they achieved an 18% participation rate and KPC tops us all with 43% participation! All employee donors to UAA are invited to the annual appreciation coffee morning. This year "Coffee with Tom" is on Thursday, September 15, 7:30 am, ADM 204.

- Are you a leadership donor and member of the College of Fellows? There are many benefits of becoming a leadership donor to UAA and plans are underway to invite College of Fellows members to exclusive events this fall. Giving is easy, especially through payroll deduction. Don't miss your chance to care for UAA through your leadership giving. Contact Julia Martinez, 786-1278 for information. (Individual donors who give annually at the \$1,000 or more join the leadership giving society at UAA)

University Relations

- The Fall issue of Accolades, titled UAA Athletics: Our Time Has Come, is currently at the printer and should arrive in mailboxes by mid-September
- "I Am UAA" campaign and individual feature stories have been a great success this past year. We will continue this effort during the 2011-12 academic year. If you know an exceptional student, faculty member, staff member or alum that should be considered for a feature, please contact Joanne Haines at joanne_haines@uaa.alaska.edu. We have also partnered with the UAA bookstore to sell "I AM UAA" t-shirts. Both men's and women's styles available!
- Some fun stats for you from last year's electronic media efforts in Advancement:
 - We published 79 "I Am UAA" stories on the Green and Gold website with 58,176 hits
 - We posted 103 podcasts with 12,028 hits and over 1,246 full-length listens
 - We currently engage 717 people via our UAA twitter feed at www.twitter.com/uaanchorage
 - We currently engage 202 people (we assume mostly students) via our UAA Free Food twitter feed at www.twitter.com/uaafreefood
 - We engage 3,694 people via the UAA Facebook page at www.facebook.com/pages/UAA-University-of-Alaska-Anchorage/57576345235
 - The UAA YouTube (www.youtube.com/uaanchorage) channel garnered 15,696 views last year
 - The Green and Gold News website received 133,332 visitors last year
- We've hired some new folks and reorganized a bit in University Relations. Chris Hargrave has joined the team as an electronic media specialist and will work a great deal on designing HTML emails for campus-wide and donor events. Joanne Haines fills a new position in Advancement—writer/publications specialist. Joanne will be responsible for major writing projects both in the print and online worlds. Jamie Gonzales also joined the team as a part-time communications assistant. She'll be responsible for getting Green and Gold Daily into your inboxes each morning!
- UAA is about to undergo its first ever branding effort. During the 2011-12 academic year we will be conducting in-depth research in the community, with civic and industry leaders, with the UAA community, with parents of college-bound students and with local high school students. Stay tuned for more details about this exciting new project for UAA!



Faculty Senate

UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

August 25, 2011

Report from Faculty Senate President Senate Meeting Held on September 2, 2011

1. Faculty Retreat was held on August 24, 2011. The theme for this retreat was Academic Integrity. John Petraitis and Kimberly Swiantek did the heavy lifting in organizing this retreat. Claudia Lampman presented the findings of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Integrity. Don McCabe was the guest speaker. Susan Kalina & Bruce Schultz presented on International and Intercultural Laboratory. My thanks to John, Kimberly, Claudia, Don, Susan, Bruce and members of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Academic Integrity.
2. Met with Terry MacTaggart twice to discuss the strategic planning directions/process. I am an unapologetic fundamentalist and a stickler for methods. I suggested that the first step in a strategic plan is a SWOT Analysis. SWOT stands for Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat. The whole idea is to look at ourselves (Strength and Weakness) and our environment (Opportunities and Threats). This analysis thus gives us a fix on who we are and where we are situated vis a vis our environment. Once we get that firmed up, then we can deliberate and decide where we want to go. The process is interactive. I got the impression that Terry MacTaggart is not likely to start with SWOT.
3. Sent our response to Fisher Report to President Gamble. The response that was sent is attached to this report. President Gamble appreciated our efforts. In an e-mail to me he wrote:

Nalinaksha.

Good to hear from you. I received the document and at first blush am impressed with the quality and relevancy of the responses. To be sure, this will carry weight in the planning process we are about to commence. Thanks to you and those who helped in the effort.

Warm regards, pat

4. I am scheduled to meet with the Provost twice a month and with the Chancellor once a month. This will facilitate information sharing between faculty and central administration.

5. Met with Mike McCormick, Assistant Director of Student Activities to discuss Faculty Participation in Homecoming activities. Requested interested faculty to volunteer for Homecoming Planning meetings.

A handwritten signature in black ink on a light-colored background. The signature reads "N. Bhattacharyya" in a cursive style, with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya
Faculty Senate President.



Faculty Senate

UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

June 10, 2011

Patrick K. Gamble
President
University of Alaska

Dear President Gamble,

Subject: Response of the University of Anchorage Faculty to Fisher Report

In February 2011, the Faculty Senate of the University of Alaska Anchorage established a committee to review the recommendations of the Fisher Report and prepare a response for the Senate. The committee has met several times and also consulted with the UAA faculty in the preparation of our collective response to the recommendations of the Fisher report. This letter and the accompanying appendix constitute our response to the Fisher Report.

We understand and appreciate your intention in appointing the Fisher Committee to do an external institutional review. It is the hallmark of every good leader to complement their own knowledge with the specialized knowledge of others. It is very admirable that you sought out an external review to help you in providing leadership to the UA system.

However, we are afraid that the report by Fisher Committee is deficient in several key aspects and we do not think the report does justice to UAA or to your intentions. The Fisher report suffers from the following deficiencies.

- The report does not fully appreciate the demographic trends of Alaska.
- The report makes the assumption that the three MAU's are "one University", when in fact they are separately accredited institutions.
- The report often relies on anecdotal evidence and on single samples for justification, when a representative survey of UA stakeholders could lead to a different conclusion.
- The report suggests that in the interest of "efficient usage of resource," the growth and development of UAA should be curtailed. Instead we see the University system as a fundamental resource in itself.

As such we reject many of the recommendations of the Fisher report. However there are several recommendations with which we agree with the Fisher report. The Fisher Report recommends decentralizing UA Statewide administration and shifting more activities to the local MAUs, thereby empowering the MAUs to better serve their constituencies and function more effectively (see pages 53-56, Fisher Report). This has been a supported idea by many for a long time and is a step in the right direction. But this recommendation needs to be implemented carefully in consultation with the MAUs and not followed *blindly*. Otherwise, a more problematic structure could result.

In addition, we agree with the following three recommendations in the Fisher report. The Alaska Scholars program is a good program and should be supported. Professional and employee related decisions are best taken in a decentralized manner. The practice of deferred maintenance is insidious.

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

Several Fisher Report recommendations hamper the MAUs to serve their constituents and operate efficiently. This is not a statement against MAUs having restrictions, but the deciding factors in the decision making process should be:

- Industry needs.
- Constituent demand.
- Goals of strategic plans for UA and the MAUs.
- Marketplace factors.

If a business plan for a new bachelor, masters, PhD, or other program at UAA can be shown to be viable, and even profitable, then it should be allowed to be considered by the UA President and not first rejected internally by a UA Statewide group with no industry or constituent representation.

The “ten ton gorilla” problem regarding UAA and UAF (p. 7, Fisher Report) is misstated by the Fisher Report. Research competition is not between UAA and UAF as assumed by the Fisher Report. Research competition is between a single UA campus and outside national universities. The big picture is that UA brings in a relatively small amount of external research funding (about \$120M, p. 17-18, Fisher Report) compared to the total available nationally. Each of the major UA campuses could bring in 5 times more research funding and it would still be a small amount compared to the national total, but would be an astounding success for the UA campuses and Alaska. In other words, the national funding “fuel” source is free (i.e. already paid for) and is so large that you should want more engines hooked up to it generating economic power for Alaska.

Statements implying or effectively stating that UAF should be the only sciences and engineering campus (p.11, Fisher Report), or obstructing UAA from developing in these areas, are incredibly

baseless broad strokes. These type of statements are in direct conflict with the mission of UA and the individual campuses that identify research success as part of their mission statements. Furthermore, these type of statements hamstringing development of two great areas that a university has for obtaining external funding: sciences and engineering. The Fisher Report provides no economic analysis or business plan to substantiate its recommendations that appoint programs to a particular MAU. The hampering Fisher Report recommendations are in direct conflict with its other recommendations calling for more efforts to increase funding for UA.

The Fisher Report extensively describes the importance of increasing alumni fundraising (p.58-66, Fisher Report). However, industry and alumni support will be severely hampered if: 1) the programs alumni want for their children at UAA do not exist, or 2) the research and collaborative programs that industry wants in Anchorage, where industry has their headquarters, do not exist at UAA. Thus, there is severe conflict among the various recommendations of the Fisher Report. Again, a key mistake of the Fisher Report is that it makes recommendations without considering the needs of the UA constituents (i.e. the customer) or other marketplace factors.

