

## Statewide Academic Council Summary – May 16, 2013

**Present: Dana Thomas, Susan Henrichs, Rick Caulfield, Robert Boeckmann, Elisha Baker, Helena Wisniewski, Gwen Gruenig, Fred Villa, Mark Myers**

1. Approval of the summary of the April 2013 meeting – Approved
2. New Program Proposals, see <http://www.alaska.edu/research/sac/new-programs/> and Deletions - Attachments
  - a. New UAF Program - Bachelor of Arts in Secondary Education
  - b. New UAA Program - Master of Science, Mechanical Engineering – Bear will talk with new Dean next week and may pull the new proposal
  - c. UAA Program Deletion - Practical Nursing undergraduate certificate (suspended 2005)
  - d. UAA Program Deletion - Industrial Welding Technology (suspended 2010)
  - e. UAA Program Deletion - Nondestructive Testing Technology (suspended 2010)UAS will submit an Associate of Science program proposal for the September board meeting. UAA likely to have some program deletions for September.
3. Smarter Balanced Consortium – Rick Caulfield working with state led consortium on college and career readiness in math and English – align with common core standards by 2015-16 school year. Focus on K-12 middle and secondary school assessments. What are the roles for postsecondary? College readiness is the key element. Is the curriculum preparing secondary students for college? Assessment of the common core curriculum student outcomes is the focus of the group. Rick will share ideas and summary of issues periodically.
4. Metrics – Gwen Gruenig – Attachment – working draft of metrics discussed. Response by May 30.
5. Distribution of FY14 \$400K for Advising – not proportional – greatest student impact
6. Finding a common student survey across MAUs – the BOR heard at the AGB conference that they should hear the results of student surveys and they have told me they prefer a common survey. A process allowing some unique MAU questions would be advantageous as well. What are you currently doing and on what schedule? Please have a look at the following list of national possibilities. We will add what is being done now by MAUs, look at those, and propose an approach to the board. The major national surveys used by postsecondary institutions are as follows:
  - a. UCLA Cooperative Institutional Research Program freshman survey (CIRP)
  - b. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) – Indiana University
  - c. Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) – University of Texas, Austin
  - d. College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) – Indiana University
  - e. Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) – Noel Levitz
  - f. Evaluation Survey Services (ESS) – ACT

UA also has McDowell run a graduate survey

see <http://www.alaska.edu/student-services/staff/ua-grad-surveys/UA-Grad-Survey-2012.pdf>

UAS – McDowell ran a retention survey and intends to do this every 3 years- ran in 2009 and in 2012. They would like to continue doing this. Concerns about the national survey – sample sizes were too small, questions asked did not relate well to student issues. CCSSE took a lot of engagement from faculty and staff but did not provide information to create change. Rick ambivalent about this so we need to look carefully at different options. Standard national tools do not address the nuances of the Alaska mission. UA has unique features that national surveys may not capture or address well.

UAA – looking at tools – have not done a survey in several (3 or 4 years). Did NSSE a few years ago. Reaching out to non-returning students directly. Nothing in budget for next year. Did just use ModernThink for faculty and staff survey – great experience – 57% response rate included part-time, full-time, adjuncts, etc. well. Robert suggests that we can incorporate system specific questions into the national survey.

UAF – using NSSE on a roughly 3-year cycle – works reasonably well for Fairbanks campus undergraduate population. NSSE would not work well for community campuses. Does not see how one survey could work. Apply survey to 4-year programs and separate survey for rural and distance students. Okay with a systematic survey approach but need distinct categories.

Rick suggested working group look at the options and make recommendations. Susan Kalina, Carol Hedlin, Susan will name someone. Robert will take part as well.

Robert liked the idea of a common approach with some Alaska specific questions. He also suggested common timing cycle for their application. Got agreement on this.

