

# UNIVERSITY *of* ALASKA

---

## Faculty Alliance

Monday, February 25, 2008, 7:00pm-8:30pm by audioconference

### Draft Minutes

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Bogdan Hoanca, Chair, Faculty Alliance and President, UAA Faculty Senate  
Jon Genetti, President, UAF Faculty Senate  
Cathy Connor, President, UAS Faculty Senate  
Chuck Craig, Past President, UAS Faculty Senate  
Shirish Patil, Past Alliance Chair and Past President, UAF Faculty Senate  
Jill Dumesnil, President-elect, UAS Faculty Senate  
Anne Bridges, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President, UAA Faculty Senate  
Genie Babb, Chair, UAA Faculty Senate Graduate Affairs Board

Pat Ivey, Executive Officer

2. Adopt Agenda

MOTION passed

“The Faculty Alliance moves to adopt the agenda for the February 25, 2008 meeting. This action is effective February 25, 2008.”

3. Approve December 14, 2007 minutes

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/Minutes/2007/12-14.pdf>

MOTION passed

“The Faculty Alliance moves to approve the December 14, 2007 as amended to change December 14, 2008 to December 14, 2007. This action is effective February 22, 2008.”

4. Report from the Chair – *Bogdan Hoanca*

Bogdan Hoanca sent out the flow chart on the survey of student intent.. Next up, it goes in the list of IT projects. Hoanca requested a history of changes, so if a student initially goes in to get a PhD in history but changes to a masters in social work, we will be able to track changes. IT will be able to retain ten changes per student.

There was a Board of Regents February 5 and 6. Most of the Board meeting was on February 6. Hoanca met with Representatives Berta Gardner and Kawasaki and mentioned the ORP differential funding to them. They knew about it but can't do anything about it.

5. Vice President for Academic Affairs – *Dan Julius (standing agenda item)*

Vice President Julius had a scheduling conflict and could not attend.

6. Old Business

6.1. Internal Administrative Review Status

<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-02-13.MacTaggart-trans.pdf>

<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-02-12.MACTAGGART-STUDY-FINAL.PDF>

Dan Julius sent the document to Hoanca for Alliance comment. Genetti reported that the HR redesign has been put on hold because of a misperception about the recommendation. The main Alliance concern is that campus-specific issues should be dealt with at the campus level. There has been a lot of personnel and salary creep at statewide and this needs to be addressed. Statewide has contributed to research more than has been recovered through indirect cost recovery. Does this mean that this will result in a reduction of research funds at UAF?

At the Business Council, Jim Johnsen laid out timelines for comments on the report.

On page 31 there is a long list of councils and the Alliance is not on all of them. For instance, the Community Campuses Council, the Risk Management Council and the Facilities Council should have a faculty member on them. Pat Ivey was instructed to find out who chairs the Risk Management Council and Facilities Council. The Councils, however, should not substitute for the appropriate people on the campuses.

The Alliance Chair will share concerns with Vice President Dan Julius and ask President Hamilton how he wants governance to participate. President Hamilton and/or Jim Johnsen will be invited to the March Faculty Alliance meeting to discuss the report.

For the March Alliance meeting, the Alliance will discuss the appropriate metrics to evaluate the performance of Statewide based on the report recommendations. The document will be discussed at the senate level.

MOTION passed

“The Faculty Alliance moves to thank President Hamilton for soliciting the MacTaggart Report, commends him on the process and spirit by which the report was drafted, and urges President Hamilton to take action on the recommendations in the report and the responses from the governance groups. This action is effective February 25, 2008.”

6.2 Policy on Retention of Course Records

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-11-30.retaincourserecords.pdf>

The Alliance will keep this issue under old business until we discover for sure whether or not this is an IT or an academic issue.



### 6.3 Student Educational Goals Analysis

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.ed-goal-Bogdan.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.2006earnings-by-career-cluster.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.earnings-by-careercluster-and-MAU.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.earnings-by-careercluster-MAU-program.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.residents-in-degree-related-jobs.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.residents-in-nondegree-related-jobs.pdf>  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2007-12-06.student-reported-goals-analysis.pdf>

Shirish Patil will evaluate the data for the next Alliance meeting.

## 7. New Business

### 7.1 High School-College Alignment

<http://gov.alaska.edu/Faculty/2008-02-20.HS-COLLEGE-ALIGNMENT.pdf>

At the Faculty Alliance retreat, Dave Veazey was urging statewide alignment of high school-college academic standards statewide. This issue will be taken up at the Student Success Task Force level. At UAF, Dana Thomas is already looking at the alignment issue.

The Alliance will revisit the issue at the next meeting and movement needs to occur on this.

Texas is the most advanced state in terms of alignment of high school and college requirements. The Texas college track high school diploma is aligned with the college expectations but the other two diplomas do not align.

### 7.2 Professional Development for Deans – SAC 2/5 Question

The Alliance recommends that professional development be offered for community campus directors as well as the deans. Community campus directors need instruction on where the academic decisions are made. The funds would come from Anne Sakumoto's funds. The Alliance reiterated that they would not support the reduction of faculty development funds to support professional development for Deans and Directors.

