Present; D. Julius, S. Henrichs, M. Driscoll, R. Caulfield, M. Myers, J. Petraitis, J. Dehn, J. Anderson, C. Brems

I. Meeting Summary

The January 20, 2011 SAC summary was approved with amendments.

II. New Programs

No new programs were brought forward at this meeting.

III. Operating Guidelines for the AMP

SAC revisited the discussion concerning the use of what had been formerly known as Version 28 of the AMP. It was agreed to use this version as an interpretative and operational guide for the AMP accepted by the UA BOR on February 17, 2011. SAC agreed to the following in regard to the use of the operational guidelines;

1. The guidelines shall remain operative beyond the expiration of the AMP approved by the BOR on February 17, 2011.
2. The guidelines may be amended. Amendment procedures shall be set forth in the operational guidelines.

The operating guidelines will be revised as necessary by Provost Henrichs and on the agenda for the March SAC meeting.

IV. Faculty Alliance Report

The Alliance reported on its work on the AMP. Alliance members suggested they will now turn their attention to other matters, including a response to the Fisher Report, grading policies including the transfer of incomplete grades and grades of C- in core/general education classes and, lastly, forming a taskforce to address issues concerning the distance delivery of science labs.

Note: The BOR motion accepting the AMP on February 17, 2011 is attached to this summary.

Further, the BOR directed the Alliance to make several editorial changes to the AMP. Such changes will be made and forwarded to SAC for final review and approval (before
forwarding a final report to the President). This topic will appear on the March agenda for SAC.

V. UAS Mission

Rick Caulfield and Jonathan Anderson reviewed the UAS mission plan/document with SAC. Questions concerning intent and focus of the statement were addressed. SAC did not take any formal action on the statement which will now proceed to the BOR through the President and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. The document discussed with SAC is appended to this summary.

VI. Program Review

SAC engaged in a general discussion on program review processes currently in place at MAUs. The President and BOR have requested that program review and assessment processes be reviewed at future board meetings.

Following lunch the SAC was joined by Chancellors Ulmer and Rogers and President Gamble. The following represents a summary of the discussion held at the joint meeting.

1. Joint SAC/President’s Cabinet Meetings

SAC and the President’s Cabinet agreed joint meetings were a good idea and productive. The next one is scheduled for April 6, 2011.

2. Clarification of AMP on issues of doctoral programs and related issues

Chancellors, Provosts and Faculty Alliance members discussed a number of clarifications and editorial understandings regarding the AMP accepted by the BOR on February 17, 2011. These clarifications concerned doctoral language and other matters originally agreed upon in Version 28 of the AMP. It was agreed that UAA and UAF would reduce mutual understandings to writing, initial these, followed by sending a letter with those understandings attached, to President Gamble.

Note: At the February 2011 meeting of the BOR, the AMP submitted to the BOR by the Faculty Alliance (through President Gamble) was accepted with minor edits. These edits will be made and submitted to SAC at the March meeting for review prior to submission to President Gamble.

3. Strategic Planning Process
A general discussion ensued on the scope and extent of the strategic plan for the UA System. President Gamble reaffirmed his support for inclusion of many constituencies in the development and implementation of the plan.

It was agreed the plan would augment mission and long range plans already in place at various MAU’s. Further, it was agreed five or six major issues would be identified which will inform the strategic plan. Following that, appropriate groups/committees will be assembled to review the status of these issues and secondly, how and to what extent the system should focus on such issues in the next three to five years. It was acknowledged there may be major and minor themes in the plan. It was also suggested and accepted that a consultant would be engaged to assist in the process to develop a plan.

President Gamble suggested a strategic plan may take a year to complete because the system will benefit from a very inclusive process. The process to assemble the plan, at this time, may be broadly defined as follows:

**Step I Identify Major Themes/Core Subject Areas**
Identify boundaries to thematic issues, which may include existing plans.

**Step II Identify a Process to Arrive at a Plan**
What constituencies should be involved, time frames, etc?

**Step III Validate Process and Core Subject Areas**
Line out a sequence of events. Identify individuals/groups responsible for respective areas of the plan. Ensure alignment with existing committee structures.

**Step IV Identify How the Plan Will Be Used**
Ascertain what we need to do after the plan is approved.

It was agreed the Fisher Report will be used to inform the strategic plan.

4. **Fisher Report Discussion**

The SAC/President’s Cabinet identified core themes set forth in the Fisher Report. These included;

- Student Success (time to graduate, improvement of graduation rates)
- Use of Central Resources versus Campus Resources (duplication, overlap, how we might structure SW or MAU’s to better utilize the following: Human Resources, Institutional Research, Instructional Technology, Risk Management, etc.)
- Facilities Renewal and Renovation
- Performance Metrics (how we might better utilize metrics, more “analysis” and less “counting”, how to better link performance metrics to efficiency and accountability, better reporting of metrics we do utilize)
Financial Sustainability/New Revenue Sources (how to stimulate a more entrepreneurial culture)
- Expansion of inter-institutional cooperative models (greater adherence to WWAMI type models/programs)

The group suggested we might take the following action (next steps) in regard to the Fisher Report.

- Identify the recommendations that we clearly intend to ignore or reject (the group named two in particular, layoff 60-80 SW staff and collective bargaining)
- Identify what SW functions are presently being performed well and those that may be redundant. This discussion also extended to MAU functions/schools. Note: This returns to a common theme, when is duplication needed/justified and when is it not.
- Identify our Core Values. For example, “to serve people where they live.” When we deviate from a core value we should have accepted and agreed upon criteria. Also included in this discussion should be criteria which identify the programs that should be sustained, added or deleted. A first step should be to develop criteria needed when the system deviates from a core value.
- Alignment and integration. The group wanted to ensure we are moving in the direction supported by President Gamble. For example, reaching agreement on five or six thematic or core areas, discerning what exists now and what is needed.

This discussion will be continued at the April meeting of the SAC and Cabinet.

VII. SAC Agenda, March 16, 2011, 9:30am to 12:30pm, AUDIO Conference

1. Approval of SAC summary
2. New Programs, if applicable
3. Identification of HALO Programs (ref. Fisher Report) – The question here, in my estimation, which was articulated by Regent Fisher for a future BOR agenda item, is as follows: “Based on the Fisher Report, which one or two programs (identified as halo programs) should be recommended for additional funding?”
4. Review of Alliance edits(changes to AMP in light of Regents’ comments during discussion of the AMP.
5. Faculty Alliance Report
6. Review of HEX form revisions and revisions to the operating guidelines for the AMP. Both of these items will be distributed by Provost Henrichs prior to the next meeting.
7. Program Review, continuation of discussion/preparation for the BOR
8. Distance Education, preparation for BOR demo
10. Other issues which may be brought forward by SAC members

Agenda for April BOR, Academic and Student Affairs

1. New Programs, if applicable
2. DE (online or e-Learning) demonstration  
3. Program Review/Assessment  
4. Halo Programs  
5. VP Report  

VIII. **Agenda for April Joint Meeting of SAC and President’s Cabinet**  

At this time:  

1. Continuation of discussions of AMP, Strategic Plan, and Fisher Report  

IX. **Attachment to the SAC Summary for February 16, 2011**  

1. January SAC Summary (approved)  
2. AMP, approved by the BOR on February 17, 2011  
3. BOR Motion approving AMP  
4. Faculty Alliance presentation on the AMP  
5. UAS Mission Document