

B. Approval of Minutes to Meeting #152

The minutes were approved as distributed.

C. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as distributed.

II Status of Chancellor's Office Actions

A. Motions Approved: none

B. Motions Disapproved: none

III Public Comments/Questions No public comments.

IV A. President's Comments – Marsha Sousa

Core Review Committee (for the Provost's project which is a broad overall assessment) has been identified, though they haven't met yet. A representative for Math needs to be found. The ASUAF representative has been identified, but Marsha doesn't have the name yet. Several of the members will attend a conference in Rhode Island in early November, called Engaging Science, Advancing Learning, General Education Majors of the New Global Century. Then there will be some options to attend another meeting in February on General Education Assessment and the Learning Students Need. Does anyone have input for the committee? Please let Marsha know. The members are currently: Susan Todd, Anne Armstrong, Diane Wagner, Jacob Joseph, Michael Harris (of the FS Core Review Committee), Karen Grossweiner, Trent Sutton, Charlie Mayer, Dani Shepherd, an ASUAF rep, and a Math rep.

Linda Hapsmith asked if there were any staff on that committee. Susan H. said that she (Linda) is slated to be on the committee. Ken B. asked Marsha to clarify what the final output of the committee is to be. Marsha gave some background about the project, stating there have been course by course reviews, but no one has stepped back to look at the whole. The project is to take a holistic look at the core to see if it still meets needs, looking at broad goals of the Core before accreditation takes place. It's taking a global, broad look at what's needed for the baccalaureate student.

The switch to Google mail is taking place with students already having been notified of the option. There's one year for the rest of us to make the switch. OIT is planning a G-Day event for students to make the switch. Email Karl Kowalski if you're interested in switching now. The process rolls all current email to the Google account which will use the "alaska.edu" domain. Anne C. asked about authentication to the library systems, particularly with rural users. Marsha said both naming systems will be active for now. Marsha will ask Karl Kowalski to be sure. Heinz W. asked about other domains like "gi.alaska.edu". It's only "uaf.edu". Marji I. notes that this is a crucial factor for rural students taking classes. Marsha will ask Karl, and asked Marji and others to also feel free to ask Karl directly as he has invited all questions.

Marsha announced that the Course & Degree Procedures manual will be found online only from this point forward, rather than being a printed document.

The Senate Alliance (leadership from all three MAUs) will be meeting face-to-face with Dan Julius and the Statewide Academic Council (SAC) on Wednesday. The meeting is about clarifying the goals, outcomes and mechanism for developing the statewide academic plan. She invited everyone's comments.

Invites suggestions for guest speakers for meetings later in the year.

Terry Reilly was the faculty chosen for the Student Rec Center (SRC) Board seat, Christa Bartlett for Chancellor's Diversity Action Committee (CDAC); and Layne Smith for the Technology Advisory Board (TAB).

B. President-elect's Report – Jonathan Dehn

Faculty Alliance didn't have their meeting last Friday as there was not a quorum.

Topics that are being worked on include doing a recount of faculty in schools, colleges and units for updating Senate representation. This has been passed to the Faculty Affairs committee, and Susan Henrichs will provide PAIR data to help with looking at Senate rep numbers. They're looking at ideas on how to approach representation, for example, for post-doc research associates who are union members, but currently not represented on the senate.

The concept of the Research Advisory Council is another topic being taken up. Buck Sharpton mentioned at the last senate meeting that dissolving this group (RAC) into the SW context of the SAC is under consideration; which Jon feels is unfortunate. He wants to approach this in some fashion – a new council, maintain the present, or form a Senate research committee. He likes the idea of a Senate committee involving more faculty, who'd be reviewing larger research issues not proposals. Their purpose would also be to help with leveraging the directions we're going in, and giving faculty a voice. Jon invites suggestions from everyone. Ken B. offered his opinion that it might be better to have the senate make a resolution recommending that there be no disbandment of the SW council. Ken asked if it were a done deal. Jon is not sure it's a done-deal.

Jon asked for Susan to comment. She said there is no formal effort to eliminate RAC, it just hasn't been active in a while. So, SAC is looking at it. The Anchorage vice provost for research is talking with their faculty about what they want to do, and Southeast doesn't have a research administrator. There isn't a group of people to meet right now. The other two provosts are currently representing research for their campuses. Susan thinks a resolution wouldn't hurt coming from the senate to say RAC should remain an active body because the SAC doesn't have the time to take up research issues effectively because of how busy they already are. There's just no one to give it attention recently.

Jon has been approached by several faculty regarding the decrease in ORP contributions. The percentage of contributions is down to 12.5%, and with the stock market situation, it's an upsetting situation. The UA President is investigating possibilities, and Jon will keep everyone apprised.