Enrollment data has shown for years that UAA serves the Anchorage area best and UAF serves Fairbanks. However, both UAA and UAF engineering enrollments are growing which shows that growth at UAA engineering is not harming UAF and may be helping it. The demand for engineering from UA constituencies and marketplace factors support programs at both UAA and UAF campuses.

The key to unlocking the huge potential of UA for obtaining tremendous funding through research and entrepreneurial activities is to allow development of engineering and sciences at UAA in Anchorage. Anchorage is the center of industry and of the medical community for Alaska. Certainly, stifling UAA, which has with the largest and growing engineering enrollment, is not in the best interest of Alaska industry or Alaskans. Continuing the blind appointing of programs to MAUs without considering marketplace factors is a recipe for failure. This type of past dictating by UA Statewide administration will continue to be a cause for conflict between campuses. It is the reason why decentralization of UA Statewide administration and the strengthening of the individual MAUs are needed. Decisions based on marketplace factors result in decisions that are reasonable and understandable and thus are more acceptable to the campuses.

The demographic trend of Alaska is such that the Matanuska-Susitna Borough will continue to eclipse the demographic growth in the rest of Alaska.¹ In the light of this demographic fact, we disagree with the Fisher Report that all research facilities must be concentrated in UAF. We would argue that given the vast size of the State we need to have dispersed Universities which will develop and offer programs to suit their respective dynamic environments.

There is nationwide recognition of the value of a strong menu of PhD programs in urban universities. The urban professional population needs convenient access to good programs that offer Masters and PhD degrees. If those programs are not at UAA, professionals will either not

¹Source: Alaska Economic Trends, December 2010, Volume 30, Number 12. It is downloadable from <http://labor.state.ak.us/trends/dec10.pdf>.

pursue the degrees or go elsewhere for their education. It is not likely that if an Anchorage professional decides to move in order to pursue a PhD then that professional will select Fairbanks. There is a broad menu of West Coast schools actively engaged in marketing to Anchorage professions for out of state graduate level education. The lack of a good menu of PhD programs at UAA will, in the long run, reduce the number of the PhD students in Statewide University system.

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

“An examination of the data for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 shows enormous variations in state funding and in the use of federal funds. For example, state appropriations for higher education declined 26.1 percent in Alabama (20.1 percent after inclusion of federal funds), 19.2 percent in Nevada (4.3 percent after federal funds), and 16.4 percent in Virginia (9.4 percent after federal funds). At the same time, ***appropriations in North Dakota increased 18.5 percent, even though no federal stimulus funding went to higher education. Appropriations for Montana higher education increased by 10.8 percent, jumping 30.1 percent with the inclusion of supplemental federal funds.***” (p.10)²

We therefore reiterate that it is imperative to invest in education now and build up our competitiveness in the knowledge sector. We need to strike the iron when it is hot and at this point we have a strategic window of opportunity. Only three states in the country are in good fiscal health and Alaska is one of them. The states of North Dakota and Montana have already taken steps to build up their infrastructure for the knowledge based economy. Alaska will be well advised to follow their example.

We appreciate your request for feedback on the report. The Faculty Senate at the University of Alaska Anchorage invites you to visit the Anchorage campus often and speak with our faculty, staff and students. We look forward to sharing our dynamic University with you and we look forward to many discussions with you on the future of UAA.

With best wishes



Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya
President of Faculty Senate

²Source: 2009-2010 Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, published in *Academe* , March- April 2010 issue and downloadable from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/Z/ecstatreport09-10/default.htm>. Emphasis added.

Appendix

Faculty Response to Fisher Report University of Alaska Anchorage

Introduction

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

General Comments

Comments on Methods and Assumptions

1. A major problem of the Fisher Report, is its reliance on a few and at times individual anecdotes to support many of its recommendations. In the social sciences, there is a semi-serious aphorism that "the singular of data is not anecdote." That is a way to remind ourselves that while meaningful, generalizable data is certainly made up of individual data points, each individual point of data is merely an anecdote, and therefore not generalizable. Even when the Fisher Report includes numeric data, it is usually data from a single year. Given the dubious methodology their report in general should be viewed with a high degree of skepticism. Of course even a broken clock is correct twice a day. So some recommendations might still be supportable on the basis of common sense.
2. The assumption of "One University" is used in a very simplistic manner. This assumption of centralized authority and decision making with the President and BOR ignores shared governance and the authority of the chancellor and provost on each campus (as well as that of faculty) and the fact that the three MAUs are separately accredited.
3. The report does not generally address how changing university programs, demographics, needs, or resources in the state might impact the mission of the campuses, and accepts

historical assumptions regarding the role of each campus. They frame growth of UAA as a zero sum game-it must come at the expense of UAF. They ask “First, how much should the UAA campus be developed in size and programs and to what extent might (should) this occur at the expense of UAF? ”(p.7) but fails to ask whether UAA’s development should be curtailed in order to maintain the status quo.

4. The report references the US News college rankings at several points. An underlying assumption in the Report is that UAF and UAA need to be “highly ranked academic institutions in national higher education surveys.” (p. 10) Much recent research and commentary focuses on the methodology of some of these national studies, particularly the US News and World Report.³ Using ranking makes sense when talking about marketing, but not when talking about the strength or weakness of academic programs. The Fisher Committee’s reliance on a ranking system that is widely known to be flawed raises concerns about the report generally.

Other General Comments

1. As a general rule the authors of this report have a very disturbing habit of drawing conclusions based on a single example. There is a general lack of references/citations.
2. Many times their comments are just off the cuff comments, rather than reasoned arguments. In several recommendations (e.g., #7) the Fisher Committee recommends decentralization, and then in others (e.g.,#8) more centralization is recommended. It is difficult to tell whether the committee views the optimal organization to be one system with several colleges and universities, one system with three universities that each also include a number of branch campuses, or as one university with several campuses. This particular lack of clarity makes it very difficult to evaluate a number of the recommendations in the report.
3. They present much material in a manner that did not clarify underlying assumptions, make suggestions concerning very complex issues that seemed overly simplistic in nature, and present numerous questions with out providing much guidance.
4. The report additionally becomes sidetracked by minutiae.

³For example see The Flaw of Overall Rankings By Robert J. Sternberg published in the January 24, 2011 issue of Inside Higher Ed-available online at <http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2011/01/24/sternberg>.

