

- | | | | |
|------|----|--|---------|
| 1:00 | I | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Call to Order – Jennifer Reynolds A. Roll Call B. Approval of Minutes to Meetings #188 and #189 C. Adoption of Agenda | 4 Min. |
| 1:04 | II | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of Chancellor's Office Actions A. Motions Approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Motion to approve the Library Science Unit Criteria 2. Motion to amend the grading policy for C- (1.7) as minimum acceptable grade for major / minor degree requirements and prerequisites 3. M– Jennifer Reynolds 10 Min. B. President-Elect's Comments – David Valentine | 1 Min. |
| | A. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chancellor's Remarks – Brian Rogers ss Old Business A. Motion to confirm the Outstanding Senator of the Year Award, | 10 Min. |

ATTACHMENT 190/1

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Outstanding Senator of the Year Selection Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to confirm the nomination of Cynthia Hardy for the 2012-2013 Outstanding Senator of the Year Award.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The selection committee has carefully reviewed the nominations according to the award criteria, and forwards the nomination of Cynthia Hardy as Outstanding Senator of the Year for confirmation by the Faculty Senate. Procedure stipulates that a simple majority vote of the Senate shall confirm the nomination, and a formal resolution shall be prepared for presentation to the recipient at the May meeting.

College of Engineering & Mines

Representatives

Cheng-fu Chen (14)

Alternates

Orion Lawlor (14)

ATTACHMENT 190/4
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

MOTION:

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the new Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education with Content Area.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2014, with Board of Regents approval.

RATIONALE: Alaska has a chronic need for teachers. This proposed new major provides a structured path, within a baccalaureate degree, for a student to gain the complete education necessary to become a secondary education teacher in the State of Alaska. The program is structured to improve access to interested students and to incor u1 i4(p)-1T7Pi-11(o)-24(i-6 w)-2(i)34(t)-1(e

3. To provide an undergraduate teacher certification degree that responds to the State of Alaska's critical need for more teachers who are prepared to successfully teach in linguistically and culturally diverse schools.

The central components of the new baccalaureate degree include:

1. Identified undergraduate majors in content areas suitable for public school teaching that can be completed concurrently with education courses leading to teaching certification.
2. Early, appropriate and consistent advising of students who seek to enter the teaching profession in an identified content area.
3. An integrated set of education courses and fieldwork experiences in school and community contexts throughout the degree offering to provide the foundation for a successful internship.
4. A year-long school internship with a mentor teacher with concurrent enrollment in professional coursework that focuses on the integration and application of theory, research and practice in both urban and rural school environments.

Career Opportunities

There are unlimited career opportunities for secondary teachers in the State of Alaska, as well as nearly every other state in the United States. This program is designed to help fill the hundreds of

Content Area Exams: Candidates must submit a score report from the relevant content knowledge Praxis II Subject test for each content area the applicant expects to teach. The scores must meet the score set by the State of Alaska

(www.eed.state.ak.us/TeacherCertification/pdf/Content_Area_Exams_2008.pdf)

World Language Exams: Applicants applying to teach a World Language are required to submit Praxis II scores in the target language AND are required to submit scores for the cor20(gu)-24.56

9. Projected enrollments (headcount of majors). If this is a program deletion request, project the outenrollments.

Year 1:15	Year 2:15	Year 3:20	Year 4:20
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Page number of attached summary where demand for this program is discussed: 17

10. Number* of new TA or faculty hires anticipated (or number of positions eliminated if program deletion):

Graduate TA	None
Adjunct	None
Term	None
Tenure track	None

11. Number* of TAs or faculty to be reassigned:

Graduate TA	None
Adjunct	None
Term	None
Tenure track	None

Former assignment of any reassigned faculty:
For more information see page of the attached summary.

12. Other programs affected by the proposed action, including those at other MAUs (please list):

Program Affected	Anticipated Effect	Program Affected	Anticipated Effect
Teacher education programs at other MAU's.	Some students may be attracted to the Fairbanks campus because of the offering, however the impact to other campuses is likely to be minimal. It is anticipated that the highest number of recruitments will be from rural areas currently served by UAF.	Departments at UAF that offer content majors suitable for teaching (math, English, sciences, history)	Departments may see an increase in enrollment if students choose UAF bec of the baccalaureate degree leading to a degree and teacher license.

