

Academic Council Agenda

September 21, 2018; 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Attendees: Maria, Karen, Susan, John, Saichi, Chris, Fred, Anupma, Gwen Gruenig (Chair of IR Council), Priscilla, and Paul.

1. Safety Minute – Paul – It’s getting dark and there has been a lot of fog lately, be careful driving. Remember to replace your headlights.
2. Approve 8/17/18 meeting notes – All, 2 min. (*attachment*) – No corrections. Approved.
3. August 17, 2018 Action Item Update – Paul, 3 min.
 - a) ACTION: Kelly will send UA Regulation R03.01 Authority through Action Transmittal. – Done – With the president – Anupma – Was the language changed from “effective chancellor”? Paul – The language was not changed. Paul will follow up with GC to see if it needs to be clarified.
 - b) ACTION: Kelly will send UA Regulation R10.04.040 General Ed Requirements through Action Transmittal – Done
 - c) ACTION: Kelly will move forward the Regent’s Adjunct Award – proposed award process. – Done
 - d) ACTION: Add Emeritus (faculty and staff) to next agenda. - Done
 - e) ACTION: Paul encourages the council to look at the eLearning charter and provide feedback to Karen. Paul would also like to show this to the president for his comments, and then return for final approval.
4. BOR, Summit Team and Budget update – Paul, 10 min. – The Board meeting was in Juneau. The Academic Affairs meeting advanced the program changes and had a presentation by Brad Moran from the College of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences on the Sikuliaq, a brief presentation from Steve Atwater on the College of Education. Not a lot of discussion at the ASA or the Board on some of the academic actions that we have been taking. The consent agenda went through without much discussion or controversy. The main focus was on the budget presentation. The way that the president has framed the budget this year is at a high level. We did not get into the specifics of the campuses and kept them in the broad sense of the students, research, etc. The Board responded well to that approach. Regent O’Neill felt this was appropriate and the Board should not be trying to micromanage what the campuses are doing. Also had a presentation on the compensation studies that are being done for the faculty, staff and executives. This is an ongoing process and HR is working on this. Anupma – Enjoyed the time she had with the provosts and bonding with them. The open session had a compelling presentation by the School

of Education. Paul – The SE Conference was held the day before in Ketchikan. It was a good chance for Paul to talk to Priscilla and to the folks at the Ketchikan center. Paul thanks Priscilla for hosting. Priscilla – The Advisory Council enjoyed having the chance to talk to the chancellor, provosts, vice presidents and president. They rarely get a chance to meet with them face-to-face. Paul – Summit team – basic reports. The regents have been presented with the budget, which is basically going to be a big lift if you look at the individual categories. This is not an increase historically, but does get us up to the level we were at 2 years ago. This is catch-up for the last 4 years. It will depend upon the election, makeup of the governor’s office and the legislature. John – One of the things that may change, Regent Bishop’s term is ending and is not seeking to be reappointed. Hopefully we will get someone who is equally as engaged as she has been in the previous years. Also, with regard to the budget, Susan Foley discussed at the Summit Team, encouraging everyone to consider themselves as part of the development team, so we can provide some financial stability for the university. Paul – Will be looking at which regent should be on the ASA if it cannot be Regent Bishop. Paul will discuss with the president. Larry – There is an election this autumn and there could be a drastic change in the budget and should be thinking about a contingency plan in case of this change. Paul – We have four sources of revenue, ICR, tuition, research, and philanthropy and fundraising. A lot of the foundation accounts we have are for students. Susan will be doing an audit and contacting deans and programs regarding these funds. This is an untapped source of revenue available. Larry – As we lose state funds, we lose staff and faculty, which impacts the amount of revenue we can generate.

5. AC Scorecard updates – Paul, 5 min. (*attachment*)
 - a. UAA MPP/MPA Program Development – Paul is assuming it is moving through governance? Susan – They are re-upping their search for director. She is checking to see if they are waiting for a new director before they move the program forward. John – They can move it forward and make revisions when the new director is found. Paul – Provosts - look at the scorecard and clean up the projects. Paul would like to provide an update at the next Summit Team meeting. ACTION: Provosts will look at the scorecard and clean up projects.
 - b. E-Learning – Paul would like to work with Karen on changing some of the language in the Strategic Pathways goal so it doesn’t sound like we are moving in the outsourcing direction, but that we are looking at other sorts of options and how the discussions in eLearning have gone. ACTION: Paul and Karen will work on Strategic Pathways goal language.

