

Academic Council Summary
June 15, 2018; 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

1. Safety Minute – Paul – Usually a focus on physical safety, as there is a lot of construction around, but also a focus on Title IX and sexual predators and harassment and keeping an eye out for what is going on around you. Keep an eye on the people in your environment and not accommodating the behaviors. This is something that we need to be aware of for safety in our community. This is a focus for the president moving forward, making the campus a safer place.
2. Approve 5/18/18 meeting summary – All, 2 min. (*attachment*) – Done
3. May 18, 2018 Action Item Update – Paul, 5 min.

ACTION: Paul will check with the Executive Council to see where the common calendar should be assigned. – Done.
Saichi will work with the registrars at each campus and also with governance. Saichi – The next calendar will go out to July 2023 by the end of the month or beginning of July.

ACTION: Kelly will update scorecard. - Done

ACTION: Paul and Kelly will send the requested changes regarding emeritus status at UA to GC for their evaluation. – Done. Pending GC evaluation.

ACTION: Duane, Karen and Susan – Send Kelly the changes. Leave Policy alone, clean up Regulation. Make sure Regulation is consistent with Policy. – Done

4. AC Scorecard updates – Paul, 10 min. (*attachment*)
 - a. Working on the initiatives, UAA MPP/MPA Program, in the hands of UAA. Will continue to work on this in the fall.
 - b. E-Learning was supposed to meet yesterday, but delayed the meeting until Tuesday, when they will have a presentation from a vendor to look at possible publishers.
 - c. Concurrent Enrollment is still with the GC or with the president on the actual Regulation change. Still working on the fee issue.
 - d. Academic Unit Establishment, Major Revision, and Elimination: SNRE and addition of CES – The Board did approve UAF's request to change the name to Cooperative Extension Service with a delay of implementation until July 2019.
 - e. Remove UAA-Community and Technical College name change to College of Technical and University Studies.
 - f. Proposed BOR regulation change to R10.04.04C3 – Approved by the President for dual purpose credit.
 - g. Suspension of programs – we are working on. The scorecard will be updated based on the discussions today and will be recorded for the next meeting in July.
5. UA Gateway update – Saichi, 5 min – The President had a presentation for the BOR on this. Saichi – The RFP was originally going to close on June 12, which was this last Tuesday, but the RFP had to be reissued because of some questions that needed to be answered. There were about 17 questions that required responses and by the time

they were able to gather all of the answers, John Hebard had made a decision to delay the closing date to June 18th. They are still on track to finalize and sign a contract in July. The scoring team includes an individual from each university, along with Saichi and John Hebard. A related ongoing project, Strategy 360, is a company that was hired to do the usability testing. They have identified the path that we want the user to go through and the steering committee has offered feedback on the characteristics that the test subjects were looking for. There were a total of 15 test subjects, 11 of them will be within the state of Alaska, 4 will be from outside the state of Alaska. The mix has reached everything from traditional to adults with some college, the majority are nontraditional. They expect to have everything completed by the end of July and provide an analysis by that time. The Regents are going to be off all summer, but have requested a written report by mid-July to give them an update before meeting again in September.

ACTION ITEM: Saichi will Email a list of the Gateway committee members to Paul.