7. Distinguished Professor – President likes the idea of special recognition by the BOR for truly exceptional faculty members. Should we attempt to provide some criteria or ask the various P&T committees to make no more than one recommendation (could be zero for many years) for such recognition per MAU per year? Faculty Alliance was mixed on support for this recognition. Concerned about how such folks might be recognized and criteria for nomination. Alliance should propose this and should not be administratively driven. Pick out some unique elements, e.g., unique contributions to Alaska – invention helping resolve an Alaska issue, art recognition, etc.
8. Review the UA 5-Year CTE plan draft document – Fred Villa – Attachment – Perkins funding requires a plan required by the federal government. 15% of such funding comes to postsecondary institutions in the state. Fred asked SAC members to review the draft plan and provide feedback on it. A response by May 30th is requested. The draft plan has also been sent to campus directors and a few others across the UA System. Feedback to Greta Goto or Fred Villa.
9. FSMI update – Attachment – Continue to have FSMI meetings weekly – occupational assessment with active industry input – then identify gaps in programs and use this for budgeting purposes. None of FY14 proposals were funded – would these be resubmitted for FY15 by MAUs or SW? UAS would like to see the fisheries technology in their proposal. Are UAF and UAA included in their FSMI budget proposals? Yes, still in play In FY15 discussion. No final UAF or UAA budget proposal list yet. Industry process not finished until fall. Should we go ahead with 4 proposals

not funded last year for FY15 or do we adopt some new ones that may arise in the fall from industry.

9. Discussion - What would you think of BOR policy including the following:

- a. Required UA common placement tests, placement scores, and expiration dates for English and Math – the tests, scores, and expiration would be mutually agreed upon by faculty alliance - potential students and their parents would appreciate this. UAF – some concern – good in one way but may stifle creativity and experimentation to improve placement. UAF is considering using ALEKS because it is much more effective and because it includes self-help improvement mechanism so students can improve their placement. Agree it is convenient for students. Slow to change with system wide approach. Robert – Alliance not homogeneous in responsiveness to this issue – but thinks a majority of membership is supportive of this direction. Directive to move toward common placement processes in math and English – would not preclude an MAU from experimenting and engage others in the conversation. Bear – really good idea – easier for students and parents –we should be discussing it all the time. Rick – overall good idea. Will a grade 11 assessment in K-12 allow for placement? Make regulation not policy – consensus on this.
- b. Baccalaureate admission requires ACT of 18 (or SAT equivalent) or UA scholar or APS eligibility (this could be stated in university regulation to make it easier to change, policy would simply say that regulation will set minimum admission criteria). We have clear evidence that poorly prepared students do not succeed in baccalaureate programs. In addition, I would to encourage the development of more AAS to baccalaureate pathways, which are common at other institutions. We should also be tracking transfer success from our community campus operations to our baccalaureate operations consistently and recognizing the campuses for those student successes.

UAF broadly supportive of this idea. UAF has a minimum admission standard – high school GPA of 3.0 or better is better predictor – use that rather than ACT 18. For those without GPA of 3.0, an ACT of 18 is alternative. Many minorities have average ACT lower than other students. We should look more closely at which students are successful and which are not in setting criteria. Helena – grade point average better predictor than test score. Robert – some faculty may see this as in opposition with our open admission policy – so we must emphasize we are still open admission and this is focused on baccalaureate admissions and in the best interest of students. UAA does not adequately identify who will be successful and who will not so this could help. Also needs clear development of AA/AAS etc. emphasize this. Dana would draft a motion for faculty senate consideration. Bear – ongoing discussion at UAA to create AA degree for under prepared baccalaureate students. What do we do for adults returning to post-secondary education after a delay? Rick was supportive of moving this item forward. There was consensus to move this forward.

10. Roundtable – Robert – UAA discussion on MOOCs – the catalog will read (roughly) “at this time we will not accept ACE recommendation of accepting MOOCs for credit.” However, this is dynamic and will be reassessed as needed. UAS took some exception to this. This may create a new transfer issue for the UA system if other MAUs behave differently.

Rick – UAS SOE is offering a MOOC. Would UAA accept that course for credit? Robert indicated that the UAA motion addressed ACE recommended MOOCs outside the system. Robert does not have an answer specifically but it depends on the broadness of the interpretation. A robust discussion is needed. Robert – UAA not concerned about distance courses but are concerned about MOOCs assessment of student learning. Add MOOC discussion to June meeting – Robert will work on definition of MOOC and how this is distinguished from distance education generally. Also, how do we deal with regionally accredited institutions transferring credits to us that result from MOOCs.