Abel proceeded to give a UNAC status – they are looking into legal action. Abel says it's a breach of contract and that lowering the contribution amount only for the UA system is not allowed by the Alaska Constitution.

Marsha added that the Administrative Committee did ask Faculty Affairs to look at forming a Legislative Action subcommittee, ad hoc committee or separate standing committee, so they can be more effective in advocating for UAF and the UA system as a whole with the legislature.

V A. Remarks by Interim Chancellor Brian Rogers

Chancellor Rogers gave an update on several efforts that he raised during transition with setting up task forces and committees: the initial letters went out for the family friendly and housing groups, and the sustainability letter is waiting for his signature. So the groups will start and there will be room for additional members to be added to them. He's gearing up to begin legislative advocacy for the budget with three primary efforts: 1.) energy and engineering with an emphasis on the capital side; 2.) life sciences, on the capital side; and 3.) on the operating budget side, the Indigenous Studies doctoral program funding. He's taking a statewide approach to the mission of the university and wants to broaden how we look at what we're doing throughout the state, not just in Fairbanks. It takes active engagement by all of us to focus on areas outside of Fairbanks, how we recruit students outside Fairbanks, K-12 engagement outside Fairbanks, looking for ways to highlight what we do throughout the state. This will help us make the sale on our key budget requests and to get the recognition as a university that we're asking for.

He mentioned the issue of accreditation, and that we must keep an eye on UAA as they're ahead of us in the cycle by about a year. We can look at each others' roles, missions and visions, and ensure that they don't stray too far into our vision where not appropriate. Make sure that our vision sets the tone for the next seven years. The BOR has asked for a revision to the UAF campus master plan. While the real vision is in our programming, the facilities we have and how we organize ourselves on the main campus and community campuses gives us what space we have to exercise our vision. It's about an 18-month process to revise the master plan which is due to BOR at the June 2010 meeting. It incorporates the TVC master plan, and references the Community Campus plans. This plan leads us to the 100th anniversary of the university.

Reminder of reception at 5 pm at his house.

B. Remarks by Provost Susan Henrichs

Her office has been very busy with the Annual Performance-Based Budgeting report. (Ian Olson's office also – PAIR). This year's report format focused on linking performance and performance measures, especially subsidiary measures added to the main metrics they're required to use, linking it all together to relate to and support the budget requests. It constrained the things that were being looked at, as the report didn't give leeway for including many things – it narrowed the focus. Positive things in the report include our good performance as an institution – we're up in student credit hours (about as much as UAA), good retention numbers (about 66.5%) and going upward as a 10-year trend. 70% retention in baccalaureate student numbers, and 75% in first-time full-time freshman – progress overall in retention. Research expenditures were down last year – lost several key earmarks or they were reduced. Outlook for research funding looks like it will go down – federal monies and effects of current economic state being factors. In the area of high demand job degrees, we're doing very well and are up to 731 degrees. The concerns have now shifted away from performance based budgeting due to the

events of the last few days. They're seeing lots of challenges on the horizon for the state and the university. The state budget surplus is decreasing dramatically. The legislature may go back into the saving mentality rather than spending. There will be impacts on TRS, which may lead to the rate increasing again. It's not fully foreseeable at this time. The PBB report showed we're a strong university and we have the resiliency to spring back from whatever comes in the months ahead.

Other bylaws changes that were made were mostly minor. The only major one was with regard to the elections that he mentioned. The representative assembly plans February travel to the BOR meeting. They'll lobby the legislature again for the UAF budget.

VII Guest Speaker

A. Paul Reichardt, Provost – Emeritus

Paul spoke in his capacity as a commissioner with the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), about the changing NWCCU standards by which UAF will be evaluated for institutional accreditation in 2011. NWCCU has been in the process of revising its standards and processes for the last five years and there's a new approach being piloted. UAA is one of the institutions that is trying out the new standards, though they're still in draft form.

The standards have become clusters. Cluster 1 is mission, goals and outcomes. Cluster 2 is resources and capacity (inputs to the system). Cluster 3 is planning and implementation – based upon your mission and goals, your resources and capacity, what do you plan to do and how will you implement your plans. Cluster 4 is about how you assess whether or not you're making headway. Cluster 5 is a retrospective look over a period of time to assess whether the mission has been carried out. Has the institution looked ahead to see what changes there might be in the environment and how will the institution adapt to that.

The NWCCU is getting away from bean-counting types of standards, to a new model that starts out with the mission statement of the institution and asks for the planning documents that implement the mission and the evidence to document what the institution says it does. It's an outcomes based process. It's a response to the increasingly intense call for accountability from education. The standards are moving from a large book, to a much smaller set of new standards, a very different kind of approach. The whole idea is to focus the institution on a continuing process.