6. Faculty Initiative Fund review update – Paul, 15 min. – Paul – Thanks the council for the time that it took to do reviews. He knows it was a lot of work and effort, and we had received a lot of really strong proposals. To recap, following the ad hoc reviews for each proposal, they were ranked and the top dozen or so constituted about a million dollars in requests. These were moved to the second stage of the review, which included a small panel of Lisa, Maria, Susan Henrichs, Duane Hrcir, and Paul. They were scored and ranked based upon the reviewer comments and proposals, and then identified 8 with a little bit of budget adjustment that came in at the \$500,000 mark. Paul went to each of those 8 people were given a deadline of yesterday afternoon to get back to him with a revised budget, and all of them responded positively. They were also given the option to modify their abstract in addition to the budget. We will publish the titles, abstracts, and PIs for each of the proposals and publish them on the website. In addition, per the CBA, we will notify Academics of who the recipients are. There was good balance across the system, great collaboration and a good cross-section of disciplines. Some of them from disciplines that do not normally get a lot of funding support. Some had community partnerships. We will get that finalized early next week and will send out letters to each of the PIs that did not get funded. Paul is deciding the best way to respond to review and score inquiries for those that did not get funded. He can do it in a very quantitative sense based upon the ad hoc reviews. Letting them know where the concerns were. For a lot of the reviewers, there were no comments, only scores. The CBA states that the decisions are the sole responsibility of the Academic Council, so actually they are not owed a response. Paul has also responded to some of the requests regarding the process stating that we will be revisiting the process in the fall. A 10 percent success rate is not a very efficient process for the proposals or the reviewers and would like to make it more efficient. If anyone has any thoughts on giving feedback to the proposals, please let Paul know. Susan H. – Feels that it may be awkward to provide reviews verbatim. It would be best to share more qualitative things, such as let them know if they were within the top 20 percent. This would give them an idea of whether they were close or not. Another point would be to compile a list of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals. Help give the people the things that we are looking for in a proposal (collaboration, etc). When we debrief in the fall, maybe we should consider categories. Paul – One of the ways that we can do this is to go back to UNAC and tell them that we would like to encourage members to apply, and maybe they could help partner to mentor faculty in proposal writing. One of the purposes in this exercise is to

get faculty outside of the traditional proposal writing areas, sciences for the most part, and engineering, to think about writing proposals. Some of the proposals that were not funded at this time may be good enough to go through other agencies for funding. Some campuses have done proposal writing workshops, but UNAC could also be a way to engage them, helping their faculty and their members be competitive for this. Since we are bringing in UAFT faculty in to the process, we want to advantage them as well, making sure they know the process.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will talk with Labor Relations and eventually with UNAC to plan a good way to move forward with assisting faculty members (UNAC and UAFT) with the next call for proposals.

Lisa – When the review of the RFP happens in the fall, she is wondering if we would consider input from UNAC?

Paul – The contract is written that the Academic Council has the responsibility for this process. It does not say that we will do anything with the union. He had engaged the Faculty Alliance because you are members of the council, and felt that was the appropriate avenue for faculty input, rather than going through the union. If you look at the CBA itself, it says the Academic Council (SAC) will decide on the process. He could go back through Academics, but would rather work through the Council, and especially the faculty representation on the Council, rather than engaging the union as another negotiation. Once you've engaged the union, you are negotiating something in the CBA. That is a little bit of a different process than just simply having the Alliance help contribute to an RFP.

Anything that he would discuss becomes a negotiation outside of the contract and Paul is not supposed to do that. He would have to bring in Geoff Bacon and it would be a formal request and a signed agreement on the process. It is our responsibility. That is what it says in the contract, let's keep it that way.

ACTION: Paul will take a look at the FIF proposals and come up with qualitative points to provide the PIs.

One of the things that had come forward during the BOR meeting was that Regent Davies would like to see the proposals that weren't funded. For the funded proposals, there is no problem. They are funded and will be public. However, the non-funded proposals aren't publicized in any way. They are still sort of proprietary intellectual property, because they haven't been funded and they may want to pursue other funding sources. Paul is not willing to publicize 80 proposals in terms of their titles. He can share those with the Board, but he is unsure if we want to go farther than that. Again, for the funded ones, we will publish the titles and abstracts so they can see what we are doing with the funding. In the CBA, we have to notify the union on the funded proposals. The unfunded proposals are still the intellectual property of the proposer and he does not want to publicize those out farther because they could be scooped. Lisa – What about publishing just the abstracts? Paul – Even publishing the titles can be scooped by somebody else. He is really reluctant to publicize those proposals.