Comments on Specific Recommendations

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

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

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

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
3	Despite improvements, reality is that large numbers of students begin studies at the University, but then disappear. (We note here that the high school dropout rate is also unusually high.) There may be valid reasons why UA lags national standards; if not, then the numbers we observe reflect a waste both of human and financial resources. Whichever is the case, the University needs to determine why its performance lags national norms and then, as necessary, outline how it intends to improve the situation.	12	<p>Why students begin studies and then disappear is a good question. We are not sure what “actual data” Fisher et al are suggesting. One would be at a loss to figure out how to collect it besides surveying students who have left, and they are not always easy to find.</p> <p>In part we are using the wrong data. 6 year grad rates are based on first time, full-time freshmen. However the average student age at UAA is 30, only 35 % are full time. 80% work, many full time.(p. 41 of the Fisher Report).</p> <p>There are a wide variety of reasons why students drop out of UAA, e.g. financial, academic, lack of interest. Some students transfer to “outside” universities and obtain degrees there. These students are not tracked.</p> <p>Certainly, more can and should be done to support students. However, this recommendation assumes (and it is a widespread assumption these days) that ensuring college completion for every admitted student, or at least the vast majority of them, should be the goal of every postsecondary institution. Despite that, though, there is also something to be said for college acting as a sort of “quality control” mechanism. That is, if grades actually are intended to mean something, and if it is expected that it can be possible to fail a course, then one would expect that some students will not make it through what is supposed to be a rigorous experience. This is naturally even more the case at an open access university like UAA, where there are inherently fewer filters on the preparedness of entering students.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
4	Elsewhere in this report, we argue that the University of Alaska might be well advised to focus its scarce dollars on a smaller number of programs, especially at the graduate level, many of which can legitimately aspire to national rankings. It is not clear to us that some of the doctoral programs at UAF would survive if such criteria were applied. We recommend that the President and the Board take a long look at this situation and reexamine the viability of programs including enrollment, retention, research productivity and graduation.	13	We question the goal of aspiring to national rankings as a goal as opposed to “useful to residents and policy in the state of Alaska.” The President and the BOR should study the enrollment and the number of Ph.Ds awarded in the various programs. For example, if less than 3 Ph.Ds are awarded in a 10 year time frame, the funding could probably be better used in other areas. If a program review is called for then it should be done by the Provost of the relevant MAU.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
5	<p>This is a difficult and often treacherous milieu. Nevertheless, we recommend that the University as an institution seek to avoid adopting official policy stances in such controversies, but instead: (A) insist on scholarly integrity and do its very best to avoid shoddy scholarship that will draw legitimate criticism; (B) seek to apply the University’s considerable expertise to the analysis of similar problems; (C) via its faculty, offer prospective solutions, but not endorse those solutions; and, (D) actively sponsor discussions of relevant issues and ensure that the University remains a free and open marketplace for ideas. On occasion, it may be necessary to defend academic freedom and free inquiry when interested parties are not pleased with the results of University research, or with the expression of particular points of view. However, untrammelled scholarly inquiry and research are foundation stones of any respectable academic community and the University of Alaska should not equivocate in such situations.</p>	14 & 15	<p>This recommendation seems confused about UA’s “official policy.” It simply needed to say that UA should support academic freedoms regardless of the consequences.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
6	Therefore, it is prudent for the University of Alaska to plan for the possibility that: (A) its general fund support from the State of Alaska might not keep up with price inflation; and, (B) its share of the state's budget might decline. The University should explore what the University would be like if ten years from today, the "real" (after inflation) value of its state appropriation has not risen, or even declined. What activities must the University improve or discard to operate efficiently in such a world? What things must it begin to do if this will be the state of affairs in 2020? What would this imply for tuition and fees? The number of questions that must be answered is almost endless.	15	This recommendation simply means that the University should plan for the future. A large class of recommendations by Fisher belong to this genre-basically sound but not very profound.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
7	<p>Hence, we must recognize that a reorganization of the University of Alaska is not a cure all for whatever ails it. Even so, it is apparent that some improvements can be made. These fall into two main categories. First, as it stands, the University of Alaska is overly centralized and devotes too many resources to a command and control regulator model that should instead place more emphasis upon incentives, distinctiveness and entrepreneurial activities. Increasingly, under the authority of the President, UA Systems administrators should act as staff to the Board and provide recommendations rather than wielding final administrative authority. Second, the University’s attempt to seamlessly integrate all post-secondary education into the same administrative structure sounds better than it actually works. UA’s vocational, technical and community college activities must be accorded greater prominence and not viewed as “four-year lite”(the observation of a sometimes frustrated individual associated with workforce development).</p>	16	<p>UA has become too centralized, and statewide administration has grown considerably in recent years. Each MAU is distinct, and “one size does not fit all”.</p> <p>Since Alaska does not have a community college (except PWS), it is extremely important that vocational, technical, and workforce development programs be supported as well as baccalaureate and graduate programs.</p> <p>If we are serious about becoming more efficient, then many of the resources that are currently being used to support the UA administrative structure should be reallocated to other, higher priorities. Instead of an overarching UA administration, we would like to recommend more independence for MAUs and for individual campuses, not less.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
8	<p>Our point is not to concentrate all program-reduction attention on teacher education; instead, why maintain three free-standing teacher education programs, three free-standing MBA degrees, three free-standing environmental studies programs, et al? UA often talks about being “one university” but shrinks from situations where one MAU will supply faculty and courses to another MAU, or one MAU will perform all of a certain type of administrative task for other MAUs. We believe it is time for the UA System to move off the mark on these issues and recommend that the President take steps to see that it occurs.</p>	20	<p>No, UA does not talk of being one University. If we have one university and three campus model, then we should have one Provost and one Senate and one Library. Three separate programs are needed. Juneau, Fairbanks and Anchorage are far apart geographically, and the programs serve the communities in which they are located. We need engineering programs at UAA as well as at UAF, as the population center is in Anchorage. The solution again is for programs to follow students. This statement is contradictory to Recommendation 7 which calls for de-centralization.</p>
9	<p>The problem with this approach is less the courses required and more the comparative absence of empirical evidence that the programs “work.” Have students learned when they finish these programs and is there a measurable “value added?” Have their attitudes changed? Do they become more or less tolerant of the views of others? Are they better able to integrate and synthesize information? How do they compare to other students nationally? How do graduates from UAF, UAA and UAS compare, since they do not complete the same general/liberal education sequences? Does the “capstone” course at UAA designed to integrate knowledge make a perceptible difference? These are important questions and we strongly recommend that the University employ rigorous means to seek their answers.</p>	20 & 21	<p>This is not a recommendation, this is a series of questions. They certainly are important questions, but one has to wonder why this was numbered as a recommendation when no real suggestions are made for either how to investigate these questions, or probably more importantly, what to do with any answers that are found. Are these questions about programs working particular to the UA system or do they plague all universities? We don’t know of any university basing their programs on this kind of research. We would say that the jury is still out on the methodology and relevance. The question about comparing graduates reveals an incredible simplicity of mind when it comes to looking at programs, In the same vein, “Value added” is not a useful measurable term in this context.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
10	We recommend that the President refashion the entire institutional research function with the UA System. If necessary, different individuals must be hired who are capable of performing sophisticated multivariate analyses and that have mastered applicable operations research techniques such as linear programming, queuing and simulations. Most of the heavy lifting in terms of institutional research should occur on the MAU campuses and experts on these campuses can be allocated specific tasks as well by the President. Relatively few central system personnel will be needed and these should focus on recording and classifying data and completing necessary reports.	21	There is somewhat of an irony here, in that this recommendation highlights the importance of sophisticated quantitative statistical analysis but precious few of the recommendations in the report are based even remotely on any sort of quantitative analysis at all.
11	It appears possible for a UAA student to avoid taking a laboratory science. UAF requires two laboratory science courses of every baccalaureate student, and UAS requires one course (although the UAS Catalog does not make this point clear for students). For several reasons, a laboratory science experience is an essential part of a respectable liberal undergraduate education. We recommend that UA require such on every campus.	21-22	A lab science course for the GER is required at UAA. UAA follows the GER requirements approved by the BOR (Page 61 of the UAA catalog). According to p. 82 of the current UAA catalog, all bachelor's students must take 7 credits of science, including a laboratory course. This is easily findable by simply searching for, e.g., the word "laboratory" in the PDF version of the catalog (or, if one uses a paper version, by scanning the headings in the general education requirements). Making such a claim in a recommendation leads one to wonder how in-depth the committee's research actually was. Also, it seems odd that after stating earlier in the report that the needs of associate's degree programs and students should not be ignored, at this point in the report "a UAA student" apparently means precisely a UAA bachelor's degree student.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
12	There is no writing competency exit examination. Given that high proportions of UA students transfer into the campuses where they seek to graduate, and many are mature and hence completed writing courses many years previous, it is important that they demonstrate their ability to write clearly and cohesively. We recommend that UA take steps to implement such an examination. We can guarantee that citizens and employers will approve.	22	A generic writing examination will not allow us to assess a student's writing ability. It is important that our students communicate well, but communication in each discipline is different. It makes a difference whether the sort of writing examination the committee would like to see involves writing for an academic audience, business writing, technical writing, multimodal composition, etc. We are not aware of any university that has a writing competency exit exam in any event none of us had to face such an exit examination. Our GER, capstones and course standards address writing competency. The time and money required to implement a cumbersome exit exam could be spent in better ways.
13	We are uncertain what "academic" writing is (F211, F213). Such labels suggest these writing courses somehow are not aimed at preparing students for effective writing in other situations, e.g., in business, or everyday life. We recommend different titles.	22	These courses are UAF courses. UAA has ENGL courses at the 200 level that are geared towards Literature, Technical Writing, Social and Natural Sciences, and Persuasion.
14	We recommend that UA institute a computer literacy requirement for all baccalaureate degree candidates. The vast majority of students will come to the University with computer and Internet skills, but will not necessarily be familiar with certain software programs and/or search techniques. Computer and Internet literacy has become a prerequisite for the exercise of intelligent and full citizenship and UA should ensure that its graduates have demonstrated such literacy. We note that computer/Internet literacy and library literacy are not identical.	22	This is another cut and paste from previous Fisher reports. We provide many regular and short term courses for computer skills. Although faculty appreciate the role of assessment, we wonder if the sizeable costs of assessing computer literacy of every graduate is sufficiently justified in an era when success in college today mandates that students are reasonably facile with computers for doing their research, writing their papers, and submitting their works.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
15	We recommend that every baccalaureate degree recipient be required to demonstrate competency in a non-English language or culture. UA students will graduate into a world that is increasingly international. The first language of more than one-quarter of all new elementary school students in California is Spanish. In Alaska, approximately fifteen percent of the population speaks a language other than English at the dinner table. Further, language is the repository of a culture; it is essential that UA students come to grips with other cultures, preferably by means of their languages. Both the understanding of UA students and their employability will increase if they acquire facility with a non-English language at the second-year collegiate level. We recommend that UA introduce such a requirement.	22-23	This has also been discussed in the past, and is currently under discussion by a UAA Faculty Senate committee. If UA were to introduce such a requirement through the BOR, the budget implications on the various campuses would have to be considered. Fisher's recommendation on this issue would have been more credible if it had reported the extensive and unique cultural and language research and resources in Alaska and at UAA. We welcome recognition and support. This is one area in which UA is an international leader. The extended campuses play a crucial role in these programs. KPC is proud to host the Dena'ina research and language teaching program that began with original research here in 1989. Note also that the Dena'ina language website is cutting-edge in language instruction. Native languages and Native ways of knowing are important area of research and their results implements throughout Alaska. Also the joint UAF-UAA psychology PhD program is the only rural indigenous psychology program in the country.