There are many annual processes going on at UAF. PBB is one, as is the academic development plan that is part of the budget cycle. The idea is to have the institution pull all these things together in a more coherent fashion – what are the expected outcomes for the institution. This will drive the accreditation process. It will be a lot of work up front to bring the various plans together into some coherent statement of the institution's goals and the processes for implementing them. There is the strategic plan, the results from the vision task force, the transition teams, so UAF is well on its way in putting this all together. It needs to be put into a manageable set of goals.

The schedule and nature of the new plan's steps will be quite different. It's going to be a 7-year cycle:

1. Institution responds to cluster 1: statement of mission, of goals, and associated plans: it will be an iterative process between the Commission and the institution, until there's an acceptable statement finalized. The Commission will look at the goals and the plans to ensure that the overall approach of the institution is understandable within the constraints of its mission statement and the expectations of higher education.
2. Over the next couple of years the institution files progress reports on clusters 2, 3 and 4 items: assess the institution's capacity, there's data collection and analysis of outcomes.
3. Year 4 is like the year-5 interim report is now. The results of the first 3 years are summarized in a comprehensive interim report.

know if institution understands the new process. Paul will do some questioning at the January meeting.

VIII New Business

A. Resolution on Graduate Student Tuition Rates, submitted by GAAC (Attachment 153/1)

Marsha asked Ron to bring this to the floor and he did so. It has new wording now, with help from the Chancellor. The resolution now includes Masters students, too, along with Ph.D. students. Heinz mentions he's in favor of the resolution (as one of the GAAC members), but states for the record, that it will be necessary for tuition to be waived for all graduate students to

IX Discussion Items

A. Update on UAF Bookstore's move to online ordering

Marsha spoke with Robert Holden, associate director of auxiliary and business services, and he spoke to the Senate. He's heard of concerns about the way adoptions are going to be handled, but, he says that there's no change for the way this will be done this upcoming semester. They're moving toward an online version of the textbook. They've done some market research. Most students are already going online to buy textbooks. One of the biggest hurdles the bookstore faces is the freight cost of getting books here. Last year freight was over \$200,000. This year it will push twice that with increased freight costs. They ran a test-pilot with the military programs last year that was very successful. Positive student feedback received. They want to roll it out all at once, not just with one unit like TVC. An RFP has resulted in two viable candidates. Final vendor selected will allow multiple ways of ordering and delivering books. Shipping is cheaper than selling at the store. One big plus is the ability to get electronic texts – no freight charges at all. Contract is being finalized now. They'll do training sessions – hands-on and online – in person. System gives students flexibility about when they do their ordering and where they take delivery. Most students are familiar with online ordering. They can still come into the store and order books with full assistance.

Jane W. asked about spring 09 – ordering will be online; but the adoption process will not be changed in spring 09. Students will use new system in the spring to order and pick up their texts. Jane asked about custom published texts. Robert H. responded that they want to get electronic texts. Still under negotiation with the company about whether they can get electronic versions or have materials printed.

Falk asked about payment – does it have to be by credit card. Is there cash pay option? Robert H. answered that all payment options will be continued, including Bear Bucks. Students can use Bear Bucks and their Polar Express cards. What is turnaround time, John H. asked. Same day shipping is possible. If ordering can be done in advance, that shipping will be cheaper, of course. Students with financial aid can't order until their aid comes in. Robert H. commented that is still being discussed – textbook loans will be available from the business office – like Bear Bucks on the Polar Express account. What about selling books back? There will be buyback options by the company with free shipping back to them. They'll have an extended period for returns.

CDE will not be using this option; they're a separate bookstore and not under this new system, which will just be for Fairbanks.

Anne C. asked about online rights. Robert didn't have an answer right off about that; it depends upon the publisher. Is there buyback of online texts? Not at this time.

Jane asked about the late notice of this change to faculty. Robert said they meant to, but it didn't happen. Last semester \$600,000 worth of textbooks were returned, with shipping costs. Summer Sessions textbooks will be out of the bookstore because of the short classes.

Alex O. asked about students on wait lists trying to get their books in a hurry. Will they be penalized with shipping charges? Robert responded that there may be options to get chapters via electronic delivery while they wait for textbook delivery.

B. Academic Master Plan

Dan Julius has asked SAC to do the academic master plan for statewide, to clarify what each MAU is responsible for – if similar programs are proposed at each, which MAU will be the one to deliver it? There needs to be a mechanism for faculty input. Marsha asks for comments and questions. There were no comments. Marsha will keep everyone informed.

X Committee Reports

XI Members' Comments/Questions
Tim S. commented about retention efforts of