### 7.3 Other New Business

There was no additional new business.

## 8. Reports - Administrative Councils

### 8.1 Systemwide Academic Council

<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-01-09.SAC-Meeting.pdf>

SAC also met in February. Bogdan Hoanca will send out his meeting notes in addition to the January notes above. Dan Julius is changing assistants. Dave Veazey is on medical leave.

### 8.2 Human Resources Council

Marsha Sousa attended today's meeting and will send notes. The last two meetings were centered around the HR redesign.

8.3 Ed Tech Team

Bogdan Hoanca will check with Steve Hamilton. There was a distance ed conference in Anchorage this past weekend but since the focus was on K-12, Alliance members did not attend

8.4 Instructional Technology Council  
<http://www.alaska.edu/itc/meetings/>

Evidently, a memo went out to all faculty from Dan Julius that any student who checked the privacy box could not be contacted by a faculty member by email for any reason, even advising. Hoanca will investigate and update the Alliance on the memo.

8.5 Research Advisory Council

Dan Julius now chairs RAC. Shirish Patil has received no communications about meetings.

8.6 Business Council  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-02-12.BizCouncilminutes.pdf>

Cathy Connor said the facilities group is doing a space inventory including how faculty use research and classroom space which will affect indirect cost recovery. The Alliance needs to track this.

8.7 Student Services Council

Genie Babb said most of what was talked about in the latest SSC meeting consisted of reports on activities that had already occurred. A lot of discussion had to do with student success and FAFSA. There has been a discussion of some registration fees based on degrees. Linda Lazzell brought it up and it probably applies only to the Anchorage campus.

8.8 Student Success Steering Committee  
<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/studentssuccess/2008-01.StudentSuccessTF-summary.pdf>

SSSC has been meeting at least once a month, first talking about barriers to student success and went on to identifying priorities. Last month, it took a turn for the worse when Dan Julius also asked the group to started talking about prioritizing in case of budget cuts.

Chuck Craig said SSSC members are supposed to come back to our own MAU groups and identify what to do if we do get new money. There is no indication that there will be money for any SSC measures.

At this point, Hoanca asked for a report from the campus level task forces. UAS is working with the initiatives for first year experience, is meeting next week and will attempt to realign the subcommittees along the lines set forth by the SSSC. The UAA task force is looking at best practices, finding out that UAA is doing quite a lot, and is starting to look at advising. At the last SSSC meeting that there was quite a bit of agreement in terms of student success related priorities that MAU's see for themselves on one hand, and on priorities that MAUs see for Statewide on the other hand.

#### SSSC AND CAMPUS LEVEL TASK FORCE REPORTS ARE STANDING AGENDA ITEMS FOR MARCH AND APRIL ALLIANCE MEETINGS.

#### 8.9 Retirement Committee

The last meeting consisted of a presentation from Emeriti to add a healthcare component to ORP II and III, the idea being that ORP1 had the option of TRS while others are not. The UA would have to contribute \$500 per person per year into a healthcare account with the individual contributing another \$500. Typically if there is no healthcare component in retirement, people retire later and later. The philosophy with ORPII or ORPIII is that if they make this a mandatory contribution for 20 years that would cover roughly half of the healthcare costs at retirement. Individual contributions could cover the remaining half. Emeriti formed a group for healthcare purposes and have about 50 institutions on board thus being able to offer affordable healthcare insurance.

#### 9. Senate Reports UAA UAF and UAS

UAA Faculty Senate has the new student evaluation document, talking about the teaching component, chancellors award etc.

UAF Faculty Senate is looking at the electronic faculty activity report because it looks like it will go through. Pilot program participants said the electronic activity report now takes three days to complete. The main purpose was to track research activities and it has now gotten way out of hand. Additionally, if there are mistakes in Banner, there is no way to fix it in the electronic activity report.

Pat Ivey was instructed to formally transmit to Dan Julius the December motion to drop the faculty activity report for formal response.

Jill Dumesnil reported on Cathy Connor's behalf that the UAS Faculty discussed changes to the faculty handbook. The accrediting agency has asked UAS to show that the deans run the academic programs even at extended campuses, instead of the campus directors. The provost is insistent that this be straightened out.

#### 10. Agenda items for next meeting, March 31, 2008 7:00-8:30pm

Agenda items include

##### \* Internal Administrative Review

- discussion with President Hamilton/Jim Johnsen
- appropriate metrics to evaluate performance of Statewide based

on the report recommendations

- \* High school – college alignment
- \* Facilities survey of faculty use of classroom and research space
- \* Student Success Steering Committee activities
- \* Accreditation reviews
- \* Student educational goals analysis
- \* Faculty activity reports – response to December motion

11. Other Items of Interest

<http://gov.alaska.edu/faculty/2008-02-22.ConfidentialityMemo.pdf>

Anne Bridges just sent out the confidentiality memo referenced earlier in the meeting.

