Statewide Academic Council
Meeting Summary
February 18, 2015

Present: Richard Caulfield, Virgil Fredenberg, Samuel Gingerich, Susan Henrichs, Karen Schmidt, Diane Hirshberg (for Tara Smith), David Valentine, Daniel White

Absent: Helena Wisniewski, Tara Smith

1. The summary of the 1.15.15 meeting was approved.

2. Policy and Regulation Revision
   a. (Susan Henrichs) Regulation 10.07 is near completion; UAF OIPC staff recently submitted a few edits. Once SAC members have had the opportunity to review the most recent version (distributed with the agenda), approval will be requested via e-mail.
   b. (Saichi Oba) Policy and Regulation 9.02 is still undergoing review; the goal is to have Policy changes ready for Board approval at the April meeting.

3. (Saichi Oba and Gwen Gruenig) Implementation of common student satisfaction survey.
   The survey is scheduled for Academic Year 15-16. Gwen Gruenig is chairing an ad hoc committee to implement the survey. The standard Noel-Levitz survey includes some appropriate questions, but there will need to be some added. For example, we want to use this survey to assess progress relative to Shaping Alaska’s Future. Discussion made the point that design of the questions needs experts, and ISER has employees with this skill. Discussion of the repeat interval yielded agreement that three years was about right. The cost per administration is about $50,000. We will need to establish a process for analysis, review, and response to the data. This probably will involve appointing a committee including faculty and student services staff.

4. New program proposals or deletions
   a. (Susan Henrichs) The Master of Security and Disaster Management new degree program proposal (UAF) was approved for the April Board of Regents meeting agenda.
   b. The proposal to convert the Bachelor of Science in Engineering tracks to separate BS degree programs (UAA) was approved for the April Board of Regents meeting agenda. The proposed BS degrees are:
      i. BS in Computer Systems Engineering
      ii. BS in Electrical Engineering
      iii. BS in Mechanical Engineering

5. (Steve Atwater) Dual Enrollment

   The goal is to develop Policy and Regulation; most discussion focused on the draft Policy distributed with the agenda. The target is to have Policy ready for Board approval in June. There are concerns about ‘quality control’, relative to the course and instructor qualifications. The syllabus and text need to be those used at the college level, and assessments of student learning outcomes need to be the same as well. There are also concerns about student qualifications, ability to benefit, and dual enrollment impacts on financial aid eligibility if students are not successful. However, many of the specifics would be left to Regulation. What needs to be in Policy? A good definition of “dual enrollment” is needed. Some felt that (since Tech Prep has established processes, is taught in high...
schools by high school teachers, and focuses on VoTech) perhaps Tech Prep should not be included, but after discussion the agreement was that the definition (and policy) needs to be inclusive of all ways a secondary student can earn both high school and college credit for the same class.

UA needs to engage other entities because we do not control the high school policies: ACPE, working group with State Board of Education. There can be some issues with K-12 labor agreements, need information.

SMH will look at some existing policies for other states, and circulate some initial revisions to the proposed policy and aim to have another draft for the next meeting.

6. (Steve Atwater) College and Career Ready Definition.

This also has a June target for completion. The statement is aimed at high schools and high school students. Not clear at what level of detail/specificity university standards should be addressed. SAC found the existing draft lacking in substance relative to college readiness, but a statement endorsed by UA should have faculty buy-in. SAC members agreed that we could insert university readiness standards by reference, and develop them in a parallel process.

[NB: President Gamble later rejected this idea and stated that the university would not approve the CCR definition without and included, acceptable statement of college readiness standards.]

7. (Karl Kowalski) Learning Management Systems

Review of LMS is going slowly. The Alliance has been busy with other matters; the Alliance will discuss at the upcoming retreat, but it does not appear to be a high priority with most faculty. A faculty satisfaction survey relative to Blackboard is planned. OIT has been looking at top systems and the cost of change: i.e., a consolidated instance of Blackboard, Desire to Learn, Moodle, Canvas. Some things that need to be considered are whether hosted vs. “cloud” applications, use on mobile devices, availability of “help”.

8. (Karl Kowalski) Non-credit Tracking Software

Lumens has been chosen by consensus of the group that was convened to make a systemwide selection. It provides ‘discovery’, registration, and access to courses. SWIR is concerned about reporting capabilities; Lumens has full export capability and tracks all of the needed data. “Landing” pages can be branded by institution and/or by campus, department, etc. We will need to provide training to users. Should have a user committee (Provosts provide names) to oversee implementation. Note that there is at least one existing system for tracking continuing education that was developed by the Mental Health Trust. If our goal is to consolidate all non-credit reporting, MHT would need to be brought on board, but that might be difficult.

9. February Board of Regents’ Meeting agenda items
   a. Policy Revisions
      i. None
   b. New program proposal
      i. AAS, Veterinary Technician, MatSu Campus
   c. Program deletion
      i. Bachelor of Arts and Sciences (BAS), UAF
   d. Health care faculty recruiting and retention report (Bill Hogan, Jan Harris of UAA)
e. Common calendar update (Saichi Oba)

f. Update regarding plus/minus grading (Susan Henrichs)

g. UA Acting Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and Research – Responsibilities and Schedule

10. April Board of Regents’ Meeting agenda items

a. Policy Revisions (SMH will check with Saichi Oba on whether these are ready)
   i. P09.02 Student Rights and Responsibilities
   ii. P09.05 Employment of Students
   iii. P09.06 Services for Students with Disabilities

b. New program proposals or deletions (see above):
   i. New program: MSDM (UAF)
   ii. Program conversion; BSE to three BS, in Mechanical, Electrical, Computer Systems Engineering.

c. UA Graduate Employment Report (Statewide IR)

d. SAF Theme 3 report – Productive Partnerships with Public Entities and Private Industries. (SMH will distribute outline to the provosts.)

11. Future SAC Agenda Items; Next meeting March 12.

a. The issue of substitutions for SAC members was raised. Susan Henrichs proposed:
   i. No substitutions for provosts, research representatives, or VPAA, but they may call in if traveling
   ii. Each of the Faculty Alliance reps may designate one alternate, from the same university as the rep. That person will be included on agendas, attachments, and other SAC correspondence so that they can be up-to-speed. The rep. should keep the alternate informed of issues discussed at meetings.

   There appeared to be agreement with this approach but it can be discussed again at the next meeting if desired. If there is no further discussion the alternate’s names and e-mails should be provided to Morgan Dufseth.

b. Feedback to SAC on SB241 report (Rick Caulfield)

c. UA Admission Standard; Governance report on status

12. Roundtable

a. New Sitka Campus director, Chris Gilmer, will start July 1, 2015.

b. David Valentine wants to work with SAC on a clear and well-structured process for the Board of Regents or President assigning issues and tasks to Governance. There should, in each instance, be a specific charge and due date. The charge should specify who should receive the report; it seems that normally this would be the VPAAR.

   SAC members agreed in principle. An approach would be to draft a memo to the President; the memo would need to come from Governance but (after review) could gain SAC’s formal support.

c. David Valentine also indicated that the Faculty Alliance wants a faculty representative on the Summit Team.