Page number of attached summary where effects on other programs are discussed: 22

13. Specialized accreditation or other external program certification needed or anticipated. List all that apply or 'none':
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).
(As of January 1, 2013, NCATE will be called Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

14. Aligns with University or campus mission, goals, core themes, and objectives (list):
Educate undergraduate students.
Prepare: Alaska's Career, Technical and Professional Workforce
Connect: Alaska Native, Rural, and Urban Communities through Contemporary and Traditional Knowledge
Engage: Alaskans via Lifelong Learning, Outreach, and Community and Economic Development

Page in attached summary where alignment is discussed: 2, 14, 15, 25, 26

15. State needs met by this program (list):

The Institute for Social and Economic Research 2011 report "Alaska's University for Alaska's Schools," indicates that 28% of all teachers statewide are prepared in the UA system. Research shows that teachers trained in Alaska stay longer, which means better continuity, especially in the rural areas. More continuity means higher achievement. The need for secondary teachers is significantly more pronounced than that for elementary teachers.

Page in the attached summary where the state needs to be met are discussed: page 18, 19, 25

/

/

ATTACHMENT 190/5

EXAMPLE #3

Course Title: Fundamentals of Media Design and Web Tools 2.0

Course Number: ED F432

Designators: none

Credits: 3

Course Format: online

Lab: no

Prerequisites: GEOS F101 or GE F261

Course Description:

Create and publish materials with proper media design for use in teaching and learning. Topics include photo and graphics formatting, video production, video podcast production, SMART technologies, static screen capture, motion screen capture, and analyze for educational content. These productions will be included on the students' MITI eportfolios. This course is a prerequisite for subsequent MITI courses and should be taken after or concurrently with ED 431 Web 2.0 Fundamentals: Participate, Produce, Publish. It is expected that this course will take 135+ hours to complete.

Course Goals:

This course supports the UAF School of Education's mission by providing students with the skills necessary to design thoughtful individualized instructional environments utilizing technologies and strategies appropriate to all learners. Students will acquire skills in the management and implementation of technology that will enhance their professional qualifications based on ISTE and Alaska teacher standards for technology and instructional design.

Student Learning Outcomes:

Students in the course will:

- x Capture and manipulate photos in proper format for print, computer display and web publication.
- x Create and publish video productions with multiple elements and in correct format.
- x Create, publish and video podcasts for educational content.
- x Create and publish SMART presentations and incorporate available presentations
- x Create, publish, and print tutorials using static screen captures and analyze for educational content.
- x Create, publish, and analyze video tutorials using motion screen captures.

Grading: letter grade

Date of Entry: February 26, 2013

Assessment of Electronic Course Evaluation Options for UAF

A Short Summary by the Core Evaluation Team

Authors: Franz J Meyer (CNSM), Eric Madsen (SoEd), Chris Beks (OIT), Andrea Ferrante (CNSM), Kelly Houlton (CRCD/Dev Ed), Brenda Konar (SFOS), Michael Koskey (DANRD), Sally Skrip (Provost's Office), Nathaniel Zierfuss (OIT)

Task and main research activities

In October 2012, the Faculty Senate was approached by Provost Susan Henrichs to evaluate a potential implementation of an electronic course evaluation system at UAF. As a consequence, the Faculty Development, Assessment, and Improvement (FDAI) committee together with Dr. Eric Madsen, School of Education were entrusted with studying the following two main questions associated with electronic course evaluations:

1. Is it advisable for UAF to move to an electronic course evaluation model?
2. If so, what would be the necessary steps towards adopting an electronic course evaluation system?

