

Academic Council Notes

April 20, 2018; 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Attendees: Paul Layer, Fred Villa, Karen Carey, Larry Hinzman, Maria Williams, Priscilla Schulte, Susan Hencrichs, Lisa Hoferkamp, Chris Fallen, Susan Kalina, Jeff Jessee, Kelly James (scribe), Dan Kline

1. Safety Minute – Paul – 3:02

Paul reviewed Title IX, Safety Hazards, and requested that supervisors ensure that all safety trainings are current with all employees. – Safety training is just a small part of the process

2. Approve 3/22/18 meeting summary – All, 2 min. (*attachment*)

Correction, #13 – “Duane reported that UAA is seeking discontinuation of the AAS in Industrial Technology and the MA in Anthropology programs”. This is not a discontinuation, only a suspension.

3. March 22, 2018 Action Item Update – Paul, 5 min.

ACTION ITEM: Paul, Saichi and Myron will coordinate the EAB funding distribution once campus lead contract administrators are identified. In Progress

ACTION ITEM: Paul will forward a recommendation to the President regarding the UAA MS Global Supply Chain Management tuition proposal. DONE

ACTION ITEM: Paul will sign and transmit the UAF BA of Applied Management program addition PAR form. BOR agenda item

ACTION ITEM: Paul will sign and transmit the UAF BA of Sport and Recreation Business program addition PAR form. BOR agenda item

4. AC Scorecard updates – Paul, 10 min. (*attachment*)

Paul relates that very little changed from last meeting.

- a. MPA and MPP program and eLearning
- b. No movement on the Fee pay and Inquiry
- c. Program discontinuations and suspensions and programs – temporary suspension for UAA Associate of Applied Science in Industrial Technology
- d. Statement from FA regarding faculty’s opinion on the temporary suspension
- e. Distribution of fees – Saichi is working on this
- f. Completed changes will be left on the Scorecard for one complete cycle then will be archived
- g. As Strategic pathways wraps up, other items may take the place – what items do we want to focus on – make recommendations

There were no additional comments

5. UA – General Data Protection Regulation Compliance – Paul, 5 min. (*update*)

Paul reported that the Committee had a discussion that compliance will be met by May 25th. Outside vendors have addressed their compliance with the new regulation. Elucian has already been working on this to be sure we are in compliance. Paul reminds the group that there is information we collect, making us a vendor for others. We need to be sure not to collect information beyond what is required to comply with the new regulation. Paul will follow up with the council once the draft of regulations have been completed. IR has representation on the working group – Shiva and Andy Harrington (leaders). The committee is meeting weekly and updating regulations to meet the requirements.

6. New dual enrollment regulations implementation – Fred

Fred reported that the GC's response to the FERPA issue was that it was already covered in the board policy and regulation R09.04.060 and did not need to be repeated again in this set of regulations. Approval of AC was requested to take this recommendation and that it be sent to the President. Paul moved that we forward this on to the President for his review at this time. No objections were made.

ACTION: Paul will send this regulation to the president for his review and hopeful approval. The policy was approved at the last board meeting.

7. Career Coach economic impact demo – Fred, 5 min

Fred reported 4,700 unduplicated visits in the past 6.5 months with over 2000 people actively participating in the Career Coach site including completing the interest assessments to help steer them towards a job/career. Fred further relayed the economic impact of our completers with our students being placed in our communities' jobs, along with the variations of multipliers needing interpretation. EMSI is working on interpreting the data to assist the university in identifying which jobs and students are making impacts on the community economically, so we can be more informed on how we are making those decisions. Paul shared that recruiters and councilors at UAA are using the tool. Fred also added there is the research database (Analyst) to determine the values, and can also identify users needing additional support.

ACTION: Fred will put a more cleaned up report for the council at the next meeting for their reference and sharing.

8. Faculty Initiative Fund review process discussion – Paul, 10 min. (*attachment*)

Paul discussed that the proposals would be reviewed by the council. The RFP was left fairly general and is generating a lot of interest. We will have to evaluate those proposals as they come in. Looking at the RFP (item 5), there is a request to PDF email proposals to Paul's office. Kelly James will now be logging and responding to the

submitters as they come in. April 27th is the deadline and the evaluation of the proposal will begin April 30th to May 11th. Paul asked the group how do we do those evaluations, who will do those evaluations? The evaluation/rubric sheet was reviewed. Paul questioned whether we want to have faculty in areas of expertise who are not on the committee look at proposals. The committee does not have the expertise to properly evaluate proposals in areas outside of our areas of expertise. Review sheet covers the 7 areas highlighted in the RFP. These could be used as possible rubric in order to evaluate, then ranked on a scale up to 5, and using the 2 weeks between April 30th and May 11th to allow outside reviewers time to review the submissions. Roughly half the money may be disbursed.

