TO: SAC/ RAC; Summary of the Meeting on the 15\textsuperscript{th} of October  
DATE: October 15, 2008

The Statewide Academic Council met in conjunction with the Research Advisory Council (Buck Sharpton, VC Research; UAF, John Dehn, Chair, Faculty Senate UAF. Research positions from UAA and UAS were represented by Provosts from those MAU’s.) The SAC was also joined by the RAC (Research Advisory Council) and the Faculty Alliance for this meeting.

Henceforth, SAC meetings will be scheduled in conjunction with the RAC. Meetings have been scheduled through November and, it is hoped, will shortly be scheduled through the academic year. The next meeting is scheduled for October 30\textsuperscript{th}. Information about SAC including agenda and meeting dates can be viewed through the SW Academic Affairs website. A summary of the October 15\textsuperscript{th} meeting follows:

1. **Academic Master Plan (AMP)**  
   SAC engaged in a comprehensive discussion with the Faculty Alliance and members of RAC concerning the genesis of the “charge” which will frame the discussion for an Academic Master Plan. Among issues and matters discussed was the history leading to the need for a plan, why all constituencies involved were meeting today and the MacTaggart/Rogers recommendation for an academic master plan. The discussion focused on the actual wording of the “charge” as well as the relationship between the master plan and other strategic and mission related plans in existence at MAU’S.

   Major concerns expressed by members of the Faculty Alliance appeared to fall into the following categories:

   a. What is the rationale for assembling such a plan, and how would this plan differ from what is presently in existence?
   b. What will the process be to assemble the plan? How much consultation will occur and with which constituencies? Will this plan simply be imposed on the system or result from true collaboration and consultation?
   c. How will the plan promote academic and institutional collaboration, entrepreneurship (in the best sense of the word) creativity and alignment among faculty and MAU’S, as opposed to simply a “reaffirmation and a differentiation of missions” as is currently written in the charge?
   d. Will established mechanisms (forums, groups, etc.) be adhered to or will new governance mechanisms, groups be appointed to replace existing forums?

   VPAA Julius offered to try to clarify the charge to accommodate the issues, ideas, and concerns raised by Alliance members and others attending the meeting. To this extent, the following summary is suggested as a clarification amendment to the document approved by the President’s Cabinet on July 21, 2008.

   a) The rationale for the plan is to provide an academic roadmap for the system, over the next five or so years. In regard to MAU missions, it was acknowledged that the BOR has the final determination, and that SAC is a
recommending body to the President’s Cabinet. The AMP roadmap will set forth, among other issues, where new programs or schools might be located (based on capacity, financial resources, and a set of factors and variables recommended by SAC, and set forth in the charge; see section B, item 3 of the charge).

The AMP will also discuss where duplication of programs is warranted and, as well, where such are not warranted, how certain types of programs or services could be organized at the system wide level. (For example, Distance Education). The plan may also address the academic role of various MAU’S in relation to each other or the SW office, for purposes of collaboration, joint programs and related entrepreneurial and creative endeavors, all of which may ultimately have programmatic or fiscal impacts. It was recognized the system is not big enough to support (nor do the demographics or mission statements suggest) the need for duplicate programs, missions and schools in a variety of areas.

The “charge” permits discussion of all matters if such are brought forward. The change makes no reference to the role faculty currently enjoy in regard to the programmatic content or delivery of the curriculum. Once programs are approved, established academic review policies apply.

b) The process to assemble the plan is in progress. Consultation will be regular and consistent; (through established constituencies and avenues of communication). At SAC, communication will come through representatives attending meetings. SAC may periodically invite representatives of other constituencies to meet, or members of SAC may address select constituencies at MAU’S. It is the stated intent of SAC not to arrive at a plan imposed in a “top down fashion”, nor was it ever the intent of SAC to abolish or bypass any formal governance bodies (Alliances, et al). Consultation means conversation and discussion, which, to be meaningful, must occur in an atmosphere of civility, trust and respect for all points of view. To this extent, participants in these discussions acknowledge that certain nuanced terms or phrases may have historical meaning, not otherwise intended, simply due to the nature of evolution of UA as a system. These kinds of organizational challenges and perceptions are common in academe, and often serve as a useful catalyst; encouraging “fears” or “expectations”, based on particular historical experiences and interpretations associated with actions or words, to be discussed in a transparent manner.

c) A plan, in and of itself, cannot dictate behavior, nor can rules or plans ever substitute for character and common sense. A plan can serve to set forth incentives and guidelines which hopefully will encourage participants to align activities, goals, objectives and the like. The latter normally occurs in higher education under three circumstances; a) when such incentives and guidelines comport to Board mandates and important organizational (and recognized) needs; b) when such incentives and guidelines are linked to the actual capacity of respective institutions or individuals and, c) when
such incentives and guidelines are articulated by institutional leaders and recognized as legitimate by funding authorities. Resources are a factor to be considered when “capacity” is being defined, as are the priorities set forth by respective MAU’S.

2. **Specific Recommendations on AMP “charge” Section A.**
   a. The words “reaffirmation and differentiation” be removed from items 1-4 in Section A. This can be accomplished because it is self evident the AMP should result in recommendations/strategies for collaboration, entrepreneurship, alignment and creativity in academic functions as well as, when appropriate, differentiation, among respective MAU’S.
   b. Number 4 under Section A refers to a clarification of the role and scope of various academic system wide committees in existence and was not meant to refer to “Governance” bodies and groups as such are defined in BOR policies.
   c. In Section B, agreement to expand item 3 and further refine the concepts of “capacity”.
   d. Item 5 shall be read to include SAC as expanded by RAC members

3. **Distance Education**
   The SAC was given a status report on Distance Education (legislative Audit) and the work of Dr. John Monahan in assisting SAC in the implementation of the May 28, 2008 guidelines. In a recent email Dr. Monahan has forwarded a discussion out line which will be on the agenda on October 30th.

4. **Community and Branch Campus Directors.**
   VPAA Julius will follow up with Community and Branch Campus Directors in light of discussions held at the President Cabinet and by participants at the last meeting of the Director group.

5. **Administrative Fellows Program and Related Matters**
   Documentation concerning this program has been forwarded and is in the hands of the Provosts. It is hoped this professional development program will begin soon.

Reports on the status of the Educational Summit and preparations to address SB 241 were provided.

7. **Agenda for October 30th**
   1. Distance Education, Administrative Fellows Program, Community and Branch Campus Director Conference Follow up; 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.
   2. SAC and participants invited to lunch with the President of GCI and Mark Hamilton. 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
   3. Academic Master Plan discussions; 1:15 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
      Location UAF, Room, TBA