Statewide Academic Council Summary

9:30 – 12:30; January 16, 2014

Present: Dana Thomas, Mark Myers, Susan Henrichs, Elisha Baker, Robert Boeckmann, Virgil Fredenberg, Cecil Lardon, Rick Caulfield, Barbara Hegel, Dayna Defeo, Cathy LeCompte, Carol Gering, Fred Villa, Martha Mason, Pete Pinney, Michael Cirri, Matt Cooper, Karl Kowalski, Pat Shea

1. Approval of the summary of the 12.10.13 meeting – Attachment – approved

2. New program proposals or deletions – UAA has a doctorate in nursing practice in development, UAS certified medical assistant program in consultation with UAA and UAF, UAF graduate certificate in adaptation and resilience. No deletions in works.

3. SARA report and recommendation – Carol Gering, Barbara Hegel, Eric Pedersen, Pete Pinney, and Matt Cooper

   Background: consumer protection issue – if UA wanted to operate a branch campus in Washington state, there would be certain requirements, not as clear for distance offerings when there is no physical presence – feds passed a regulation that stirred the pot, it was withdrawn but this caused work on the issue. What constitutes physical presence in a state; does marketing? Each state has different regs, different costs, applications, administration structure, etc. The regional compacts, e.g., WICHE, came up with a plan similar to the driver license use in other states. ACPE has a list of institutions operating in state. ACPE would apply to SARA but then okay UA institutions to take part. SARA will make common definitions of physical presence and rules regarding various levels of operations in another state; this process is voluntary – states get to choose whether they take part or not – for those states that do not take part, AK would still have to know their regulations and follow them. Many states will have to pass legislation to align with SARA; AK well aligned. New AK regulation is needed and is being worked on. If student complaint, an agency outside the UA needed to receive and address complaints. Each MAU would be authorized to take part in SARA; the system cannot be authorized as a whole. If student not satisfied with complaint resolution at MAU then they must be informed that they can file with ACPE. Student grade or conduct issues are not considered by ACPE or the SARA process. Is there anything in UA BOR policy or University Regulation prohibiting ACPE from channeling complaints? Matt Cooper said no but some policy or reg may be needed for clarity of process. Also how we inform distance students about how to file complaints. ACPE has two meetings a year (January and July) to pass the new regs; this must be completed before UA MAUs can apply to SARA. Cost? $2000 to $6000 depending on FTEs at MAU. ACPE working to get this cleared up no later than August.

4. Learning management systems review – Karl Kowalski – formal review of LMS needed as requested by Faculty Alliance – current contract with Blackboard up in June but no rush to review or change – we can extend for one year at a time. LMS review should be directed and decided by academic side – OIT can provide demos, training, etc. Consistent use of LMS should be considered – UAS requires some minimal presence for all courses (syllabus, library resources, etc.) – OIT believes this should be consistent across system. How should we proceed in evaluation process? A two year decision process is too long given the software revision cycle. Two issues; product selection process and policy development. Currently no policy. SAC level discussion of policy needed. Consistent student experience and efficiency should help drive
policy. Faculty Alliance takes the lead? Have subcommittees at three MAUs move this forward – through cooperation across the MAUs. Address policy first then software selection; some parallel processing possible. Faculty Alliance will ask senates to start this work and collaborate across MAUs. What are the policy questions? CIOs will work with MAUs to create list of policy questions to SAC at next meeting.

5. Tech Prep policy issues – Cathy LeCompte and Fred Villa – Attachment – two reports – September 2013 and December 2013 to SAC. Courses occur in high schools by high school teachers using UA approved syllabi. Table based on memo from 2006. Much of this already covered in BOR policy. What else should be covered? Eligibility for students? High school teachers? There are four specific guidelines for courses available via tech prep – they are focused on career prep – UA has wandered off mission here – including gen ed, electives, developmental courses, offerings in correctional facilities, and adult programs – we need to rethink the approach here. Tech prep was intended to be collegiate level course taught by high school teacher – why are developmental courses being offered? Why are adult programs herein? We agreed to start by looking at the federal tech prep requirements and then revisit this issue at the next meeting. It was not clear what UA BOR policies or University Regulations would need to change, if any.