7. Revisions to UA Regulation R.10.04.040 – Lisa Hoferkamp, 15 min. (*attachment*) – Paul – This is a proposal from the Alliance to do major changes to the General Education Requirement definitions. Of note, the change that was done to R10.04.04C3 has been signed off by the President that says a student shall not use a single course to meet more than one General Ed category, however General Ed courses may satisfy degree requirements. That has been approved by the President as a regulation change. Everything else is a new proposal from the Alliance. Lisa – The language provided in the motion was developed by SW General Education Learning Objectives committee, and then was later revised by the General Education Learning Objective team in 2015. Proposed revisions were sent to each of the faculty senates, voted on and approved, and now presented to the Academic Council. They deal

primarily with minor revisions to disciplinary categories, as well as minimum credit distribution. Also, General Education courses should be at the 100-200 levels. It has already been approved for dual purpose GERs.

DISCUSSION: Paul – Would like to recommend that members of the council take this back to the campuses, give it a thorough read and make a decision on it at the next AC meeting. We can get it moving forward at the July meeting if there are no other objections to it. He would like to get feedback from the Provosts and academic leadership as well, before we move this forward to the president. Lisa – Would like to add that the GER alignment effort does hinge on a few of these, so it is important that these revisions be approved.

ACTION: Paul will talk with the Provosts regarding feedback on Revisions to UA Regulation R.10.04.040. The Provosts will provide feedback at the July meeting.

8. UAA Academic Units Regulation Revision R10.02.040 – Duane Hrcir/Susan Kalina, 5 min. (*attachment*) – Paul has not had time to collate the next 3 agenda items into a single document.

ACTION ITEM: Kelly will collate and provide a clean, track changes copy of the R10.02.040 with all 3 campuses' changes.

9. UAS Academic Units Regulation Revision R10.02.040 – Karen Carey, 5 min (*attachment*)

10. UAF Academic Units Regulation Revision R10.02.040 – Susan Henrichs, 5 min (*attachment*). Susan - There is a small name change in Policy. Alaska Earthquake Information Center to Alaska Earthquake Center. There are a lot of units listed that are service units and Summer Sessions has a lot of units listed. The Policy is very expansive in its definition. Paul – If it helps to give the units' structure, he does not have a problem with them being on the list. It can be an exhaustive list. This can give some guidance to the President and Regents on what kind of things we work on, which is the purpose of this list. It is up to the provosts on how deep they want to go on this list in terms of research areas or departments. Discussion: Susan would like more consistency. Duane suggests talking a little more offline about the direction to take. Paul suggests the provosts work together to coordinate the structure and will take this up again at the July meeting. Give a good overview of who we are as an institution and provide consistency. Keep in mind that if it is in Regulation, then any changes made within the units needs president's approval to change them.

11. Accelerated Masters in Civil Engineering – Duane Hrcir/Susan Kalina, 5 min. (*attachment*) Duane – UAA is proposing a fast-track master's program for Civil Engineering. It is very much like the one we did this year for Mechanical Engineering, consistent with how Fairbanks does their petroleum fast-track. It is really driven by the students and their desire for well-prepared students and to move quickly into the master's program and get them into the workforce in Alaska. There is a lot of support from our industrial partners. Discussion: Paul – Given it parallels what was done for their other program, it looks pretty good to him. He did not see any red flags on it. Objections to the proposal moving forward? None. We will prepare this to move to the Board for approval. ACTION ITEM: Kelly will place "Accelerated Masters in Civil Engineering" on the BOR agenda for September.

12. UAF Notice of Intent to Suspend Admissions – BA in Chemistry – Susan Henrichs, 5 min (*attachment*) Susan – Something to emphasize, they are keeping the BS in Chemistry. The BA in Chemistry has been in place for years, but almost no one ever graduates from it, something like one degree in 10 years. There are generally 8-10 students enrolled in it, but they do not complete the degree. Discussion: Paul recalls back when he was dean that there was

a discussion on the need to keep it for the Justice Forensic program or Teacher Education program, or some other need to provide a BA pathway in science. Susan – They decided it wasn't attracting any students to the program. They are keeping the BA in Earth Science and BA in Math as a preparation program, and also in Biology. Paul – This would be a suspension in admissions at this time. Objections to the proposal moving forward? None.