- c. Concurrent Enrollment Fees and Payment Responsibility – Paul would like to move this towards a discussion. In his mind, what this talks about is cross campus teaching, how do we handle tuition, fees, etc? We have done this on an ad hoc basis, making it work with some programs. Does this serve as a barrier for other programs to get involved? Paul would like to work with the provosts on what we are doing now and what needs to be done with both concurrent enrollment and dual enrollment. Do we have formal processes for collaboration across the system between academic programs? Karen and John both agree that we do not, but would be beneficial to have this. Paul would like to see this on the working agenda. Susan – This line item is focused on dual enrollment. This discussion belongs under the student tuition and fees title. Paul – Concurrent enrollment and dual enrollment seems to be working with the MOUs that are working with the middle colleges and some of these other programs. These have pretty much gone forward. Fred – There was a subcommittee working on the concurrent enrollment regulations, which were passed, but there were unresolved issues outside of the regulations specifically. The thought was with some of the leadership changes that we would reconstitute the subcommittee to address these issues. This group would include Anupma, John, Karen, Susan and Teri Cothren. ACTION: Paul is asking Fred to write up a brief history of concurrent enrollment subcommittee and send this to the provosts, as there are a couple of new people.
 - d. Academic Unit Establishment, Major Revision, etc – We did pass the Board meeting with some of the changes in terms of the academic units. The regs that were just talked about in the summer are with the president as well.
 - e. Common Calendar – See below
 - f. Distribution of student tuition & fees across system – take Saichi off as the “owner”.
 - g. High value non-credit workforce – We have not really moved much on that. Will need to coordinate with Gwen to see how we want to track those types of things. We will need to put it into a single report.
6. UA Gateway update – Saichi, 5 min. – The update provided to the Board a couple weeks ago stopped short of the following: The RFP and the best and final offer process has concluded. We have selected a vendor, Academy One. There were only 2 vendors who made offers and continued into the best and final offer. They have tremendous experience doing this work. They have created gateways for much larger entities, entire states, not just state systems of higher ed (example: Tennessee Reconnect). There was a small kickoff meeting of Wednesday this week

following the 10 day cooling period. Faye Gallant is the project manager and Martha Mason. We are scheduling our larger kickoff meeting with the entire project team and some new individuals from the campuses on the implementation team. We are going to replicate the model and structure of the travel management project, which utilizes an implementation team, frontline, head down experts, a consultant team or feedback team, along with a project team, and decision making team. The travel management project has had great success. October 1st is the first actual day of the contract. The first 90 days there are a couple of goals. The implementation timeline is a total of 200 days, but the first 90 are the most important, because it falls in December.

7. Common Calendar Update – Saichi, 5 min. – There are drafts for AY21, 22 & 23 that were developed by the registrars, then given to the FA. Their subcommittee is going to provide feedback. We are currently waiting on that feedback. Chris – The common calendar committee had some questions about the start dates for one of the years, but this has been resolved. They are going to meet one more time on this. Maria – Megan Buzby, who is the chair of that, has sent out the proposed new dates and had asked each faculty senate to email that in case there were any questions or queries for faculty input. Paul – At the Summit Team yesterday, the president latched on to the fact that although we have good alignment of our academic calendars, our fiscal calendars are not aligned, as far as fee payment, etc. He has charged Myron and Paul to start working on that. This has always been a barrier in the past and has been left to the side because of a lot of pushback. Paul will work with Myron. Maria – These issues had been brought up at the last subcommittee meeting and one of the points was that because of the size of UAA that the registrar had pretty good justification as to why some of those dates are not going to be the same. Chris – This was discussed during the retreat. Juneau also has a different date. Paul – Would like to get down to the reason and resolve the issues. Saichi – The only issue they were unable to resolve was the fee payment issue. All of these dates were discussed among all campuses. John – The registrars should have input, but should not be driving the bus on this. Anupma – Is Blackboard linked at the SW level or campus level? If the student is dropped from a class due to fee payment issues, they would still be live on Blackboard. Paul – Will check to see SW responsibility with Blackboard. Susan – Really supportive of having the deadlines aligned. The billing messaging that is going out to students is on the SW level. Having them aligned, we can work on the message that goes out to students and provide timeliness of the messages. Paul and Saichi will work on tracking down the Blackboard piece. Saichi – We could not replicate what was asked or described, so he has the campuses go out there to find someone who is enrolled

campus wide physically, but being charged for a fee at another campus where they were just taking a class on line.