6. Program review cycle – Dana Thomas
Is a 7-year cycle preferred to a 5-year cycle? Should different programs have different cycles, e.g., certificate/AAS shorter than baccalaureate or graduate? Should there be common sequencing of program review, i.e., math at UAA, UAF, and UAS would be reviewed in the same year and each university would be engaged in the review of the other’s program?

It was agreed to submit a formal change from “at least every five years” to “at least every seven years.” It was noted that research units are to be reviewed on the same cycle. It was also agreed that different programs should not have different cycles for review and that the logistics for coordinating reviews for similar programs across MAUs was prohibitive because of different specialized accreditation cycles, UAS wanting to keep their five year cycle when UAA and UAF prefer the seven year cycle, and the challenge of aligning which programs or program areas would be reviewed at the same time, e.g., environmental programs of various types differ significantly but have similar names.

7. Qualification standards for high school teachers to teach lower division courses – Dana Thomas
Should there be a system wide standard? Possible standard – a master’s degree in field or related field or AP certified teacher in that area. Problem – potential transfer issue among MAUs if there is not such a standard. This will be increasingly important for dual credit delivery and the Alaska Learning Network. We need to be careful about tech-prep in this discussion.

No agreement was reached on this issue and the issue was tabled. Alaska’s Learning Network was considered a key issue here but it also applies to some specialized areas like Alaska Native Languages, Business courses, and others. It was pointed out that Western Oregon University is working with Alaska school districts and allows their teachers to offer courses for dual credit (they are delivering distance courses to the schools as well). We briefly discussed different sets of qualifications, e.g., Board Certified Teachers versus AP teachers but it was agreed that faculty must be consulted further and this discussion needed to address tech-prep and middle college as well.

a. P10.02.04 and R.10.02.04 – UAF requests to combine the School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences with the Cooperative Extension Service to form the School of Natural Resources and Extension – Susan Henrichs – Attachment - this proposal passed SAC.

b. P10.07.070 Human Subjects in Research – Dana Thomas and Robert Boeckmann – Attachment – There was agreement on this proposal after some discussion about the specific wording. It was agreed that a final version would be circulated for SAC electronic vote before submission to the UA BOR.

c. Additional R10.07 review as time allows – Did not get to this.

9. Common Placement Tool Decision Processes, e.g., moving away from ACCUPLACER – Rick Caulfield – UAF’s faculty senate and chancellor approved a limited time experiment to use ALEKS for math placement. It was argued that this disrupts the consistency across the system and should have been discussed and agreed upon within SAC before that happened. It was agreed that there is a desire for clear and consistent communication with K-12 on placement.

10. Feedback to US DOE on college-rating system – Dana Thomas

11. WICHE passport – http://www.wiche.edu/passport/ – Dana has asked for a presentation from WICHE – schedule is still being developed – INFO ITEM ONLY – subsequently scheduled presentations at UAF and UAA (with webstreaming to UAS) around the February BOR meeting.

12. eLearning committee with SAC member – Dana Thomas – DELAYED

13. February Board of Regents’ meeting – Academic and Student Affairs Committee
   a. In-state, out-of-state, and international student recruiting efforts by each university; what is working, what is not, and how they know – VCs of Student and Enrollment Services – Saichi Oba will coordinate
   b. Policy and regulation revisions
      i. 10.07.010 Role of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity
      ii. 10.07.020 Sponsored Projects Submittal and Acceptance
      iii. 10.07.070 Human Subjects in Research
   c. New program proposals or deletions
      i. UAF – Music MA to MM
   d. Arctic Region Supercomputing Center presentation – requested by Regent Heckman
   e. National Council on Teacher Quality report
   f. WICHE State Authorization Reciprocity Agreement – Carol Gering
   g. Osher presentation
   h. ADDED – School of Natural Resources and Agriculture Sciences and Cooperative Extension Service organizational change.

14. April Board of Regents’ meeting
   a. ????

15. Roundtable