12. Comments

There were no additional comments.

13. Adjourn - The meeting was adjourned at 8:37pm



---

**From:** "Hoanca, Bogdan" <afb@nero.scob.uaa.alaska.edu>  
**To:** "Faculty" <ml-faculty@email.alaska.edu>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 21, 2008 10:14 AM  
**Subject:** [Faculty]FW: Report:HS-college alignment of academic standards

FYI, from Lynn Shepherd.

-----Original Message-----

From: [blshepherd@mail.uas.alaska.edu](mailto:blshepherd@mail.uas.alaska.edu)  
[mailto:[blshepherd@mail.uas.alaska.edu](mailto:blshepherd@mail.uas.alaska.edu)]  
Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2008 9:45 AM  
To: [afb@uaa.alaska.edu](mailto:afb@uaa.alaska.edu)  
Subject: Report:HS-college alignment of academic standards

From The Chronicle of Higher Education News Blog

February 20, 2008

States Make Progress in Aligning High-School Offerings With Colleges' Expectations

A report issued this morning says states have made substantial progress in raising the graduation requirements of their high schools and aligning their high schools' academic standards with college and career expectations.

But the report (<http://www.achieve.org/node/990>), by the nonprofit group Achieve Inc., says relatively few states put in place key mechanisms for ensuring that high schools adequately prepare students for colleges, such as tests of college readiness or data systems that track students' academic progress from pre-kindergarten through college.

"The pace and the progress of high-school reform efforts are encouraging, but no state has done everything that is necessary to close the gap between what is required of students in high school and what will be expected of them after they graduate," Matthew Gandal, executive vice president of Achieve, said in releasing the report.

The report found, among other things, that:

- \* Eighteen states and the District of Columbia now make the awarding of high-school diplomas contingent on students' completing a college and career-ready curriculum that includes four years of challenging mathematics (including Algebra I and II) and four years of rigorous English courses. Twelve states expect to do so. As of three years ago, just two states had such requirements in place.

- \* Nineteen states report that their high-school standards are aligned with the expectations of colleges and workplaces, and 26 are in the process of such a standards alignment.

\* Nine states administer college-readiness tests to all high-school students; 23 plan to administer such tests to all of their high schoolers.

\* Just four states hold high schools accountable for college readiness, while seven have plans to do so.

\* Just eight states have systems in place to track students' progress from pre-kindergarten through college, although 39 states have plans for the development of such tracking systems.

The policies that Achieve tracks arose from a 2005 National Education Summit on High Schools organized by Achieve and involving 45 of the nation's governors, corporate chief executives, and leaders of colleges and elementary and secondary schools.

The three states that today's report described as making the most progress in adopting the recommended policies - Louisiana, New York, and Texas - have put in place four of five. Arizona, Kentucky, Michigan, and Tennessee have each adopted three.

Nineteen states have not yet put in place any of the policies tracked by Achieve. They are Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maryland, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin. -Peter Schmidt

Posted on Wednesday February 20, 2008 | [Permalink](#) |

#####  
This message is sent to you because you are subscribed to  
the mailing list <[ml-faculty@email.alaska.edu](mailto:ml-faculty@email.alaska.edu)>.  
To unsubscribe, E-mail to: <[ml-faculty-off@email.alaska.edu](mailto:ml-faculty-off@email.alaska.edu)>



*Simple copy  
made 10/10/08  
copy.*

### Student Success at the University of Alaska

Building upon efforts of the Faculty and Staff Alliances from last year, the UA Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs began a comprehensive strategic planning process in December 2007 with the purpose of improving student success at the University of Alaska. Leadership from around the UA system including Provosts, faculty, and staff convened to begin work on this critical plan to improve student success.

Prior to the first meeting VP Julius offered the group a frame work in which to consider our task of helping students find success at UA.

- What are the primary internal and external variables impacting retention and attrition rates? Responding to this question should include an analysis of the current programs directed at improving student success.
- Do we know what "success" will look like? In other words, is there a consensus regarding "where" we want to be as a system and as MAUs? What measurable outputs do we seek to reflect? In this regard, is there consensus on the "data" which will be utilized? Have such data been collected? Have we taken into account alignment with current PBB metrics?
- How will we best coordinate, integrate, and align our efforts as we develop and implement a plan? Another way to articulate this question might be, given where we are now and the accomplishments made to date, how will our plan build on our prior success and understandings of these issues?
- Given our task, to coordinate, integrate and align our efforts, what might be the best approach considering current budget parameters? What are the most important student success activities/programs currently underway and what are the financial needs associated with them?
- Will our plan (and those involved in assembling it) integrate both system wide perspectives and distinctive MAU perspectives? Are we clear on our approaches to student success at the system wide level and at MAUs, where distinctive institutional and demographic variables may impact student success?

### Plan Design

What about the actual plan itself? I have tried to set forth the major questions the steering committee might consider. For example,

- Does the plan contain measurable goals and objectives? (Commonly agreed upon performance metrics and a timeline?) Are there data or experiences that might demonstrate the plan will succeed?