8. Evaluation of EMSI update – Fred, 10 min – We have a contract from 11/1 to 10/31 with EMSI Economic Modeling for a few products that we are using across the university system. One is called Analyst and the other is Career Coach. Career Coach is a career exploration site. We have been providing training to the campuses. Analyst is a deeper dive type of tool for setting economic development implication and workforce projections. EMSI has proprietary methodologies for analyzing information that is in the public domain, but it is not readily aggregated. The evaluation of EMSI is to determine whether we want to renegotiate the contract going forward. The first year has been very successful. He just went to an EMSI user conference last week. He learned that there were colleges there using EMSI data for accreditation purposes, including a graduate college operating in California. Per capita, Alaska is ranked #6 in using Career Coach, and that was only after 8 months of use. We have had over 7300 visits, which is about 1% of the population. One of the differences of EMSI, is the occupational forecasting of the state of Alaska. Traditionally, we would look at the Department of Labor data for 10 years out. EMSI took this information and created a more accurate forecast and they go 15 years out. We do have a subcommittee working on replicable queries to see if this system is accurate and valid. They will complete their evaluation in the next week or so. We have also taken the 2nd largest producer of this type of information, called Burning Glass and have also asked them to do queries that we are doing with EMSI right now. We are finding that EMSI is producing much better results for us, more timely. At this point in time, it is his intention to renew the contract with EMSI and provide technical assistance sessions for people who want access to it. Anumpa – Has used Career Coach. Where does she see the data and what it does? Fred – with the Analyst program, there are 30 licensed users, so there are specific people on the campuses that have been identified. Paul – Does Fred need something from the Council in regards to an authorization? Fred – No authorization needed from the Council. This is just an informational update. Before they asked for the investment, they wanted this council and others to know that they had given some demos to help understand and support the initiative. They think it has been highly successful and would like to continue with EMSI. John – Has seen the alumni portion. From a dean’s point of view, specific program or department chairs and directors would be interested in this as well. It is a powerful way of understanding what our alumni think about what their jobs mean and what preparations they need. Fred – There is some interest on the alumni portion. This is extremely informative for development opportunities. Also, one of the discussions that they

have seen, particularly for Alaska, income levels for those without degrees is almost inverse to those with degrees, that are noncredit programs or not currently being represented when people are looking for programs associated with occupations. However, EMSI has come up with a system within the last year to be able to sweep those things together and demonstrate those, which requires some mapping on our part to the programs and the occupations, and have created a streamline process to do that. With UAA already using ASAP to collect those and demonstrate them on a website, it helps to consolidate where we can get that information. It may be easier and faster than those campuses that do not have the information aggregated. This is the goal of the upcoming year. Priscilla – Career Coach, the people using it are happy. Analyst has been more of a problem for a small community on an island, because they do not pick up employers with less than 25 employees. Alaska presents some special challenges. Paul – Would like Fred to take a look into whether it is a value to track these types of things. Fred – We are currently not utilizing all of the user licenses for Analyst and we will negotiate Alumni into the contract without raising the cost.

9. Workforce Summary project report – Fred, 10 min – Workforce Demand Summary has been developed for the aviation, construction, education, healthcare, IT telecom, maritime, mining, and oil and gas industry. Full reports were drafted for education and healthcare. We received input from all of the campuses and programs directly associated with the industries in the highest demand occupations. Data was gathered through EMSI with the help of Bonnie Nygaard and Teri Cothren and input from the campuses. We have given those reports to Paul, who has shared them with the president. They will talk with leadership about how to disseminate the information. Essentially it has the largest employers, highest demand occupations, gap analysis between the number of students produced vs the forecast for those different occupations, wages, etc. We are currently working with the Alaska Gas Line Development Corp to complete a UA plan for identifying and investing in programs for the LNG project. We have had our first conversation with them. They are hoping to get on a BOR agenda to share an update about the project itself and how the university can partner with them. They are already working with Petroleum Engineering. Paul – The president is looking at them for reaching out to the major employers, Providence, BP with regards to some of these occupations and preparing this workforce and expanding our ability to prepare the workforce. We are not currently meeting this need. The president is thinking about this and will present it to the legislature for funding support. In regards to Gasline, we are looking at more than just construction jobs, but also legacy jobs that will be associated when it comes on line. They may need welders, but only for a year or

two, which leaves leftover welders when the job comes to an end. We want to look further out and train the petroleum engineers, process technology people. The conversations are going to include how to meet the immediate needs, including the legacy jobs.