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

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
18	Incentives count where research is concerned and we recommend that the University reexamine how it utilizes and distributes the indirect cost overhead recovery funds that accompany many grants that it receives. We don't have a formula to offer that magically and optimally distributes these funds amongst researchers, departments, colleges and the University. Nevertheless, the comments of some faculty suggest that increasing the distribution of funds to the actual researchers who generated the funds might induce more grant activity over time. These funds also could be used to nudge institutions (e.g., UAA) in programmatic and research directions consistent with the UA System's overall strategic plan.	24	It is difficult to tell what this recommendation means. If it means that a UA level committee will decide what line of research is appropriate for an individual faculty member to follow, we oppose it. If, however, it means that more grant funding is fed back to grant-funded research, we support it.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
19	<p>We recommend that the Board of Regents study extending the WWAMI model to other academic areas, especially high cost, low enrollment programs within particular academic specialties or professional schools. “Buying” spots in reputable graduate programs in others state might save Alaska the expense of operating and equipping small, high-cost graduate training. Veterinary medicine, dentistry, architecture and law could be candidates for WWAMI-like programs, but only if documentable shortages exist that have inflated wage rates. It would make little sense to initiate a WWAMI-like program if Alaska already is able to obtain the individuals it reasonably needs in a particular occupation or specialty.</p>	25	<p>This could be a slippery slope and cause the University to develop a “support” oriented faculty per WWAMI-like program. A University should have the capabilities to graduate students without sending them to another program. Are we Universities or are we support institutions? This is doing education on the cheap and dirty. The University of Alaska must grow its own professionals. The remark “[unless] able to obtain the individuals [from outside Alaska]” referring to health care providers, veterinarians, dentists, lawyers, architects, shows lack of understanding of Alaska by the Fisher group. The following statement from the 2010 report on health care providers in Cordova (http://www.cityofcordova.net/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/1.pdf) reflects the situation concerning individuals obtained from outside: “They do not intend to stay long term, and they cycle through. They do not get involved in the community and they do not spend money and support the local economy. It is almost like the mindset of health care providers is that medical stints in Cordova are meant to be temporary.”</p>

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

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

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

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
24	Some of the funding for UA’s technology efforts is supported by a \$5.00 per credit hour student fee (maximum = \$60 per semester). We believe there is a strong argument for increasing the size of this user fee, provided the proceeds are used directly to support and assist students. Additional “smart” classrooms (noted above) provide such an example, as would additional work stations. We also recommend, however, that UA administrators utilize student advisory committees to assist them in ascertaining how things are working and what things need to be done.	30	At UAA, the Consortium library provides 35 research stations for students. It is debatable whether more are needed, as most students bring their own notebook computers/tablets/IPads /cell phones to campus. Maybe fewer computer labs are needed except when specialized software is needed. Before making such a decision, though, one presumably ought to determine whether the technology investments funded by such fees would actually be worth it. An example: one of us have taught at a university where every classroom had digital projectors funded by student technology fees imposed several years ago, but they were effectively unusable because they were early-generation projectors with a low resolution, and it was deemed too expensive to replace them even given the existing fee structure. We need to avoid trying to build a revenue stream that we then use to create that sort of problem for ourselves.
25	Finally, while UA’s technology intensive distance learning efforts are much appreciated by students, it is fair to note that some knowledgeable outsiders believe that UA is not at the forefront of distance education today. “There are some outdated in their approaches and high cost in their operations.” said one, who believes the President should bring in one or more acknowledged experts at institutions that either are on the cusp of new developments, or which currently operate highly successful, profitable programs. We concur.	30	Since Fisher Group did not visit KPC nor assess KPC’s distance education practices and technology, it is hard to see how they can judge UA’s distance programs to be outdated. Also why are the “knowledgeable outsiders” kept anonymous? This recommendation does not give credit to CAFE and the people in educational technology who run great workshops and assist faculty. Before bringing in institutional experts, we should support the programs and people we already have in place to do these things. We would also like to point out that the nursing program at UAA does use a large number of online courses.

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

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
28	The UAFT agreement recognizes that community college, community campus and vocational-technical college faculty are different individuals with different responsibilities. We agree and note that the differing missions and scope of these units is one of the reasons why it would be wise to differentiate further the four-year institutions (UAF, UAA and UAS) from the UAFT-oriented units, and administer them and record their results separately.	34	The UAFT CBA does NOT say that they are different with different responsibilities. The UAFT represents faculty on various campuses. If they think that UA needs to differentiate campuses based on union affiliation, why did they eliminate the community colleges (except for PWSCC)? Also, administrative structure should not be based on union affiliation.
29	Further, we cannot help but note that UAF, UAA and UAS would not be savaged so much in national rating systems if their retention and graduation numbers did not include students from the community campuses who have not already earned an associate degree. We regard this as a win-win proposition for all concerned and recommend that the President move in this direction.	34	
30	We recommend that the President give very strong consideration to negotiating changes in the CBA that will provide more faculty salary flexibility among the institutions and that UAF be accorded a different set of peer institutions that more closely fits its doctoral research role.	35-36	According to Fisher Committee recommendations UAA cannot be a doctoral institution because UAF is a doctoral institution and UAF should get higher faculty salary because they are a doctoral institution. That's a very circular argument. This appears to be further justification for maintaining a situation where UAA cannot develop doctoral programs. This approach will mean that "salary flexibility" will thus be unevenly applied given that not all UAF faculty have a research component in their workload. Therefore, it does not make sense to accord a different set of peer institutions to the UAF faculty as a whole.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
31	We have two recommendations with respect to the UNAC CBA. First, the President should work to increase the share of the total salary pie devoted to market and merit raises. If the State and the University truly believe in excellence, then they should reward it.	37	The difficulty, of course, is how one defines merit. Is this intended to provide power to define merit via a shared governance model, or to place all of the power to define merit in the hands of an arbitrarily selected group of administrators? Why do they not recommend rewarding the same things for UAFT faculty?
32	Second, the President should end the situation where one external salary survey (the Oklahoma State University study) applies equally to all three MAUs. As we detail below, this has worked distinctly to the disadvantage of UAF, which realistically has a very different set of peer institutions than UAA and UAS. Further, it also sometimes has resulted in a strange pattern of faculty raises that one administrator has labeled “anti-merit”.	37	The University does not use one comparator for all faculty at UAA but should. Salary comparators should not be based on union affiliation

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

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

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

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

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
39	At the end of the day, it is apparent that UAF, UAA and UAS in many ways are not comparable to many of the state universities to which they are compared. Nevertheless, it is incumbent on the University to do more than it has to find out why the University falls short in this arena and take remedial steps.	45	If these Universities are not comparable, then why compare them? Also the last sentence is an example of a category of statements which are basically sound but not very profound.
40	We strongly recommend that the President of the University of Alaska make the improvement of student retention and graduation one of his very highest priorities in the next few years. The focus should be upon discerning facts, causes and remedies. To ignore this problem is to waste the resources both of students and the State of Alaska.	45	It certainly is a widespread assumption that student retention and graduation rates are a crucial measure of the strength of a university, but this is generally phrased as an assertion without evidence (as it is in this report). However, 100% retention and graduation rates could well signal a university that expects no learning or other work from its students (aside, perhaps, from the payment of tuition). This seems to be an area where the individual campuses are best situated to examine the circumstances that are contributing to retention and graduation problems, rather than have this be a centralized task.
41	Alaskans now are among the most lightly taxed citizens in the country and changing this circumstance will neither occur quickly, nor without substantial political carnage. While such discussions occur, however, state financial support for the University of Alaska could dwindle. The University should anticipate such circumstances and begin to model less generous budgets. Unfortunately, we observe the strategic plans of UAF, UAA and UAS largely do not appear to reflect such possibilities and appear to assume, or at least hope for, worlds worthy of Dr. Pangloss.	47	We do not think the subject of taxes is appropriate here. UA should anticipate and prepare for various funding scenarios. Presumably, this can be done as part of UAs upcoming strategic planning, and UA faculty are willing to help with that planning.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
42	repetitive financial cuts at the margin on all programs spread mediocrity. In the long-term, we believe it would be far better that the University completely eliminate whole programs and departments in order to sustain its support for its most vital and highest quality programs.	47	This recommendation has huge implications, but as is so often the case in this document, it is woefully short on guidance. We would be interested, for example, to learn what the writers of the report consider to be the characteristics of "most vital and highest quality programs". Without such details, this recommendation is not implementable in any coherent way. Eliminating programs that were "underperforming" was under consideration in the mid 90s. One has to be careful to maintain programs that contribute to a well-rounded education.
43	We point this out because UA is not without needs and might well find it attractive to float bonds for student housing or other revenue-generating activities in the future. Suffice it to say that the UA System has the ability to do so though this would require some reallocations.	47 - 48	
44	President Gamble and the Regents should bear this in mind as they consider reorganization. System administrators portray the classic "We're from the government and we're here to help you," attitude, commented a sarcastic administrator. "Sometimes they just come looking for work and problems," commented a faculty member. We deal with recommended reorganizations of the UA System in another section. It is sufficient here to note that the major place in the UA System where commentators see inefficiency is in the UA System Central Office. Whether or not fair, this is a widely held view.	49	We agree with the Fisher Group on this and note that Fisher agrees with the McTaggart-Rogers report.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
45	We recommend that the President charge appropriate staff with the investigation of public/private partnership possibilities with respect to housing, but also with respect to a variety of other activities that might be carried out jointly (including partially privatized services, joint research and development projects, real estate developments, etc.). The President and the Board ultimately might opt not to do any of these things, but nevertheless should make themselves aware of the potential benefits and costs before it makes its choices.	50	Public-private partnerships have some advantages, but they have several disadvantages, as well, ranging from the easily measurable (e.g., the inclusion of a profit motive often drives up the cost to consumers or employees) to those difficult to measure (e.g., conflicts resulting from differences in institutional culture). It is worth noting that universities might be able to gauge the positive and negative aspects of such ventures better than many organizations, as long as they find a way to tap into the knowledge base of their own faculty, specifically those faculty with expertise in the subject.
46	UAS does not compete in intercollegiate athletics, a circumstance we do not believe should change. While intercollegiate athletic teams might improve UASs identity, community support and student recruitment, they usually bring with them a variety of problems and expenses. Their operating costs would be high and initiating teams would require major investments and general fund tax subsidies for facilities, staff and travel. This seems an ill-advised course to follow at this stage in UAS's development.	51	