In addition to these main goals, the activities performed are also aimed at reviving the discussion about electronic course evaluations (ECEs) by surveying their current state of the art and by gauging the sentiment towards ECEs on campus. To respond to the task at hand, a work program was developed by Dr. Eric Madsen and members of the FDAI that has been carried out since November 2012. This work program includes the following tasks:

- x Develop a comprehensive set of evaluation criteria to be used in the evaluation of existing electronic course evaluation systems and for assessing their fit to UAF's needs
- x Compile a list of electronic course evaluation systems through an extensive internet research
- x Downselect this list to 5

- x Chris Beks, OIT
- x Andrea Ferrante, CNSM
- x Kelly Houlton, CRCD / Dev Ed
- x Brenda Konar, SFOS
- x Michael Koskey, DANRD
- x Eric Madsen, SoEd
- x Franz Meyer, CNSM
- x Sally Skrip, Provost's Office
- x Nathan Zierfuss, OIT

Main evaluation criteria

While working towards answering the two main questions of this study, a set of technical evaluation criteria developed that were used in assessing electronic course evaluation options. These technical evaluation criteria are listed in the following, structured by their relationship to the two core questions of this study. The left column of the following table contains general requirements that an ECE must fulfill to be relevant to UAF. These general requirements are translated into corresponding technical evaluation criteria are listed on the right side of the table. Please provide feedback to the evaluation team fmeyer@alaska.edu or ecmadsen@alaska.edu to propose additions and/or changes to this list.

Evaluation Criteria Related to Goal 1: Advisability of ECEs for UAF	
General Requirements	Related Technical Evaluation Criteria
Do ECEs provide sufficient student response rates?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x What are actual response rates at other universities using a specific ECE system? x Does the system include strategies for improving / sustaining response rates?
Will the faculty accept and promote move to ECE?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Ease of use (user friendliness) of the system for faculty and students x How early after the semester ends can reports be released? x Usefulness of output to students, faculty, UAF
Will students accept move to ECE?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Is student anonymity guaranteed? x Can results be easily shared with students? x Does ECE Interface with Banner/Blackboard? x Does the company provide implementation on smart devices?
Is moving to ECE financially efficient?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x What is the ECE system's cost structure? x What are the immediate and short term costs related with adoption, conversion, implementation? x What are potential ongoing costs associated with hardware, software, system operation, and i(a)-a0.005 Tw system management?

<p>Is data security guaranteed? Who owns the data and who has access to original survey information?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Where do the data reside (inside/outside UAF)? x Is privacy for instructors guaranteed? x How is anonymity of students provided? x What is the privacy policy of the service provider? x How will UAF be able to retrieve/retain data if we decided to change the provider?
<p>Do ECEs meet the unique needs of the UAF system (dispersed campuses; field sites; rural campuses with limited internet access; ...)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> x Is the system flexible to merge online and paper-and-pencil reviews if necessary? x Can different schools / faculty add customized questions?

626.4 0.48 0.48 re /C2

In addition to these technical criteria, there are further questions that need to be addressed when discussing the advisability and procedure of moving towards an electronic course evaluation option. These include (1) "What is the purpose of course evaluation at UAF?" (our answer to this question has bearings on both the advisability and the implementation of change) and (2) "What are valid uses of the produced data?". These and ~~other~~ questions will be discussed in the full report that will be submitted to the Faculty Senate in May 2013.

Content of the full report to be submitted to the Faculty Senate in May 2013

In May 2013 findings of this initial study will be published in form of a final report. This report will contain the following information:

1. A more extensive description of the task at hand.
2. An explanation of the concept that was applied to assess advisability, implications, and procedures related to a change in ~~course~~ evaluation methodology.
3. A list of studied ECE systems together with an assessment of their capabilities and their fit to UAF's needs.
4. The result of a ~~down~~ selection procedure to identify a limited group of ECE finalists for further research.
5. A list of recommendations and future steps.
6. A summary of general findings and "lessons learned".

ATTACHMENT 190/8
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Curricular Affairs Committee

Curricular Affairs Committee
11 Febr 2013 MINUTES 9-10 am Reichardt 301

Voting Members present: Rainer Newberry, Chair; Ken Abramowicz; Retchenda George-Bettisworth (phone); Karen Gustafson; Cindy Hardy (phone); Sarah Hardy (phone); David Henry; Todd Radenbaugh (phone). Absent: Diane McEachern

Non-voting members: Donald Crocker (phone); Libby Eddy; Lillian Misel; Carol Gering (phone); Alex Fitts, Jayne Harvie.

Absent: Doug Goering.

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF 28 Jan
2. Report on GERC from Cindy Hardy

3. OLD BUSINESS

A. C-/C business

Motion: The minimum acceptable grade that baccalaureate students may receive in courses in the major, the minor, core, and courses used as prerequisites shall be a C-.