ACTION ITEM: Kelly will forward the UAF Notice of Intent to Suspend Admissions – BA in Chemistry – to BOR.

13. UA – General Data Protection Regulation Compliance – Paul, 5 min. (*update*) Paul – A committee that is chaired by Shiva has met to develop our policies to be in compliance with the General Data Protection regulations coming out of the European Union. He thinks we have gone through what we have and are moving towards compliance with that. We are also working with our vendors who use our data and we are in compliance on that side as well. We have their certificates of compliance. In looking at the notes from the steering committee, which has representation across the system, from May 24th, basically we have looked at all of our privacy statement policies. Looking at the next steps, there will be a GDPR web presence on the Information Management site that is being developed. A data privacy working group is going to be created to look at how we are continuing to conform with the regulations. We will have a UA statement on data privacy that will be posted to inform people on their privacy rights and then we will do some testing on how well we are maintaining student records. This is an ongoing project.
14. GER discussion: alignment update, Alaska Native Theme implementation – Paul, 5 min. – Paul – No updates. Lisa and Dan did a big presentation to the Board, which went well. The Board was very appreciative of the efforts of the faculty in moving towards alignment and complimentary to the committee. We are still a long way from GER alignment. The Alaska Native-themed GER, UAA is moving forward with that this year. UAF is going to continue to try to develop courses and processes for that now. Paul thanks the faculty for pushing this forward. It is an ongoing process.
15. SCoR update – Paul, 5 min. – Paul – Paul is taking over as co-chair of SCoR. In taking on the VP position, he takes over as co-chair of SCoR and also chairman of the Research Council. SCoR works on the Innovators Hall of Fame and will be doing requests for nominations for this in the fall. He is also working with the governor's office on the state climate action for Alaska. There are updates from the three major programs in EPSCoR from Anupma, NASA EPSCoR from Denise Thorsen and the INBRE update from Brian Barnes. INBRE has their renewal pending and NASA just submitted their proposal. The SCoR meets quarterly, so will meet again in the fall. The committee also discussed the role the committee would take in helping to shape proposals to the legislature for funding in the areas of research, to help coordinate across the university and across the state, working with agencies and also working with the legislature.
16. Administrative policy regarding high value non-credit workforce credentials – Paul, 10 min. Paul – Did not get very far in that last month. He started conversations with Greg Gruenig on the IR Council on how we will be able to track those, but this is something that is kind of a summer project. He will be working with Fred and Gwen to figure out who we need to pull together on that. Right now we have some ideas on what is out there.
17. Upcoming Topics: Question posed by the Community Campus Directors Council on classes being offered across the campuses – Priscilla, 5 min. – Priscilla – It is the effort on some of the community campus directors to address

Strategic Pathways, goal number 2, to increase collaboration across community campuses. They are trying to put together a list of classes and programs that we share across campuses. The question comes, if it is run from a different university, so if UAF has a program or course they want to add at UAF, we have already discussed the fact that in order for it to become a UAF program, it would go through the committees and faculty senate. The next issue that they are seeking clarity on is, if one campus wants to deliver something to another campus, are there any limitations to that? One of the issues that came up is, do you have to report this to NWCCU. Susan K – There is a broad rule that says, in order for a campus to advertise that they offer a program, they need to offer at least 50 percent of the courses that are required for that program. They could potentially bring in course credits from other campuses. Priscilla – It seems we do that a little bit with the nursing program at UAA that is offered at other campuses, but it is not a percentage. It is not offered at the UAF nursing program, but just have the UAA program in Ketchikan. In this case, it is still a UAA program, just being distance delivered to Ketchikan. This may answer the questions that we have. We are trying to collaborate among the community campuses, but because they are separately accredited universities, things are more difficult to do. Susan H. – You can also get approval from NWCCU to offer certain programs as a consortium. Susan K. – Has read on the rules and regulations and the main thing is that the three campuses need to figure out what they would like to do and how it benefits the universities and it really depends on what is being proposed. Priscilla – If the community campuses wanted to share programs in some way, they would work through the provosts.