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
47	At the end of the day, however, we recommend that the respective campus chancellors keep a close eye both on programmatic expenses in intercollegiate athletics and the amount of time student athletes are unable to attend scheduled classes because of their lengthy road trips. Intercollegiate athletics have gotten more presidents and chancellors into trouble than virtually anything other than presidential houses. Vigilance, good hiring and observable interest in each university's teams will go a long way toward avoiding scandals.	52	
48	While the recipe might differ in other states, there are sound reasons in the case of Alaska to centralize programmatic approvals, technology standards and related major technology resource decisions (such as the adoption of common student, employee and financial records systems), the allocation of capital and buildings, the assessment and formulation of budget requests, the overall allocation of maintenance reserve funds, negotiation of collective bargaining agreements (though we see no reason why each MAU might not have its own CBA and be heavily involved in that negotiation) and fringe benefit programs.	53	What are these "sound reasons"? The answer to this question, and it is an important one, is unclear from the report. UA does have a System Academic Council that reviews new programs, and decides which programs to send to the BOR for approval. We do not agree it would be a good idea for each MAU to have their own CBA.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
49	On the other hand, there is no persuasive reason why individual professorial and employee evaluations, nearly all hiring, college and departmental budgets, faculty promotion and tenure, disciplinary specific curricular decisions, the provision of student services, alumni activities, fund raising and most institutional research should be centralized. Individual campuses are much closer to the action.	53 - 54	We agree. UAA, UAS and UAF are separately accredited universities. It makes no sense to have faculty evaluations, curriculum, and faculty promotion and tenure reviews done at the statewide level,
50	Note that much greater individual campus autonomy often is sensible in states that boast much larger financial and population bases and multiple large metropolitan areas. In such circumstances, competition among institutions and the development of distinctive, specialized campuses often is highly desirable. Plainly speaking, we do not believe the State of Alaska has sufficient population and resources to permit such unrestrained competition.	54	It is unclear why the committee draws this conclusion. This is particularly the case given that earlier recommendations seem to assume that there is enough competition between UAF, UAA, and UAS that students could easily move from the one to the other when, e.g., they change majors (see recommendation #2). Why are the campuses seen as being in close competition in those cases, but not when it comes to campuses developing their own missions? This paradox is never resolved in the report.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
51	<p>The command and control regulatory model that the UA System has is perceived to have adopted over the past decade is in need of clarification and modification. “The statewide people act like they’re listening, but in reality they’ve already made up their minds and they’re simply trying to look reasonable”(the telling comment of an administrator whose sentiment was oft repeated). Rather than issue obiter dicta from Fairbanks, the UA System administration henceforth should emphasize well-designed incentives (often financial, though sometimes in the form of privileges relating to processes and local decision-making) to its institutions. The institutions will respond if the incentives are intelligently designed, clear and the process is not polluted. They need not be dragooned into certain behaviors. Indeed, they will increase their entrepreneurial behavior if incentives exist for them to do so. We note in passing that entrepreneurial behavior sometimes has been in short supply in the Alaska system of higher education. In any case, institutions predictably react negatively to, and even actively subvert, fiat that seem not to recognize their individual circumstances.</p>	54	<p>We fully agree that providing incentives for changes will work far better than the imposition of administrative mandates. The ultimate success of new initiatives hinges on having faculty and staff who embrace or ‘own’ the initiative. Mandates rarely work well, but incentives and support work much better.</p>

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
52	Increasingly, UA Systems executive staff, under the authority of the President, should act as staff to the Board and provide them with analysis and recommendations rather than wielding final administrative authority. If all parties behave intelligently, mutual respect will follow. We note here that central board staff often have earned the respect in similar situations in other states.	54	Faculty appreciate and respect the constitutionally-defined role of the BOR to shape the broad direction of UA. However, we would be concerned if this recommendation led to micro-managing some of the narrower steps that each MAU, their faculty, and staff need to control so they can make the MAU successful.
53	One of the more productive functions that the refashioned central staff might accomplish is to encourage the development of joint and cooperative academic programs within the system. The clinical/community psychology doctoral program provides a template for such programs. Courses, faculty and support are shared and students have the ability to benefit from a much larger portfolio of resources and specialties. With appropriate incentives, we are convinced that a variety of other programs could be mounted in the same fashion. We also note in passing that this constitutes a very nice way to provide UAA with additional advanced graduate responsibilities without granting it free-standing doctoral program authority and the concomitant additional costs that inevitably would accompany such a development.	55	Where the report uses the phrase “this constitutes a very nice way to provide UAA with additional advanced graduate responsibilities without granting it free-standing doctoral program authority”, one could easily instead read “this constitutes a very effective way to deny UAA any independence with regard to doctoral program authority”. The phrasing used by the report’s authors sounds more generous, certainly, but the actual effects of both phrasings would be the same.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
54	<p>The model we have outlined here assumes that the size of the current UA central staff may be reduced, perhaps in the target range of 60 to 80 positions (down from an estimated 200 today). Note that Virginia, which has a highly regarded public system of higher education, maintains a State Commission for Higher Education with a staff approximating 40. The Virginia system, of course, is less bureaucratic and more entrepreneurially oriented than the UA System. We recommend that the Board allocate some of these savings to the MAUs, some to the support of community college/vocational/technical education, and that some be retained to help provide incentives to encourage desired future behavior.</p>	55	<p>We agree with the Fisher Group on this and note that Fisher agrees with the McTaggart-Rogers report.</p>
55	<p>Recognizing this, the major change we have to recommend is to accord UA's vocational, technical and community college activities much greater prominence and not viewed as "four-year lite"(the observation of a sometimes frustrated individual associated with workforce development).</p>	55	<p>Workforce Development and technical/vocational programs are important to the state economy. These days, these programs usually require computer/mathematics/communication skills.</p>

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

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
57	<p>The lesson of best practice advancement across all institutional types is three-fold. Members of governing boards must assume responsibility for the advancement effort; it cannot be completely delegated to presidents, no matter how pivotal a role they must play. Second, the governing board, the president, and the professional(s) in charge of the basic functions of advancement—namely alumni relations, communications (incorporating university and government relations), and fund-raising—must work as an integrated team. Every function (alumni, public relations, et. al.) must be related in terms of attracting resources (dollars). Finally, the professionals in charge of these three principal advancement functions must be forward-thinking and broadly competent professionals who enjoy the respect of the academic community they exist to serve. The absence of any one of these characteristics will seriously weaken any institutional advancement program.</p>	59	
58	<p>New Foundation Board of Directors members should be recruited and trained to take responsibility for the fundraising performance of the University.</p>	60	