10. TVEP Schedule Notification – Fred, 5 min (attachment) – The funding source comes from the state for workforce development. We have an annual process for both putting out the RFP and then evaluating that and then distributing the unencumbered funds. Over time, we have always tried to make sure there was input and awareness in the provosts office, because we do heavily rely on the provosts to evaluate the proposals that come from the campuses related to their program. We have modified the schedule many times with the input. The Workforce Development Committee that negotiates and puts the recommendations to the president are the representatives of the provost offices. The calendar this year replicates what was done last year. For the most part, we need to have the information back to us. The campuses have the flexibility in front of this to have the information provided sooner, but the timelines listed are the times he needs the information to him. There are only a few small changes to the guidelines. We have heard from the administration sector of the DOL projecting we will not have another increase in funding next year, which is anticipated to be flat.
11. eLearning Subgroup Committee update – Karen C, 5 min. – We heard from some representatives from Blackboard. At the next meeting they will be doing a debriefing about what they had to say. This is bigger than the LMS. They are trying to get into the same type of activity that the EAB is in. Paul – If you have not had a chance to look at the charter from the last meeting, please do. We are waiting on some comments from the president as well.
12. Faculty Alliance update – Chris, 10 min. (attachments) – Paul - On Saturday, President Johnsen and Paul attended the FA retreat in Juneau. Chris – Recapping the events of the retreat – FIF – last year the AC tasked the FA with writing up the RFP and coming up with an evaluation process, which has been completed in collaboration with the council. The FA discussed what they would like to do different, such as capping the awards, having many smaller awards, a sensible timeframe, and clarification of the dean acknowledgment of the workloads, and involving faculty in the process. Overload benefit rate, if there is a class to teach and there is no one to teach it, do you give a faculty overload, or do you hire an adjunct or staff, which is expensive. The benefit rate include currently does not include additional benefits for the faculty if they take on an overload assignment. They would like to see if some adjustments can be made. Paul – In the packet there is an April 2016 resolution from the Faculty Senate and a January 2017 summary. Was there a response to those resolutions? Chris – This was brought to SW, but not

the AC at the time. They went on their own at the time in figuring out how SW works. The response to that was that no progress was going to be made. They are going to make another attempt. They had talked about the GER alignment process, which is now finished. Last year the GER coordinating task force has voted to disband itself. The task force may be brought back next year. They have considered assembling a different committee, a GER maintenance committee (GERM) to handle this in a different task and ensuring alignment, moving forward in the future. The task force's mission is considered done. Maria – It was discussed having some of the GER seed committees participate or have some component that links them, to have conversations to keep in communications with everyone else. Paul – Having the symbolic disbanding of the committee is a symbolic victory, as well as the regulation that is moving forward as a result of that. Showing that the faculty are still committed to this kind of alignment and moving this forward is also important and a good strategy. Chris – Course block alignment – The goal is to make course sharing easier to do. One of the obstacles is that very few course blocks align. One way to do that is to make sure all course blocks need the same link. Perhaps there are other ways to do it, and Paul asked the FA to come up with some of these other ways. FA would like the administrative side to address an obstacle to course sharing, revenue sharing, to make sure the money goes where it should. Otherwise, it provides an incentive to not collaborate and course share.

13. UAA - Reduce the super-tuition level for graduate courses in the MS Project Management – John S., 5 min (attachment) – When the program was originally designed, it was run out of a classroom and office setup next to the university center system. It was expensive, so they moved them on campus and the program asked the college to align their fees with the fees that were charged for all other College of Engineering programs. This is very similar to something done with the College of Business and public policy when the costs for the program were reduced. We are passing on the cost reduction to the students. Paul – This was done earlier in the spring with the College of Business. This just moves it from the higher fee level to the normal super-tuition level. This does not need board approval, but the president did want this to be discussed at the Academic Council level. Karen – Has no objection. Anupma – Has no objection.
14. UAF – Suspension of the General Science BS – Anupma, 5 min (attachment) – UAF is requesting the suspension of the General Sciences BS degree. They have reviewed the program for a long time, starting in 2011, and also went through a special program review. It has low enrollment and is a redundant program. Students who want a BS degree can complete a degree in any of the sciences and they can get their degree. There is no need for a general science degree

program, and UAF will not need a teach-out. For a teaching certification, if they have a degree in one of the sciences, they are qualified to teach any of the sciences. It does not affect their desire to go into teaching. Karen – No concerns. John – No concerns.