DISCUSSION: Maria questioned past reviews of the Presidents Professors, how were the reviewers selected? Could we implement a similar methodology? Karen related that the provost may have been asked for recommendations of people who may do it. Maria was on the faculty executive board and states they were reviewed by UNAC members. Lisa commented that UNAC members would be the best reviewers. We will need to categorize the proposals first. Maria agrees and suggested the executive councils could meet once the proposals are categorized. Paul offered that he may be able to have them placed into categories within a couple days. The FA could solicit external reviews from 3 experts. Paul can then task the governance with finding the experts. Chris commented that the topics are broad and suggested that we not try to rate the intellectual merit of these, however we can elicit this from the external reviewers. There were several faculty members that would like to see the proposals reviewed by at least one external reviewer. Larry questioned if there was an equal split between the categories? Paul commented that the objective has to be what is going to have the widest impact across the disciplines. Is the project something that would, in the long term, have a bigger impact for the faculty? Fred commented that when he looks at the guidance, in reviewing the RFP, there are 4 areas. Under each of the 7 categories, there are suggested characteristics to discern other questions, and then a 5 point rating scale, which puts another question, what has more weight of the different characteristics. Take the model of section 7, reviewers will consider... Use that statement approach for the other 6 areas of review, rather than posing a lot of different points. Define the expectations. Chris is concerned about placing a numerical score to each and then holistically scoring the proposal. Maria agrees with Chris' comment and questions if some of the questions should be weighted? Having all equally weighted, tweaked next time. Paul was torn between the other options (weighting/equal/overall opinion). The review sheet can go to the expert reviewers and we can use this as our evaluation. Maria suggested combining the types, use the current rankings and then give an overall ranking. Susan H inquired as to quantity so far, with only one submission so far, but many inquiries. She suggests a 2-step process. Ad hoc reviewers first (challenging, but need appropriate faculty). They can review on a 5 point scale. We would take the proposals that scored well in the first set of reviews (above 3 on a 5 point scale) then have a group get together again to make the final decision. The panel would have the ability to compare one proposal to another. Ad hoc rates it based on its own merit. Paul questioned having the faculty rate based on the 4 or 7 criteria, and then the panel. Have the ad hoc committee review over a 2 week timeline. It would be difficult to find available faculty at this time of year with finals. Larry

comments that there are many ways to conduct a fair review. The timing determines a lot of it. If we want to have the biggest impact, there may be a way to provide benefit for each of the proposals by giving good feedback. This requires a tremendous amount of work on the council's part. The way to be fair to everyone is to have a very narrow scope review so only the expert gets to see a few of the proposals. Or, have a very large review group where everyone gets to see all. Larry prefers to the smaller group. Paul would like to be able to give feedback to the applicants and give recommendations for alternative funding for those we cannot fund.

Paul relates there is support for ad hoc reviews.

ACTION: Monday, Paul will get to the members of the council the areas of the areas of expertise based on the submitted proposals. He will also ask the alliance if they could find reviewers for the ad hoc proposals. Current UNAC members should be asked to do the review. Solicit opinions on what rubric style to use.

DISCUSSION: Maria questioned what to do if we get a bunch of proposals that all rank 4-5? Paul stated that the panel will need to make the decision in a more broad sense. Use the information from the technical experts and apply it to the broader scope. Chris shared that on NSF panels, there is a concern, but it mostly works out to be a spread. The final decision is made by the program manager. Paul relates that a reviewer doesn't want to be too critical in their rating, but in reading their comments it becomes clear who their choice would be. Maria brought up that there are some issues regarding review of the budgets by Grants and Contracts. Chris stated that Grants and Contracts believes this should be treated like a formal proposal. They said they will make it work either way. Paul shared that it is an internal award. URSA, Faculty Fund at UAA, and TVEP funds do not go through OGCA. Paul does not want them to go through OGCA, and should go through our office. Larry shared that there have been problems in the past where the proposal has gone external and that mistakes were made. If someone makes a mistake on this proposal, we can work with them internally. An external agency is a different process. Paul shared we are going to distribute the funding through the unit and that it will be managed internally through that organization.

Approval requested of the dean/director was to be sure that they have time allocated to the project (workload time available). Maria agreed the dean must acknowledge the workload. Paul commented that we will learn from this year's questions to use for next year.