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
59	We suggest a reorganization along the following lines: the office of the President should be the prime agent for corporate research working in close conjunction with the several campuses but virtually all other fund raising activities should be housed in the separate campuses. Typically, alumni and others do not give to systems; indeed, the UA System office is not accredited. Their prime loyalty and sense of obligation is to their individual alma maters, but we note here that whatever, thoughtful consideration should be given to Curt Simic's recommendations.	61	The fact that the system is not accredited and the fact that loyalties of alumni are towards their respective Alma Mater is certainly at variance with the oft repeated justification of "one university" touted by Fisher.
60	The key to private support is relatively simple: do it "right" and support will be forthcoming, and it has not been done "right" in Alaska. The national average for alumni giving is over 17 percent, and some institutions go as high as 60 to 70 percent. The alumni giving percentage is the prime denominator for effective planned giving, capital campaigns and even corporate support. The President and the three Chancellors must each take thoughtful note of this. There are countless publications and conferences available, and Alaska, with its extraordinary academic culture, will be an ideal place to raise support for public higher education. There is only one private institution, Alaska Pacific, and it is relatively small but has a president who appears to appreciate the methodology of fund raising.	63	UAA is an economic engine for Alaska and Anchorage. This should be stressed more, because many people think we are a drain on state resources.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
61	We recommend staffing the program as necessary and then carefully monitoring the costs. As a guideline, every new dollar spent should generate additional revenues of \$6 to \$8 over time.	63	
62	We recommend the employment of an appropriate firm to conduct a feasibility study for a capital campaign. Such a study, independently and anonymously conducted, will test the University's case for private support and help to determine the level of interest by current and prospective donors in providing funding through a comprehensive campaign.	63	We hope that the benefits of using more consultants exceeds the costs.
63	An immediate major gifts and planned giving effort, coupled with the implementation of new processes, should lead to a prompt and positive impact on the "bottom line," engaging alumni and friends in the future of the University while setting the stage for successive campaigns.	63	
64	What is required, then, is a much more analytical, even hard-hearted evaluation of alumni activities and personnel. The bottom line is that either the events and the personnel demonstrably improve the University of Alaska's position, or they should be modified or abandoned. We recommend that each campus analyze its alumni events and personnel to determine the extent to which there is evidence that they actually further UA objectives, particularly alumni and fund raising. As noted below, as is often the case in "the lower 48," we recommend that each of the campus alumni officers be primarily responsible for the annual fund.	66	

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
65	Additional opportunities remain in creating focus, use of graphics and photography and in targeting future students and families as well as in cross-marketing, using print publications to drive audiences to the excellent website, among others.	67	In recommendations # 65- #72 the Fisher report is getting into micromanaging.
66	Opportunities to strengthen the System website include stronger use of photography for impact (a need in many publications, as well), a direct link to admissions information for prospective students and families (although it is likely that many would go first to the individual campus sites, which do provide such links) and more interactive features to encourage repeat visits. Many photos on the home page are run too small for maximum impact, and this is also true in many publications. Best practice is fewer photos run larger. Quality of some photos is also mediocre, with too many posed shots of people and not enough showing genuine interaction.	68	In recommendations # 65- #72 the Fisher report is getting into micromanaging.
67	Publications appearing to target potential students and families feature a secondary tagline, “Learn, engage, change” (University of Alaska Southeast). This, plus a more consistent brand and family look, might be encouraged throughout publications of constituent campuses. For out of state students, who represent a strong source of higher tuition revenue, the advantages of studying in a diverse, outdoors-oriented Pacific Rim environment could appeal to students in many disciplines.	70	In recommendations # 65- #72 the Fisher report is getting into micromanaging.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
68	Photography is an area that needs to be addressed throughout. As noted, many photos are run too small for impact. Too many are obviously posed, showing either no or little interaction, with subjects staring directly into the camera. In others, such as the front page of the Winter 2009 System newsletter, shots of equipment appear with no people for context. Some photos could benefit from tighter cropping. An upgrade in this area would benefit the entire publications and web areas.	70	In recommendations # 65- #72 the Fisher report is getting into micromanaging.
69	System Newsletter. In addition to enhanced photography, as noted above, high-priority needs for this publication are reduced word counts to avoid a cluttered look and to enhance readability and a less static, more contemporary design.	70	In recommendations # 65- #72 the Fisher report is getting into micromanaging.

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

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

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
77	In this and other publications, thought should be given to using them as vehicles to driving audiences to the excellent System website, permitting reduced word counts with additional information available online.	73	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
78	Most publications reviewed are those of the University of Alaska Southeast. Key messages and graphic identity need to be better integrated with those of the System to cross-market the brand. This appears to have been done effectively with campus and the System websites, but individual campus publications need to be taken to the next level.	73 - 74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
79	In regard to family look and graphic identity, the UA System logo should appear in a position subordinate to that of the individual campus identity; color palette and design template need to complement that of other campus and System publications.	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
80	With regard to messaging and targeting of key audiences, the Alaska Southeast pieces are unfocused and do not seem to target out-of-state students who might enroll because of unparalleled opportunities to live and study in a vast wilderness area that offers opportunities for recreation and fitness not easily found in “the lower 48.”	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.

Rec No	Fisher Committee Recommendation	Page	Our Comments
81	Recruiting publications targeting potential students, families and referral sources need to showcase academic programs building on Alaska's unique strengths and capabilities, creating interest and excitement among out-of-state students. In addition, outcomes should be more strongly emphasized: what can a student gain from a UA education that he or she might not obtain from an out-of-state institution? System campuses might consider adding a dedicated "outcomes" page to their websites, with a link from the System site.	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
82	Finally, the System might consider investing in a comprehensive publications audit (CASE and others will undertake these free of charge) and also reviewing CASE and other award winners in the "admissions" area to enhance its offerings.	74	Recommendations #73 to #82 are too focused on minor issues.
83	We recommend that the System and the individual campuses generate new strategic plans that accurately reflect their respective missions, are realistic in terms of their financial implications, and clearly indicate funds sources, responsibility for implementation, and time lines for implementation and assessment.	76	Is this just a problem with terminology? Strategic plans are big-picture plans, with details such as timelines and specific implementation plans left to other sets of plans that derive from them. If the Fisher Committee is actually stating that there should be no big-picture plans to give the general outlines for the specific planning they describe here, then we find this recommendation problematic. If it's just a terminology confusion, then this is sensible, as long as there is still a means for more general planning to take place.
84	In our view, however, before additional strategic planning occurs, it is essential that action be taken to clarify the missions of the respective institutions and that it deal explicitly with the future roles of UAF and UAA.	77	How this occurs, the process that is identified and used to accomplish this clarification, needs to be one that does not put UAA at a disadvantage. Assumptions that guide the process need to be made explicit and critiqued in an impartial manner.

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

2011-2012 Faculty Senate Membership

Officers	Position	Term	Email	Phone	Fax
Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya	President	11-12	afnb@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1949	786-4115
Robert Boeckmann	1 st Vice President	11-12	afrgb@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1793	786-4898
Dave Fitzgerald	2 nd Vice President	11-12	afdaf@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4482	786-4115
Hilary Davies	Chair, UAB	11-12	afhmd@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1745	786-6162
Susan Modlin	Chair, GAB	11-12	afsjm2@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4876	786-4559
John Petraitis	Past President	11-12	afjmp@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1651	786-4898
Vacant	Parliamentarian	11-12			