Paul – Are there any other programmatic things that we need to be aware of at this time. Anupma – They are going through their next round of program reviews. Karen – nothing right now.

John/Susan – going through teach outs in the programs that were eliminated. Susan – Interested in thinking about what the priorities of the board are now and is wondering if Paul may be able to give some guidance on what the board climate is on programming. There is some interest in developing additional pipelines to the current degrees. Getting a sense of the board's interests would be helpful. Paul – We have been receiving approval for some new programs, so they are now moving away from not approving anything. The programs that have been approved have been geared towards student success.

15. Update - UA Regulation R.04.04.070 Emeritus Status & R04.07.095 Staff Emeritus – Paul, 5 min. – Paul had a discussion with GC and they expressed some concerns. The whole draft regulations were provided in the attachment, the emeritus for staff was minimal. This did not really create a pathway that staff wanted to see. The Staff Council had proposed some requirements that were provided for review by the Staff Council for staff emeritus. It always existed, but was not a well-articulated regulation. In doing so, there was some changes proposed to the faculty regulation to make that one focused on the faculty side, as opposed to the staff side. The conversation with GC today was looking at the revocation clause, whether it was either too restrictive or lenient, and seemed to imply for cause. FA has looked at these and has some concern. Discussion: Anupma – Adding in the staff section, there is some redundancy for senior administrators. There are also senior administrators on the staff side. If you are an administrator or executive, why would you need a special one on the faculty side? A senior administrator is not a faculty. Paul – If a provost retires, there are a couple of different ways to be recognized, provost under staff or educator under the faculty. Anupma – the language is confusing and redundant. John – The language may be confusing, but he sees the value in having the route that one could be recognized in either staff or faculty. Paul – Will take a look at the wording to reduce redundancy. He will also work with GC before sending it through for approvals. One of the questions that came up during the Board meeting was how do we handle revocation of emeritus if a need arose.

16. Designation of minors on class rosters – Paul, 15 min. (attachments) – Protection of Minors policy – Adopted last August – Addresses our responsibility as university employees for minors.

Given that this language specifically focuses on minors, the committee was trying to figure out ways of informing faculty and others that a person was a minor. Of course, keeping in mind that if any person were in danger, it is our responsibility to report this to the authorities, but there are very much special rules and regulations on minors. There is an expansion of minors through middle colleges and dual enrollment, so Risk Services came up with a way of designating these students on class rosters. That was the rationale for doing that. There may be other ways of informing faculty members of their legal responsibility, but this regulation sets up the need to designate people. Paul will better relate that to faculty. The regulation that we passed in the spring on dual enrollment outlined both the responsibilities of the faculty member and the parent or guardian of the minor while in the classroom. As a faculty member, you are not under obligation to change the curriculum or method of delivery for your class. The parent assumes responsibility for the student being in the class and deciding whether or not it would be age appropriate for their child. Because the faculty see an “m” on their roster does not mean they need to change anything in their class. They can advise parents on the content, such as drawing nude models or talking about sexual assault in the class, but there is nothing that says you have to change your curriculum. Should this information come from Paul or the provosts? How do we inform the faculty, but not provide undue stress? John – Explaining in one location (FAQ, etc) how these two regulations expect faculty to either report or not change their classroom approaches. Coming in one place would be helpful. Placing the “m” on the roster without explanation caused confusion. Paul – Should this come from the chief academic officers from each university or should it come from SW that Paul should prepare? John – Suggests that it was originally from SW, so should come from SW to remain consistent with the message. Paul – Will prepare the document. John – If Paul prepares the document, then have the provosts distribute it and ensure that it was read and understood. Anupma – We are not discussing the regulation itself. Chris – What if there is a registered sex offender in the class with minors? Are they in danger? Paul – You don’t get a red “s” on the roster identifying sex offenders. ACTION: Paul will draft a memo for the provosts to distribute to the faculty. Anupma – Wishes us to be careful to remain gender neutral in the wording of the documents. Paul – He has talked with Risk Services and expressed the need to make sure that we are informed when they affect students and faculty. Fred – Would like to include Tim Edwards as part of the vetting process with the messaging and some of these questions be asked of him, as he coordinated the development of this language, along with the Risk Management people. Chris – When FA was in the loop, they didn’t know what their responsibilities were in response to the document.