Justification: consistency

1. With the past. Before \pm grades a 'C-' was acceptable because a 'C-' was simply a version of C
2. With faculty who do not use +/- grades. A student who receives a 'C-' from a faculty member who does not use \pm is ok because that grade gets recorded as a 'C'. Same course, different teacher, this one does use \pm and the grade is not acceptable.
3. With BOR policies. BOR defines a C as an acceptable grade. Clearly a 'C-', which is a version of C, also should be acceptable.
4. With transfer policies: a course with a grade of C- transfers. However, currently it only transfers as 'credit' for a course in one's major or minor. In order to satisfy the requirement for the major or minor the course would need to be re-taken and a grade of C or higher received.
5. A grade of C- is the minimum acceptable for a 'core' course. This is confusing [(t)-16(ak)-8(en)Tj -0.008 Tc 0.016 Tw (Td

B Indicates an ability well above the minimum level of accomplishment

C Indicates a satisfactory level of accomplishment

D The lowest passing grade, indicates minimum level of accomplishment

AFTER HEATED DISCUSSION WE AGREED TO SEND THIS ON TO SADA FOR THEIR
COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

4. New Business

As part of the grades and grading controversy, we took up the question
of whether acc

“C” (including C+ and C-) indicates a satisfactory level of acquired knowledge and performance in completion of course requirements.

“D” (including D+ and D-) indicates a minimal level of acquired knowledge and minimal performance in completion of course requirements. This grade is acceptable for elective courses, but does not satisfy requirements for courses in the major, minor, core, or graduate programs.

“F” indicates failure to meet a minimal level of understanding of course content and (or) performance in completion of course requirements. All F grades, including those earned in pass/fail courses, are included in the GPA calculations

The meeting ended at 10:15 am. Rainer expressed gratitude to all.

ATTACHMENT 190/9

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women

Committee on the Status of Women

Minutes Friday, February 22, 2013; 10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Megan McPhee, Jane Weber, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Diana Di Stefano, Shawn Russell, Ellen Lopez, Jenny Liu, Nilima Hullavarad,

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Derek Sikes (on sabbatical)

1. April 26th 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. Strategically Planning Workshop

Confirmed panelists: Roxie Dinstel (CRCD), Sine Anahita (CLA) Paul Layer (Dean CSM), Joan Braddock (retired full professor, former Dean CSM), Ellen Lopez (in process of fourth year review, CLA). Mary will ask Todd Sherman Dean of CLA. List of women full professors attached for further consideration – other suggestions? Will be broadcast and recorded eLive. Jane will order the food. Room is still being discussed.

2. Conversation Cafes –

First one was held Friday, Feb 15. Mentoring was the topic. For next year: could we do a more formal discussion on mentoring? Send invitations? Provide informal lunch, or coffee/ tea/ cookies for mentoring discussion. Maybe 12-2pm Tues/Thursday time frame.

For next year: At the fall women's luncheon maybe each table could brainstorm topics for the conversation cafés. Promote conversation café's at the luncheon.

Next scheduled for Thursday, Feb 28th 3:45-4:45pm – flyer attached, please post
Additional Conversation Cafes scheduled for the following times March 21st 3:45-4:45pm;
March 29th 10:30-11:30am; April 12th 10:30-11:30am; April 18th 3:45-4:45pm
topic requests/ideas. Send ideas to Kayt.

New faculty orientation: a flyer in their packet might get lost in the overwhelming amount of information. Maybe we reach out to new faculty after they have been here a few months. Call / email to invite them to conversation cafés.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board

Meeting again: March 8, 10:30 to 12:00

4. Fall 2013 Luncheon

Speaker suggestions:

- a. Cheryl Frye, INBrE Director and Professor of Neuroscience. Her email is: cafrye@alaska.edu her phone 474-5492. Some background <http://www.uaf.edu/chem/faculty/cfrye/>
- b. Director of Women's Center in Maine.
- c. Someone who has done research in mentoring.
- d. Dr. Claudia Lampan from UAA. Psychology. Ellen will look into this.
- e. URSA : Barbara Taylor: working with undergraduates

f. Denise Thorsen: Electrical Engineer, Associate Professor, Ph.D., Electrical and Computer Engineering

What about several shorter presentations? Choosing local women has many benefits.