9. eLearning Subgroup and issues around nonresident tuition for eLearning and community campuses – Paul, 5 min. Paul shared that Karen was elected chair of the subgroup. Karen provided a summary of the previous meeting. A lot of time was spent discussing contracting programs. People were not really interested in contracting out the entire program. Still in discussions regarding working with outside companies.

Karen also shared that nonresident tuition was being charged by some, but some programs do not. Paul shared the subcommittee was engaged in looking at the issues of coordination and bringing in people for services that could be provided, ie: marketing, developing programs, etc. There are issues that go on at the main campuses and rural campuses that need to be addressed. Karen relayed the committee had not met in a while. They will try to meet at least once a month. There are many things that they want to work on. Paul stated the eLearning will remain a standing item and updates on the Scorecard. Paul appreciates Karen agreeing to be chair of the committee.

10. Regulations regarding emeritus status at UA – AC to provide feedback to HRC – Paul, 5 min. (*attachment*)

Paul discussed the issue was that we have awarded emeritus status to staff across the system but there is no regulation to distinguish it from faculty. This is coming from staff alliance and is presented to AC for review.

DISCUSSION: There were no comments. Paul encourages everyone to take a look at the proposed changes. If you have anything, feel free to send comments to Paul who will pass those on to HRC for their consideration.

11. Policy and Regulation 10.02.040 changes – Provost, 5 min. (*attachment*)

Paul shared the Academic proposed policy change, which comes from UAA, renaming the Community and Technical College. Susan K states this is reflecting the shift from Tier 1 GER that has been moved over to that college because these and developmental courses have been separate, and bringing those together and building a stronger front door. Paul asked if there were any questions. There were none. Objections? There were none.

Additional change requested from UAF was presented. The proposal is to delete the SNRE as a separate unit in Policy and to add Cooperative Extension Services separately under Policy. Susan H. shared the academic element would be moved into CNSM and that the academic element is a department (regulation). They are not eliminating any part, just moving it into other administrative areas. Paul questioned if it is Susan's desire that under Policy the Cooperative Extension Service would be a standalone unit? Susan explained that the Cooperative Extension Service had previously been a standalone unit and it would return to that.

DISCUSSION: None. Objections: None.

ACTION: Paul and Kelly will send out to the council a revised version of the policy to reflect the changes to both the UAF and UAA policy.

At the May meeting, there will be a review of the regulation changes.

12. Regulation change for GERs – Lisa, 5 min. (*attachment*)

Paul: Regulation change to 10.04.04C3 came out of faculty alliance. Lisa commented that the proposal to change the current regulation assumption from “Credit may be counted towards general education or a degree major requirement, but not both,” to “A student shall not use a single course to meet more than one general education category”. The FA believes the current wording restricting dual-purpose credit unnecessarily limits student opportunities. They want to expedite and simplify the path to completion, simplify explanations of course completion and render tools like Degreeworks more manageable.

DISCUSSION: Fred questions if this change may be applied to credits that transfer from outside the institution to be applied to more than one academic degree or does it fall in line with current policy. Lisa explains that if the course transfers as a GER, it would fulfill the GER requirement and if it fulfills a course requirement, it could also fulfill a degree requirement. Paul asks if a course fulfills a course requirement, can it fulfill a minor requirement. Lisa further explains, the actual regulation does not specify that. If an English major takes intro to physics, can they also fulfill the general ed requirement? Lisa: A course may be used to fulfill major and minor degree requirements. Dan explains, a course can be used to fulfill a degree requirement, but not count multiple times. Rather than getting locked into specific, potentially constraining parameters, he suggests that it may also satisfy degree, major, and other minor requirements to allow more coverage. Paul believes that the term “other” opens too many doors and could be very liberally applied. Karen has no objection. Maria has no objection. Susan K agrees.

ACTION: Paul will forward this change to GC and upon their approval will be transmitted to the president for his review.

Dan Kline provided an update on GERS: The faculty are working collaboratively and are finding ways to align courses across the system. Because faculty are continuing to work to the last minute, there are a lot of things happening at the last minute. They are about 95% complete with the GENED matrix. The board has seen the adjustment that the faculty has made. Some of those, because of the academic review requirements will need to be reviewed in the fall. Dan will have a report ready in the June meeting and will be making recommendations. A primary concern was how to maintain the alliance. Paul mentioned there are a few outstanding GER alignment items. Paul appreciates the work they have done with a lot of efforts across the system. There are some courses that will be different, but are working towards aligning them. Lisa had no further additions.

