Date: [illegible] 2, 2000 1:25 pm
To: "Faculty Senate" <fyssenate@uaf.edu>

I agree that these are [illegible] equally long, at least in [illegible]

[illegible] because I understand math dealings [illegible] make any changes [illegible] meaning. [illegible] though we cannot see how the extra verbiage is useful, there is some general value in consistency over time. (b) I do not see anything in the criteria that conflicts with the general (blue book) criteria. Conflicts are the main reason that criteria [illegible] should be carried down. (c) Finally, if there is [illegible] detailed justification [illegible] not having more detail [illegible] called this criteria is sound, but in this case it is clear that all the evaluation is re[illegible] for an external audience. That is, mathematicians themselves know that external funding is hard [illegible] that [illegible] in the [illegible]

[illegible] > satisfy the needs for the one more [illegible]

[illegible] criteria recently [illegible] criteria is to explain unit standards to [illegible] value [illegible] and [illegible] Sin[illegible]