b. Any objection from SAC that this resolution should not be passed? None heard.
c. ACTION ITEM: Dan will let President Johnsen know that SAC does not have any objections to the Resolution of Support for the Alaska Postsecondary Access & Completion Network and the statewide postsecondary attainment goal of "65 by 2025" being sent to the Board for consideration.

5. Tentative UAF School of Fisheries and Ocean Sciences restructure/rename – Susan Henrichs
    a. This matter will not go to the

hnsen kno

a. Joint Board of Regents (Board) and State School Board of Education (SBE) subcommittee members had a meeting and concluded a College readiness definition is needed to help high schools know what the University expects. This would allow them to work toward a goal to have students prepared and reduce the need for developmental courses. There was frustration expressed that a definition is not in place.
b. Regent Fisher and Regent Tueber have been working on this.
c. Definitions were proposed by ACPE and the University (President Gamble, faculty alliance and ISER). The proposed definition was comprehensive, but spoke to Bachelor's degrees. Concern expressed that people wanting Associates degrees or certificates were not addressed. President Gamble proposed that we shorten the definition to say the student would not need developmental courses. This definition was pulled from the last Board meeting.
d. Board would like a proposal they can adopt into policy. Thoughts on the short version or the faculty alliance version?
    i. Developmental courses as part of the short definition is not necessary as students fail because they are not ready to complete college level courses. Also, a definition is not relevant to students going in to a vocational study.
    ii. Options
        1. Can capture the short version of the previously written proposals (Bachelors and vocational degrees) in policy.
        2. Other schools that have adopted college and career readiness language have worked with their State K-12 programs. We should involve our K-12 offices so that the language is co-owned by both the University and K-12.
        3. Should a resolution be proposed to the Board by the Joint Board/SBE group?
        4. Should look at Steve Atwater's study because his group looked into what the high schools needed.
        5. The definition may not be needed in policy, but a resolution is a good idea.

8. ASA Committee Meeting on 5/26/16, 9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. – Dan
    a. Concurrent Enrollment – General Council prepared a legal brief for ASA that speaks through issues with a "no barrier" statement. There are legal and risk issues that come in to play with underage students i.e. underage student in a wine tasting class.
    b. The memo contains reference to items of concern as expressed by SAC in proposed regulation.
    c. As this is a counsel to the Board, the memo is not public.

9. Accreditation – Dan
    a. Single accreditation consideration has been asked for by the Board of Regents and by the legislature. UA requested a consult for single accreditation consideration from the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). NWCCU does not accredit a system, it has to be a university.
    b. Dan has reported to the legislature that $40K would save by consolidating to single accreditation.

c. A consult with NWCCU President Elman, President Johnsen and Dan is scheduled a week from Friday.
d. University of Maine is going through a similar process.
e. Comments/questions
    i. Include people from the campuses in meetings with NWCCU.
    ii. Institutional accreditation is a peer-reviewed process through voluntary service from university administrators to ensure the university is meeting requirements. Commission might be unwilling to offer black and white solution. Will probably offer thoughts/comments on issues that might come up. Basic question will be whether UA can comply with NWCCU standards.
        1. Clarification: the letter sent to President Elman was to open a dialogue regarding a single accreditation only, not asking the commission to make a decision.
    iii. Were there questions from the Board of Regents at the last meeting that changed their mind from the 3+1 model? Yes, there was, but the specifics cannot be recalled. ACTION ITEM: Dan will review Board of Regents meeting minutes regarding the 3+1 model.
    iv. Is the consult with NWCCU the extent of the investigation? Yes, these meetings with NWCCU will be the extent of the conversation. The white paper on accreditation mentioned in the Statewide Transformation Team are separated by time and may be slightly different in their directions.

10. Single Instance Blackboard – Karl
    a.

11. 2016-2017 Meeting Schedule

3. MEE (Master's in Electrical Engineering): This has been a specially named version of the non-thesis version of the master's, but is now is being renamed to match traditional Master's degree naming.
4. ACTION ITEM: Dan will forward the proposed UAF program deletions (RUST, MEE, Theater) with "consensus of SAC" box checked.

16. Roundtable – All
    a. SAC materials can be distributed to anyone deemed appropriate as topics covered are generally not confidential.
    b. No other comments

ACTION ITEM: Dan will let President Johnsen know that SAC does not have any objections to the Resolution of Support for the Alaska Postsecondary Access & Completion Network and the statewide postsecondary attainment goal of "65 by 2025" being sent to the Board for consideration.

ACTION ITEM: Saichi will bring the Green Dot Training discussion up with Title IX committee.

ACTION ITEM: Dan will review Board of Regents meeting minutes regarding the 3+1 model.

ACTION ITEM: Dan will forward the MA in Marine Science PAR form and check "with consensus of SAC" box.

ACTION ITEM: Dan will forward the proposed UAF program deletions (RUST, MEE, Theater) with "consensus of SAC" box checked.