13. Alaska College of Education (AKCOE): Organization at campus updates and timelines – Paul & Provosts, 5 min. Steve Atwater was named the Executive Dean. Provost News/Updates: Karen is looking forward to Steve starting on July 1st. They had a teacher council meeting this morning with good collaboration with the faculty. Susan H shared the integration of the school of education and CNSM is proceeding well. The interim dean of CNSM is initiating the search process for the School of Education and will probably be advertised within the week and filled

by the time Steve starts in July. Susan K shares their faculty are getting ready for the accreditation process. Paul looks forward to hearing what comes of that process. He does not anticipate any issues, but would like to be posted on any that come up. Paul is looking forward to Steve starting.

14. Faculty Alliance Update – Lisa, 5 min.

Lisa is putting together a faculty/system morale survey. A letter was created and sent from the faculty alliance through personal email encouraging the alliance to support the big budget. They have cleaned up the issues of the bi-laws and internal issues. They have requested faculty representation on the VPASA search. President Johnsen has agreed with one from each university. The VCR has been appointed to the VPASA search committee. A letter was drafted from the BOR regarding an addendum to the last report. They are talking amongst themselves regarding student success. Saichi Oba, Keith Champagne, Joe Nelson, Claudia Lampman and Lisa Hoferkamp are working on clarifying the nature of the group. Each group will be led by each university to discuss what works and what doesn't work, collaboratively improving them, and expanding what worked. The faculty alliance will discuss volunteers for the portal. They have begun making recommendations regarding the portal. Lisa will forward those recommendations in the next week. Paul – Thanks Lisa for her service, as this is her last meeting as chair. Chris will be taking over this position. No further comments. The President did request Gartner Group to take a look at the Portal.

ACTION: Saichi and Paul would be meeting on the portal, in addition with Orion Lawlor.

Paul appreciates the alliances interest in the portal. Lisa supports getting an external evaluation for the RFP proposal submissions.

~~15. Current FA stance on course blocks. It may be modified to include the MW vs MWF issue – Lisa~~

16. Administrative policy regarding high value non-credit workforce credentials – Paul, 10 min.

Paul: What are we doing that is benefitting Alaskans as they are moving into the workforce? The president has asked how we are going to capture this and is there a way to do this? Many programs do not fall into the endorsement category and are more of a one-off. Susan K – Is asking for more clarification of the area in question. There are courses, noncredit, continuing ed and then there is workforce credentials, like a certificate, but not credited. Fred related that a few years ago they tried to go through all of the outreach programs. It took 2 years. There are on-demand offerings where an employer, civic organization or individual looking for a course that can be applied to a particular job with potential for becoming financially dependent through employment or entrepreneurship. Transferring these skills to the citizenry is hard to quantify. The President is looking for ways to do this and to show how we are doing this. Lisa stated that Bonnie Nygaard has been working on this. Through

UAOnline, each university has a link showing where they are heading and what they are working on. Fred: Looking at it from a system level, if there are internal ways that the universities do that and how it is gathered, then we can build up more uniformly how we do that and present it to the regents and to the state as a whole. ACEP noncredit offering is a good place to start. UAA Kodiak has on-demand training modules that are Rubbermaid tubs with appliances or items that can be taken to the site to provide the training. Can these also be captured in this? Priscilla states the campuses are putting together a list of partnerships with the community, which may be another way to show this. Susan H states a couple of years ago, CE purchased the Lumen and MAAPPS programs. Paul and Cam Carlson had discussed Arctic 101 training for the military on issues in the arctic. Capturing those efforts is going to be important in this report.

This all relates back to the goals of the people of the state. Not the same as degree completions, but to have value and engagement.

ACTION: Paul is requesting assistance in getting up to speed on these from the three universities. Fred can help organize this. Paul will then convey this to the leadership, Board and Legislature.

17. Upcoming topics – All, time remaining

June board meeting (May 31st & June 1st): Jeff Jessee will provide an overview. The President will give update on COE. Paul and Saichi will give an update on the Portal. Policy changes.

18. Roundtable – All, time remaining

Chris –none

Fred – When the college of health became the leader of health programs that there was going to be a regular update. Workforce development issue: 8 years ago, then president gamble wanted to develop a concept “Halo” programs around the maritime – Maritime Works – establish domestic maritime designation – Fred will provide an update by the following meeting – provide opportunities that may provide funding opportunities.

Jeff – COH – none

Susan K – None

Lisa – None

Susan H – None

Priscilla – Community campus directors met, looking for greater ways to create efficiencies and will have a proposal at a future meeting.

Maria – Have a wonderful weekend

Larry – Research council is having the 3 leads from OGCA meet for 2 days in early May to work out potential strategies to joint training sessions to make cross campus collaborations more efficient

Karen – none

Adjourn: 4:58