

Academic Council Agenda

1/4

October 19, 2018; 3:00 p.m. – Faculty and Staff Meeting – Academic Council – Pt. Seb. Bd. – FsU – 300

1. Safety Minute – Paul – It will be slippery tomorrow with the snow, drive and walk with care.
2. Approve 9/21/18 meeting notes – All, 2 min. (*attachment*) -
3. September 21, 2018 action item/regulation implementation update – Paul, 3 min. (*attachment*)
 - a. Clean up the scorecard – projects – academic programs – GER requirements
4. AC Scorecard updates – Paul, 5 min. (*attachment*) – We tried to clean it up last month. It was discussed at Summit team. UAA is still working on the MPA/MPP program. – John – Stalled in progress due to the new director search. E-Learning sub-council – didn't meet last time because of travel.
5. UA Regulation R.04.04.070 Emeritus Status & R04.07.095 Staff Emeritus – Paul, 10 min. – Paul is requesting suggestions from the council. Susan – Had no comments or concerns. Chris – Since it was driven by the staff, they didn't want to comment. Emeritus status for faculty being revoked was not a popular item with the faculty. What constitutes an “extreme” event to cause revocation. ACTION: Paul/Kelly will send UA Regulation R04.04.070 Emeritus Status & R04.07.095 Staff Emeritus to GC for review and recommendations.
6. Common Calendar – Approval Process – Paul, 10 min. – We have a common calendar that has been approved by the FA for 2020, 24 nd

concurrent enrollment. Indiana or Illinois made it a policy that the universities were to offer classes. There were different issues that cropped up in different cases. Some students were finding problems with financial aid and grades by the time they graduate high school. Paul – Sen.

11. UA Gateway update – Saichi, 5 min. – We have been working for 3 weeks now with the new company. The implementation team has been working. Phase 1 is the first 90 days. The board will be shown a presentation on an update. They are trying to establish a domain name. Academy one will block off the domain for building upon. Be creative, bold, suggestions are welcome.
Chris – suggests Alaska.edu
12. EAB implementation and future considerations – Saichi, 5 min. Client lead sessions, Alaska Contingent – each campus updated where they were. Fairbanks still has some questions. They are holding off implementation. Fairbanks and SE are still interested in going with Campus. The Governance model was discussed – Individuals from around the system sits on a team and makes recommendations about what is needed. We have had a small working group to report back on how things are moving forward.
13. ALEKS update – Fred, 10 min – The intent was to have no more than 3 meetings so we could hear from faculty without bogging them down. Issues were student accounts expiring before they completed the developmental part before they could test for placement. Also, do more research about proctored and un-proctored testing placement. One recommendation is to try to work with Enterprise Services – if a student’s placement score was more than 12 months, then that score should not be valid for placement. They did want to keep it open so they could continue to develop. Because those instances are not perceived to be excessive, they have agreed to do this for no extra cost. If there was additional need for testing, they can also un-pair the records and

with a concern of this being an additional hurdle to cross for students and could be a deterrent to coming to UA. Karen – UAS is changing their policy to allow students to register prior to taking the ALEKS placement so they can get the student into the system first. ACTION: Paul is empowering the subcommittee to conduct periodic reviews of the math placement students and to assess the process. (scorecard) Saichi – UA has allowed so much to be backed up to the start of a term that it has become a detriment to students. This committee has the potential to improve the student success rates by scaling back some of these hurdles. Anupma – Are there any hurdles being identified with other universities? Fred – It is definitely coming up geographically, but the same problems are coming up nationally.

14. eLearning Subgroup Committee update – Karen C, 5 min. - Has nothing to report this month.

Paul – Owen will be on the eLearning subgroup.

- a. eLearning Charter – Paul, 5 min. – The president has the charter, but has not had a chance to review it. Will need to place this on next month’s agenda.

15. Faculty Alliance update – Chris, 5 min.

- a. Faculty Initiative Fund – Chris, 15 (*attachment*) – Paul – We would like to get the FIF RFP out sooner to have more time to gather and review proposals. Chris – The easiest change would be the timeline. Stretching out the timeline, keeping everything within the school year and within the faculty’s contract time. Proposal guidelines – During the review process, there were different size proposals for requests. It was difficult to evaluate large next to small. Propose to create 3 different tiers and have the faculty choose which level they are going to submit to. Up to \$10,000 with 10 awards, etc. Also, lengthened the project duration from 1 year to a 12-24 months. Adding a different category, Innovative Research, Scholarly endeavors, seed money, add – projects that show partnership between the community and university. Following this, they would like to work on the evaluation process and get a better handle on this. Anupma – Suggests saying “about” or “up to”. Maria – \$5,000-20,000 tier 2 amounts. Paul – Duration – Having a 12-18 months. For a Tier 2 to have 12 months of funding. For a Tier 3 to have a single event or a month of funding. ACTION: Paul – 9/11 talk with Geoff Boccia (5/11/16)

justice, energy and health care, based on the research needs of state? Proposed timeline – 2/1/18 to submit, review period at end of March. Announcement 5/1/19. Paul – Supervisor approval – Does this become part of the workload? Did this have to go through the sponsored programs office? Anupma – Only have Tier 1 proposals to go through OGCA. Maria – The budgets had varied so widely on the proposals. Would not like to put so many restrictions on these that it deters people from applying. Karen – The most important parts are the collaborations that come from these proposals. Kelly – A common question that came across the desk was how many proposals could be submitted per person.

5617er