Fred – We are working very closely with the Department of Labor and Workforce Development and are taking the lead on the process for being designated as the University of Alaska System for the state of Alaska as a domestic Maritime Center of Excellence. That was an authorized activity by the Federal Government when they signed in the Defense Authorization Act in December and it looks like that process is very well underway. There is public comment in the Federal Register regarding eligibility and definitions regarding that designation. We are working to help make sure that the university is qualified to apply for that. We are part of about 15 college consortium across the country that have strong interest in and are potentially eligible to apply for that designation. We would be worthy of applying for it later this fall. Designations of Alaska Domestic Maritime Center of Excellence is planning on being reviewed and approved early in 2019. What that means for the community colleges and entities that are designated, is some revenue streams that will come in. The first year it is projected to be approximately \$1M per designated center of excellence, plus about \$15M that would be in a competitive grant arena designated for those maritime centers of excellence to expand and enhance their programs. It also potentially has other federal resources available to us, including what they call a Ready Reserve Fleet, which is a fleet of vessels that the Federal government has in ports around the country that are available to use in case of a national emergency, but to be able to port some of those in Alaskan waters near our community campuses and programs would give us an opportunity for technical training programs on actual working vessels. People could get sea time, which is critical for mariners to become qualified by the US Coastguard. It will give them working experience and access to resources that we otherwise would not be able to afford. There will be more on that in the coming months. Paul – We are going to be looking at how we can develop these programs across the Center. Priscilla – This is where the external accreditations are important, because the Coastguard is very strict on what you do, where you do it, who

is teaching it, what is being taught. Everything has to be approved, the curriculum, the classroom, instructors, everything. All of this needs to be coordinated.

Paul – In general, we are trying to do some very innovative things, in both the community campuses and the main campuses, working across the universities. It still seems to him that every time we are trying to do something it is an exception rather than having guidelines/best practices for how we are going to develop programs of various types. He is hopeful that as we continue to have these discussions that we can get some of this down in terms of what the best practices are going to be and help to facilitate these. It works well with our accreditors, but also within our university. You do not want to have departments try to reinvent the wheel and not understand where things are going. He would like to try to develop some type of guidelines moving forward.

18. Upcoming topics – All, time remaining – Next meeting: July 20th

- a. Make a decision on revisions to the regulation regarding General Education
- b. Make a decision on revisions to the regulation regarding structure
- c. Audit Regulation

19. Roundtable – All, time remaining

Susan Henrichs – None

Duane – None

Jeff Jessee – None. Paul has been working with Jeff and is planning a workshop/working group on health programs across the system. Jeff gave a great presentation to the Board at the last Board meeting on May 31st, that was very well received. We need to coordinate our programs across the state and Jeff has been doing the whistle-stop tour to talk to people, and he appreciates Jeff doing this. Jeff – Appreciates Paul's help in putting this together. It will be very valuable.

Maria – None. Will probably be on travel for the next meeting.

Priscilla – Nothing new to add, but appreciates everyone's input. Paul appreciates the tie between the Council and the Community Campus Directors Council.

Saichi – None.

Fred – None. Going on vacation for a couple of weeks.

Action Items:

ACTION ITEM: Saichi will Email a list of the Gateway committee members to Paul.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will talk with Labor Relations and eventually with UNAC to plan a good way to move forward with assisting faculty members (UNAC and UAFT) with the next call for proposals.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will take a look at the FIF proposals and come up with qualitative points to provide the PIs.

ACTION ITEM: Paul will talk with the Provosts regarding feedback on Revisions to UA Regulation R.10.04.040. The Provosts will provide feedback at the July meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Kelly will place "Accelerated Masters in Civil Engineering" on the BOR agenda for September.

ACTION ITEM: Kelly will forward the UAF Notice of Intent to Suspend Admissions – BA in Chemistry – to BOR.