5. CSW elections are not needed this year. All expiring seats are interested in continuing.

6. Rational for a part-time faculty/ administrative position focusing on the issues of women faculty - Still on the table. We need to be very prepared. What is the evidence of inequity? Show these problems are affecting women faculty at UAF. We need data.

Upcoming CSW meeting: March 22/10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

**Committee on the Status of Women,
Meeting Minutes Friday, March 22, 2012; 10:30-11:30 pm, Gruening 718**

Members Present: Amy Barnsley, Diana Di Stefano, Jane Weber, Megan McPhee, Jenny Liu, Kayt Sunwood, Mary Ehrlander, Nilima Hullavarad, Ellen Lopez

Members absent: Michelle Bartlett, Derek Sikes (on sabbatical), Shawn Russell

1. April 26th 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. Strategically Planning Workshop, BOR Conference Room

Panelists: Roxie Dinstel, Sine Anahita, Paul Layer, Ellen Lopez, Joan Braddock, Todd Sherman. Flyer is done. Jayne Harvie will send it out. Please post it. Jane ordered refreshments. Todd Sherman has also agreed. Kayt will moderate. We need help with Illuminate Live. We'll ask people to focus on their experience. Kayt will tell the panelists that the focus in on strategy.

2. Conversation Cafes –

Future Cafes: April 12 10:30-11:30. Topic: Leadership. Challenges and rewards of taking on leadership roles. Kayt may use some of the LeanIn organization. They provide information and guidance on creating/ promoting women in leadership roles.

3. Women's Center Advisory Board
Meeting again: Monday, March 22, 2013

4. Fall 2013 Luncheon

Can we do more? Paper invitations. Can we help Jayne more? Put that on our radar for end of September on a Tuesday. We need to choose a speaker or panel. Sheryl Frye? Claudia Lampman from UAA?

Upcoming CSW meeting: May 3, /10:30-11:30/Gruening 718

Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am

Respectfully Submitted, Amy Barnsley

These minutes are archived on the CSW website:

<http://www.uaf.edu/uafgov/faculty-senate/committees/committee-on-the-status-o/>

up between ENGL 111X placement and DEVE 070. This will be a Major change, so it will go through the steps of approval by Faculty Senate

Committee membership definition: We agreed that any changes to the committee definition are major changes and would have to go through Faculty Senate. We agreed to leave the definition as it stands for now, especially since those committee members who are elected have already indicated their willingness to serve again. We will revisit this and pass some definition changes before the end of the semester

Meeting times for spring: We agreed to stick with the third Thursdays of the month 3 – 4:30.

Adjourned at 4:20pm.

Student Academic Development and Achievement Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013

Attending: Joe Mason, Sarah Stanley, Andrea Schmidt, Sandra Wildfeuer, Dana Greci, Cindy hardy, Alan Morotti, Gabrielle Russell, Curt Szuberla, David Maxwell

Minutes of the previous meeting were not available, but we reviewed table notes.

C/C- grades: Curricular Affairs asked for our input on three motions relating to this issue:

1. To make C- acceptable minimum grade for major, minor, and core classes. This maintains the 2.0 cumulative requirement for majors and for good standing.

The committee voted 8-1 in favor.

2. To revise the current catalog descriptions of letter grades to eliminate the words “average” and “performance.”

The committee voted unanimously against this motion, stating that we thought the grade definitions should be left alone, and expressing concerns that wordsmithing in this way would lead to a need for further definitions for the +/- grades and could represent an attempt to avoid grade inflation by redefinition.

(A second draft of this motion, using language from BOR policy, was subsequently circulated to the committee and met with 6-1 approval).

3. To strike out the minimum requirement of C- for core classes, reverting to a D- as acceptable for core classes.

The committee voted unanimously against this motion, stating that we thought that having a D- as an acceptable grade for the core set students up for failure.

GERC Update: Sandra reports that the GERC committee is nearly ready to move forward and show what they've developed to the departments. However, at a statewide meeting in the past few days, it became apparent that UAA and UAS are in very different places with this process.

Sandra noted that the committee has five working groups addressing different aspects of General Education requirements (drawn from the LEAP outcomes5a46(5a46TT0 1 T (t th)22c0.26 0 Td [(as)519(-)-48(-)-

has bought some of Magna Pubs' DVDs that faculty are welcome to check out. (Magna Commons is the online access group.)

