Meeting Summary

Decisions
After extensive discussion the following were decided by the Academic Task Force.

Template Deadline: Given the delay in release of the data resulting from the work of the Facilitation Team, the deadlines were shifted to keep the same length of time from data release to initial deadline.

The AcTF did not reach a conclusion on open meetings and voting.

Meeting Notes
1) Communication
   a) Reviewed desire to present full discussion with all opinions while not attributing statements to individual members
   b) Described current state of the blog and plans to post old and new information on it.

2) Schedule
   a) Prior to meeting voted to shift deadlines by the amount of delay of data release.
   b) Discussed feasible targets for completing the final report.
   c) Counted the number of programs per week for various deadlines (May 9th, May 31st, June 30th).
   d) Calculated the number of minutes per program available given workload assumptions.
   e) Reviewed importance of consistent review of all programs.
   f) Reviewed importance of review on current data.
   g) Reviewed importance of quality feedback for all programs.
   h) Noted faculty experience reviewing complex materials in a timely fashion (e.g., faculty files, grant proposals).
   i) Noted time savings created by not needing to force an equal distribution.
   j) Considered possibility of final report being completed by a subgroup.
   k) Considered scheduling possibilities including extended use of spring break, working past the end of the semester, completing the review in the fall 2014 semester.

3) Open meetings and recusal
   a) Reviewed the importance of faculty confidence in the process.
   b) Considered different dividing lines for recusal including: member helped complete a template, member works in the program, member works in a program tied to the review program (e.g., teaches in major which includes a GER).
c) Noted that recusal is less meaningful given 15% of programs must be in each category making every vote a conflict of interest by that definition.

d) Reviewed how interconnected each faculty member and many programs are making choosing a definition for recusal difficult to impossible.

e) Noted that the 80% voting rule is difficult to track if the total number of non-recused members is different for many programs.

f) Presented the current legal opinions on open meetings which is that neither Alaska state law nor BOR policy requires open meetings for this work.

g) Discussed balance between the value of an open process and avoiding arbitrary and capricious results through influence.

h) Reviewed that no decision may use information off the template.

i) Noted the importance of clarifying for the university what will actually take place at meetings. In particular there will be no discussion on many programs.

4) Rubrics: assigned a group to complete rubric for approval.

5) Training: continued scheduling of training.