17. Ted Stevens Legislative Internship – Paul, 5 min. (attachment) – Through UAS the Ted Stevens Internship – The Ted Stevens foundation is providing funding and would like to increase the presence of the program. There is a memo from President Johnsen is appointing a task force to take a look at that program and make sure it is high visibility across the university, not just for political science students, but also other students who may benefit from participation in legislation. Alaska is such an accessible state for students to get involved directly with legislatures and the processes. We want to raise it's presence. The president did ask the chancellors to identify at least one member outside the political science department, along with the provosts. Karen – This is a really good program and we should all be excited about this. The more we can get the word out the better. Paul – Glenn has done a good job of recruiting for it, but when we recruit for it, it is an invisible program for 364 days of the year, until Glenn gives a speech and gets people excited again. We need to up its presence and make it attractive to students. Anupma – Have a former student come to speak on the opportunity. If we had a list of former students, we could use them as ambassadors.
18. Master list of classes – Paul, 5 min. (attachment) – Will be moved to the next meeting. We want to look at overlaps and duplicates. Priscilla – The list came out of the subcommittee, but the list has not gone further than the committee and is not public.
19. Upcoming topics – All, time remaining
20. Roundtable – All, time remaining
 - a. Karen – None
 - b. Priscilla – Residency requirements for different programs at each university is the reason for the need to review the master list of classes.
 - c. Maria – None
 - d. John – None
 - e. Susan – None. Paul – Accreditation visit – do they want to meet with the president or the board? Susan – Will hear back from the committee next week.
 - f. Fred – Would like to let the provosts know that the map placement program, ALEX, there are a few issues that have come up and intends to reconstitute the subcommittee. He is looking for recommendations for some of the staff and faculty that were associated with the launch of the program years ago. The issues have to do with what are the processes for doing some of the annual updates or coding changes, students whose accounts have expired by they still want to have access to the account, and the student performance for testing and placement. There seems to be some discrepancy on their

- placement and if it is different versus whether it was proctored vs nonproctored. There may be some “cheating” in the online testing. Karen – Accuplacer says you cannot give that test without a proctor and anyone who is going to be a proctor has to go through their training and obtain 100%. Their lead librarian took the test and only received 78%. There are people in rural areas that are proctoring the exams. We think there are going to be real problems and there will not be anyone who can proctor the exam. This needs to be discussed soon. Paul – We need to discuss the costs to get people prepared for being proctors. Fred – Would like to get a subcommittee together to formulate the questions to bring to ALEX. Would like to start getting the committee together next week. Karen – Would like the committee to discuss both ALEX and Accuplacer. Fred – They are different vendors, but may be able to overlap the review.
- g. Saichi – Ted Stevens Internship – Last year towards the end of the year, a lawmaker contacted us and wanted to establish an exchange between the university of Hawaii and Alaska to honor both Ted Stevens and Danny Noi. We had a few meetings, but Alaska’s side was too busy. This may be something worth talking about again as we get the Ted Stevens Internship program going again.
 - h. Chris – Tomorrow at noon is the official start of Octoberfest.
 - i. Anupma – None

ACTION ITEMS:

ACTION: Provosts to look at the scorecard and clean up the projects. Paul would like to provide an update at the next Summit Team meeting.

ACTION: Paul and Karen will work on Strategic Pathways goal language.

ACTION: Fred to write up a brief history of concurrent enrollment subcommittee and send this to the provosts, as there are a couple of new people.

ACTION: Distribution of student tuition & fees across system – take Saichi off as the “owner”. - Done

ACTION: Paul will check to see SW responsibility with Blackboard in regards to fee payments and dropping students from class schedules.

ACTION: Paul will draft a memo for the provosts to distribute to the faculty regarding minors in the classroom and the “m” designation on class rosters.