VII. Upcoming events:

Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, March 4, 2013 from 1:00 – 3:00 pm in Wood Center

VIII. Next FDAI Meeting: Tuesday, March 26, 2013 from 11:00 am to 12:00 pm.

IX. Adjourned at 12:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Kelly Houlton.

ATTACHMENT 190/12

UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013

Submitted by the Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee

Graduate Academic and Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes for 2/06/13.

Attending: Franz Mueter (by phone), Karen Jensen (by phone), Donie Bret-Harte, John Yarie, Jayne Harvie, Cheng fu Chen, John Eichelberger, Lillian Misel, Laura Bender, Chung-san Ng, Mike Daku, Vince Cee, Lara Horstmann, Tim Bartholomaeus

GAAC discussed numerous courses and program changes, and passed the following:

- 3-Trial: MSL F694 - Physical, Chemical, and Biological Interactions in the Oceans
- 6-GPCh. Program Change: M.Ed. – concentration areas of language and literacy, cross cultural education, secondary education
- 10-GPCh. Program Change: B.S./M.S. Mechanical Engineering
- 17-GNC: New course: STO F601 – Communicating Science
- 22-GNC: New course: Phys F605 – Physics teaching seminar (pending correction of disabilities phone number)
- 27-GPCh.: Program Change: M.S. and Ph.D. - Environmental Chemistry

5-GPCh.

ATTACHMENT 190/13
UAF Faculty Senate 190, April 1, 2013
Submitted by the Research Advisory Committee

RAC Minutes 18 January 2013

Jon Dehn, Peter Webley, Orion Lawlor, Joanne Healy, Claudia Koch, Barbara Taylor, John Eichelberger

- 1.) Thanks (particularly to Lawlor and Koch) for getting the FAC for faculty research out and up on the VCR's website. This should be a useful guide to faculty wanting to do research, or a good refresher for those who need to brush up on policies and procedures.
- 2.) Discussion on coordination of graduate student and undergraduate research. A model was proposed where graduate students would serve as mentors to undergraduates, involving them in the thesis projects. Each proposal would be overseen by a faculty member, but the graduate students would have latitude in how to manage and mentor the undergrads. This provides valuable experience to the grad and encourages undergrads to go on to higher degrees.

Funding for this effort could be from many sources. One idea is to have the governance fee for the graduate students be managed by a graduate student council with assistance of the Dean of the Graduate School to evaluate and support research efforts. URSA and Prof. Taylor could assist to pair eager undergraduates with grad student mentors.

This was the start of the conversation and it is hoped that the Graduate School and URSA will continue looking into this.

- 3.) Role of the RAC, the committee expressed interest to have a more active role in providing advice to the VCR and being a sounding board for large programmatic research enterprises. Talks with the VCR suggest this would be a good avenue. The faculty would really like to help out here.
- 4.) Program review of research at UAF requested by the Chancellor. In response to recent efforts to engage the Board of Regents in the role of research at UA, they have asked for a review of the research program at UAF. In turn the Chancellor has approached the RAC to do this. Given the experiences with the vision 2017 document, the Chancellor's transition teams, the Academic Master plan and the early stages of the Strategic Direction Initiative, this is not as daunting a task as it may seem. The Chancellor is willing to support two retreats, likely in the form of a weekend day of the committee together, one early on to establish a work plan, and one near the end of the process to finalize a draft document for review and publication.

The whole process should be done this semester with the first retreat in March and finish at the end of the summer, the final retreat to take place just before classes start in the Fall. The target is to have a document for the Regents in their Fall meeting.

Overall much of the data is already available through the VCR's office, past documents and PAIR. Some data collection will have to happen and be done by the RAC, hopefully with some help from the colleges and business offices around campus.

There are clearly some charged issues that should be avoided by focusing on the tight integration of the teaching and research missions at UAF. With that in mind a basic structure for the document is as follows:

Intro and executive summary of the 5 components

1. Students in research, grad and undergrad, numbers, their roles in the state, how colleges and research institutions work together to drive one of the most success research enterprises in the world
- lerin the w ate,ndncce20(n)16 work o