Senators	Representing	Term	Email	Phone	Fax
Tara Smith	At-Large	10-12	aftms@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6873	786-6857
Randy Magen	At-Large	10-12	afrhml@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6901	786-6912
Susan Garton	At-Large	11-13	afscg@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4335	786-4313
Angela Dirks	At-Large	11-13	angela.dirks@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6942	786-6448
Sue Fallon	At-Large	11-13	afsmf1@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1982	
Kenrick Mock	At-Large	10-12	afkjm@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1956	786-6162
Christine Gehrett	At-Large	11-13	ifckg@kpc.alaska.edu	262-0367	262-0358
Trina Carter	At-Large	10-12	afcc@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1846	786-1834
Tracey Burke Eva Kopacz	At-Large	11-13	tkburke@uaa.alaska.edu afeyk1@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6905 786-6909	786-6912 786-6912
Herminia Din	CAS Fine Arts	10-12	hdin@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1785	786-1799
Tom Skore	CAS Fine Arts	11-13	aftts@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1740	786-1799
Elizabeth Dennison	CAS Humanities	10-12	afejd@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1621	786-1978
Francisco Miranda	CAS Humanities	11-13	affm1@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4035	786-4190
Kerri Morris	CAS Humanities	10-12	afkkm@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4372	786-4383
Jennifer Stone	CAS Humanities	11-12	jcstone@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4373	786-4383
Elizabeth James	CAS Humanities	11-13	afejj@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1624	786-1978
Sam Thiru	CAS Math./Natural Sc.	11-13	afkt@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1958	786-6162
Alberta Harder	CAS Math./Natural Sc.	11-13	afamh1@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1748	786-6162
Katherine Rawlins	CAS Math./Natural Sc.	11-13	afkr@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1709	786-4607
Hilary Davies	CAS Math./Natural Sc.	11-13	afhmd@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1745	786-6162
Liliya Vugmeyster	CAS Math./Natural Sc.	11-13	aflv@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4709	786-4607
Larry Foster	CAS Math./Natural Sc.	10-12	aflmf@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4868	786-6162
Mari Ippolito	CAS Social Sciences	10-12	afmfi@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1718	786-4898
Bruno Kappes	CAS Social Sciences	10-12	afbm@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1719	786-4898
Karl Pfeiffer	CAS Social Sciences	11-12	afktp@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1746	786-1737
Soren Orley	CBPP	11-13	anseo@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1662	786-4115
Carlos Alsua	CBPP	11-13	afcja@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4337	786-4115
Stasia Straley	CBPP	10-12	afsstraley@cbpp.uaa.alaska.edu	786-4142	786-4115
Elizabeth Campbell	CHSW	11-13	afeac1@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4578	786-4559
Susan Modlin	CHSW	11-13	afsjm2@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4876	786-4559
Gabe Garcia	CHSW	11-13	afgmg3@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6532	786-6572
Pam Emblar	CHSW	11-13	afpje@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4509	786-4559
Betty Predeger	CHSW	11-13	afejp@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4575	786-4559
Debra Russ	COE	10-12	afdpr@uaa.alaska.edu	786-4418	786-4474
Keith Cates	COE	10-12	afkac1@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6314	786-4474
Amy Green	CTC	11-13	afamg@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1290	786-1402
Sandra Pence	CTC	10-12	afsdp@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6925	786-6938
Gail Johnston	CTC	10-12	afgaj@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6880	786-6857
Lou Nagy	CTC	11-13	afln@uaa.alaska.edu	786-7214	786-7202
Sharon LaRue	CTC	11-13	afsl@uaa.alaska.edu	786-7218	786-7202
Sun-il Kim	Engineering	10-12	afsk1@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1049	786-1079
Osama Abaza	Engineering	10-12	afoa@uaa.alaska.edu	786-6117	786-1079
Jodee Kawasaki	Library	11-13	jkawasaki@alaska.edu	786-1875	786-4639
Deborah Mole / Robin Hanson	Library	11-13	afdml2@uaa.alaska.edu afrrh@uaa.alaska.edu	786-1967 786-1827	786-1834 786-6050
Deborah Fox	Mat-Su	11-13	dfox@matsu.alaska.edu	745-9780	745-9711
Jan Vandever	Mat-Su	10-12	pfjiv@uaa.alaska.edu	745-9749	746-9303
Paul Landen	Kenai	10-12	ifphl@uaa.alaska.edu	262-0394	262-0358
Cheryl Siemers	Kenai	11-13	ifcks@kpc.alaska.edu	262-0364	262-0358

2011-2012 Faculty Senate Membership

Debbie Boege-Tobin	Kenai	11-13	ifddb@kpc.alaska.edu	235-1607	235-1626
Mark Schreiter	Kodiak	11-13	mschreiter@kodiak.alaska.edu	486-1227	486-1257

Faculty Senate Executive Board		
Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya, President	Robert Boeckmann, 1st Vice President	Dave Fitzgerald, 2nd Vice President
Hilary Davies, UAB Chair	Susan Modlin, GAB Chair	John Petralitis, Past President

Undergraduate Academic Board		Graduate Academic Board	
FSAL Francisco Miranda	COE Hilary Seitz	CAS Tim Hinterberger	CBPP Minnie Yen
FSAL Susan Fallon	CHSW Helena Jermalovic	CAS Patt Sandberg	CHSW Mary Dallas Allen
FSAL Susan Garton	CHSW Leanne Davis	FSAL Susan Modlin (CHAIR)	COE Hsing-Wen Hu
CAS Mari Ippolito	CTC Cheryl Smith	FSAL Randy Magen	CTC Peter Olsson
CAS Hilary Davies (CHAIR)	LIB Kevin Keating	FSAL Deb Russ	LIB Arlene Schmuland
CAS David Edgecombe	SOE Utpal Dutta	FSAL/CAS Vacant	SOE Joey Yang
CAS Paola Banchemo	Kenai Marion Yapuncich	CBPP Yoshito Kanamori	USUAA/GSA Veronica Padula
CBPP David Fitzgerald	Kodiak Kathryn Hollis Buchanan		
ADV Bettina Kipp	Mat-Su Joan O'Leary		
	USUAA Vacant		

General Education Review Committee		Academic Assessment Committee	
Suzanne Forster	CAS/Humanities	Tara Smith (CHAIR)	FS
Kyle Hampton	CBPP	Kenrick Mock	FS
Utpal Dutta	UAB-SOE	Osama Abaza	FS
Kevin Keating	UAB-LIB	Sue Fallon	FS
Deborah Fox	UAB-Mat-Su/Written Communication	Brian Bennett	CTC
Kathryn Hollis-Buchanan	UAB	Bill Myers	CAS
Len Smiley	CAS/Quantitative Skills	Kathi Trawver	CBPP
Marcia Stratton	CAS/Oral Communication	Keith Cates	CHSW
	CAS/Fine Arts	Deborah Mole	COE/FS
	Natural & Physical Sciences	Jennifer McFeran Brock	LIB
Sue Fallon	UAB-CHSW	Kim Bloomstrom	SOE
Robert Capuozzo	COE	Cheryl Siemers	Mat-Su
Sandra Pence	CTC	Jesse Mickelson	KPC/FS
Hilary Davies (ex officio)	UAB Chair	Bart Quimby (ex officio)	Kodiak
Bart Quimby (ex officio)	UAB-OAA		UAB-OAA

Academic Computing, Distance Learning, & Instructional Technology Committee		Diversity Committee		Student Academic Support and Success Committee	
CBPP Dave Fitzgerald	FS Alberta Harder	CAS Natasa Masanovic (CO-CHAIR)	FS Alberta Harder		
FS Angela Dirks (CO-CHAIR)	APU Regina Boisclair	CAS Patricia Fagan (CO-CHAIR)	FS Karl Pfeiffer		
FS Bruno Kappes	FS Leanne Davis	FS Gabe Garcia	FS Pam Emblar		
FS Hilary Davies	FS Elizabeth Campbell	CHSW Rena Spieker	Adv/ST Linda Morgan		
FS Debbie Boege-Tobin	FS Gabe Garcia	FS Susan Garton	FS		
FS Amy Green	FS Elizabeth Dennison	FS Paul Landen	CAS Kamal Narang		
FS Gail Johnston	APU Carole Lund	FS Herminia Din	CTC Karen Parrish		
FS	CAS Steve Godfrey	CAS Hiroko Harada	CHSW Filipinas Tibayan		
SOE Matt Cullin	CAS Mark Carper	CAS Gabrielle Barnett	CHSW Elizabeth Barnett		
CAS Liliya Vugmeyer	CAS Sean Licka	CBPP Kevin Dow	CAS Olena Murdoch		
	FS Elizabeth James	CAS Sean Licka	CTC Thomas Harman		
CBPP Alpana Desai	CAS Garry Kaultz	CAS Sudarsan Rangarajan	CAS Elizabeth Arnold		
CHSW Mary Dallas Allen	LIB Steve Rollins	CHSW Mary Weiss			
CAS Joy Mapaye	LIB Daria Carle	CBPP Yong Cao			
CAS Ann Jache	APU Ann McCoy	CAS Michihiro Ama			
	CTC Peter Olsson	Mat-Su PT Chang			
	LIB Susan Mitchell	FS Sun-Il Kim			
	SOE Peter Olsson	CAS Yelena Yagodina			
	CAS Rieken Venema	KPC Beth Graber			

Faculty Representatives to the UAA Assembly		Institutional and Unit Leadership Review Committee		Budget, Planning, & Facilities Advisory Committee	
Community Campus	Erik Hirschmann	FS Larry Foster	FS Soren Orley		
Faculty At-Large	Debbie Narang	FS Liliya Vugmeyer	FS Mari Ippolito		
FS President	Nalinaksha Bhattacharyya	FS Katherine Rawlins	FS Sam Thiru		
FS 1st Vice President	Robert Boeckmann	FS Trina Carter	SOE		
2nd Vice President	Dave Fitzgerald	FS Jan Vandever	CBPP Ken Boze		
			CTC Sandra Carroll-Cobb		
			CAS Tim Hinterberger		

Faculty Grants & Leaves	
CAS Kirk Scott	2011-2014
CAS Doug Causey	2009-2012
CAS Kamal Narang	2010-2013
CBPP Yoshito Kanamori	2011-2012
CHSW Kathy Stephenson	2009-2012
COE Andrew Turner	2010-2013
CTC Angela Dirks	2011-2014
CTC Amy Green	2010-2013
LIB Megan Friedel	2011-2014
SOE Seong Kim	2011-2012

University-wide Faculty Evaluation Committee	
Bipartite Academic	
CAS Robert McCoy	2009-2012
CTC Tara Smith	2010-2013
Mat-Su P.T. Chang	2009-2012
CTC Cheryl Smith	2010-2013
Mat-Su Erik Hirschmann	2010-2013
Bipartite Vocational	
Vacant	2011-2014
vacant	2011-2014
CTC Ellen McKay	2009-2012
CTC Anne Bridges	2009-2012
Vacant	2011-2014
Tripartite Academic	
CAS Daria O. Carle	2010-2013
SOE Nicolae Lobontiu	2010-2013
LIB Juli Braund-Allen	2010-2013
CHSW Randy Magen	2011-2014
CHSW Rhonda Johnson	2011-2014

Nominations & Elections
2nd VP Dave Fitzgerald (CHAIR)
CAS Larry Foster (2011-2013)
CAS Katherine Rawlins (2010-12)

Professional Development Committee
FS Betty Predeger
CAS John Petralitis
CTC Donald Ketner

Service Awards Committee
assigned January 2012

Program/Course Action Request

A. CAS

Chg Bachelor of Arts, International Studies

Chg SPAN A310 Selected Topics: Literary Trends and Traditions (3 cr)(3+0)

B. CTC

Del AT A420 Air Transportation System (3 cr)(3+0)

ACDLIT Committee

Academic Computing, Distance Learning, and Instructional Technology

Wednesday August 24, 2011

1:30 – 2:00 PM

Committee members present: Dave Fitzgerald, Hilary Davies, Amy Green, Bruno Kappes, Gail Johnston

The ACDLIT committee had a short meeting after the faculty senate retreat to establish a meeting day and time, strategic placement of its members on other committees across the university community, and an informational note on its account balance.

ACDLIT will meet on the fourth Friday of the month from 9:00 AM until 11:00 PM. Our meeting location has not yet been confirmed; hence, committee members will be notified by email prior to the next meeting.

Discussion of AY 2012 committee goals will be discussed at our next meeting.



UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

FACULTY SENATE DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage Alaska 99508
 Drs. Natasa Masanovic and Patricia Fagan, Co-Chairs

FACULTY SENATE DIVERSITY COMMITTEE REPORT FOR AUGUST 19, 2011

x	Michihiro Ama, Languages	E	Gabe Garcia, Health Sciences	E	Sean Licka, Art History
x	Gabrielle Barnett, Liberal Studies	E	Susan Garton, Education	x	Natasa Masanovic, Languages, 1 st Co-Chair
---	Yong Cao, Business	x	Beth Graber, English (Kachemak Bay)	x	Sudarsan Rangarajan, Languages
---	Ping-Tung Chang, Math (Matsu)	x	Hiroko Harada, Languages	x	Rena Spieker, Nursing
x	Herminia Din, Art Education	E	Helena Jermalovic, Nursing	x	Mary Weiss, Nursing (Bethel)
E	Kevin Dow, Accounting	x	Sun-il Kim, Computer System Engineering	E	Yelena Yagodina, Mathematics
x	Patricia Fagan, Languages, 2 nd Co-Chair and Secretary	x	Paul Landen, Psychology (Kenai)		
Consultants and Representatives					
x: Marva Watson, Director, Campus Diversity & Compliance Office					

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

I. Introductions: The FSDC Co-Chairs announced four new committee members for the Academic Year 2011-12: Gabrielle Barnett, Susan Garton, Beth Graber, and Yelena Yagodina. Welcome!

II. Overview of Recent Accomplishments: First Co-Chair, Dr. Natasa Masanovic, reviewed AY 2010-11 FSDC achievements. Successes included:

- ✓ Initiation of a Junior-Senior Faculty Mentorship Association, heralded by an Open House during Spring Semester 2011. Incoming Chancellor, Tom Case, was present to greet more than 30 faculty members in attendance. Additional key figures present to assist junior faculty were union representatives, Nelta Edwards and Trish Jenkins, as well as UAA CAFE Director, Lynn Koshiyama.

- ✓ Close collaboration with other UAA constituents: Diversity Action Council, Office of Campus Diversity and Compliance, and the Internationalization Laboratory Task Force.
- ✓ Active collaboration and participation in UAA Multicultural Celebrations such as Hispanic Heritage Month, Filipino American History Month, Alaska Native/Native American Heritage Month, and Alaska Civil Rights Month. FSDC has fully supported and will continue to support Public Square events at the University of Alaska Anchorage through coordination, publicity, promotion, informational dissemination, volunteerism, and attendance.
- ✓ Active collaboration with the UAA Campus Affiliate of the National Coalition Building Institute in “Welcoming Diversity and Prejudice Reduction.”

III. Establishment of FSDC Goals for AY 2011-12:

- ✓ Revise the Faculty Senate Diversity Committee Mission Statement to most appropriately reflect its current core values and endeavors.
- ✓ Bolster newly-established Junior-Senior Faculty Mentorship Association by welcoming most recently-arrived faculty members to join, particularly international faculty members.
- ✓ Formally welcome the new Director of Alaska Native Studies, Maria Williams, to present her programmatic and community goals; envision how the FSDC can assist in supporting these goals for the Alaska Native Studies Program.
- ✓ Encourage all community members—most specifically faculty whose membership pertains to the FSDC and DAC—to complete an all-day (8-hour) NCBI workshop.
- ✓ Collaborate with the International and Intercultural Laboratory Task Force in coordinating a Global Coffee House Event for all UAA community members during International Education Week, November 14-18, 2011.
- ✓ Explore Interactive Theatre (also known as “Theatre of the Oppressed”) as a resource medium on campus for problem solving conflicts related to issues such as gender or race.
- ✓ Continue to support campus and community cultural events relating to global and intercultural issues.

IV. Pairing of Mentors and Mentees: Since the initial Junior-Senior Faculty Mentorship Open House during Spring 2011, additional faculty members contacted the FSDC Co-Chairs seeking a mentor. During this August 2011 meeting, remaining mentees were coupled with senior FSDC faculty mentors.

V. Guidelines for FSDC Membership/Attendance and Participation Policies. The committee unanimously determined that it wished to adopt the following attendance policy:

- ✓ Any member who fails to attend more than two FSDC meetings during a given academic year and who does not have a justifiable excuse (i.e. notify the co-chairs of a university work-related activity conflict or documented medical emergency) will be officially removed from the Faculty Senate committee master roster and not granted FSDC Certificates of Appreciation for Service.

VI. Review of minutes from April 2011: unanimously approved with no changes suggested.

VII. Announcement of informational items:

- ✓ New course for Fall 2011
HNRS A292: Transdisciplinary Approach to Understanding Health Disparities among Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. Instructor: Dr. Gabriel Garcia.
- ✓ NCBI “Welcoming Diversity Workshop” for faculty and staff will take place on October 28. Consider attending, spread the word, and contact potential participants.
- ✓ Public Screening in Kimura Gallery, February 2012: Films (4 in total) relating to gender, identity, and faith issues by Shirin Neshat, artist and photographer. Dr. Sean Licka will solicit funding from the DAC and President’s Special Project grant.

VIII. Meeting Schedule for Fall 2011: Fridays, 3:00-4:30 p.m., GHH 103

- ✓ September 16
- ✓ October 21
- ✓ November 18

IX. It was announced that Certificates of Appreciation for 2010-11 Service had been placed in intercampus mail and that FSDC members would be receiving them shortly for inclusion in their professional files.

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

Respectfully submitted by Patricia Fagan, Ph.D.



Faculty Senate

UNIVERSITY of ALASKA ANCHORAGE

On July 1, the Faculty Technology Center (FTC) and Emedia Services transferred from ITS to be part of the faculty development activities supervised by Senior Vice Provost Renee Carter-Chapman. This followed recommendations from a faculty task force to make the FTC more faculty-centered and more focused on teaching and learning. As part of this transfer, the FTC and IT Services worked together to upgrade five Tier 1 instructional classrooms to Tier 2 capabilities, replace all projectors within Tier 1 classrooms, and purchase five additional wireless microphone sets for faculty use. These upgrades will be completed during the Fall semester.

Moving forward, the unit will be known as the Faculty Technology Center. It will be part of a Faculty Development Council reporting to Renee, composed of the directors of the FTC, CAFÉ, and CCEL. This group will help coordinate and enhance the services provided to faculty throughout the MAU.

In this Fall semester the FTC has already run a Tech Camp on August 9-13, and is offering a full suite of workshops that can be found at <http://www.uaa.alaska.edu/facultytechnologycenter>. One major activity will focus on the conversion to Blackboard 9.1 in January. Sixteen faculty members are currently examining the new shell, and their comments will be incorporated into the design. The FTC is also soliciting for a contact person from each department who will be kept apprised of the issues and status of the upgrade. Active training of faculty in the new software will begin in November.

The other major activity this year will be hiring staff for the Center. Recruitment for a Media Technician is currently underway. Recruitments for two Instructional Designers will begin in September, with faculty members assisting on the selection committee. A nationwide search for a Director will begin in October, and faculty will be actively involved in developing the position description and in the selection process. Members of the eLearning Group and ACDLIT Committee will be engaged in these searches. Throughout FY12 John Dede, Special Assistant to the Vice Provost, will serve as interim Director of the FTC, with the active involvement of Vice Provost Carter-Chapman

The FTC remains open, active, and committed to enhancing teaching and improving student learning. Please continue to contact the Center for your eLearning needs, and look for updates on progress throughout the year.