

Faculty Alliance Agenda

February 13, 2026

3:30-5:00 pm

[Zoom Link](#)

Members

<p><u>UAS</u> Ali Ziegler, President UAS Faculty Senate <b>David Cox</b>, President-Elect UAS Faculty Senate <b>Brian Blitz</b>, Past-President UAS Faculty Senate</p> <p><u>UAF</u> <b>Leah Berman</b>, President UAF Faculty Senate <b>Debu Misra</b>, President-Elect UAF Faculty Senate <b>Jennifer Carroll</b>, Past-President UAF Faculty Senate</p>	<p><u>UAA</u> <b>Matthew Cuellar</b>, President UAA Faculty Senate <b>Megan Ossiander Gobeille</b>, President-Elect UAA Faculty Senate <b>Jackie Cason</b>, Chair, Faculty Alliance and Past-President UAA Faculty Senate</p> <p><u>Ex Officio:</u> Brian Smentkowski, VP and CAO</p> <p><u>Support:</u> Noel Romanovsky</p>
--	--

1. Call to order – Happy Valentines – *When I think of us, I think \_\_\_\_\_.*

2. Approval of Agenda  
Approval of [January Minutes](#)

February Summary

**Summary**

**Data Storage Policy Changes**

Ben Shier gave a presentation about data management and storage policies. Ben explained that Google is no longer providing free storage, so the university needs to implement new data limits and retention periods. He outlined plans to manage Google and Microsoft environments more efficiently, including new standards for data storage and access. The implementation of these changes will begin with users who have been inactive for 4 years, and the university will communicate these changes to staff and students.

**Accessibility Compliance and Data Management**

The group discussed data limit enforcement, with a suggestion that communications about data cleanup be delayed until after the semester ends in early May. They also addressed a new federal accessibility standard requiring WCAG 2.1 compliance for all university digital content by April 2026, with Ben explaining that






institutions need to conduct internal reviews and establish work teams to prioritize accessible content production for summer and fall terms.

### **Legislative Fly-In Planning Meeting**

The group discussed plans for an upcoming legislative fly-in in Juneau, focusing on scheduling meetings with legislators. They encouraged participants to sign up for meetings and consider taking the lead in conversations with legislators.







### **Legislative Budget and AI Initiatives**

The group discussed their upcoming legislative meetings and finalized talking points for full funding of the Board of Regents budget, including compensation and academic programs. They agreed to address AI initiatives by highlighting university efforts while acknowledging competing proposals. The team reviewed and refined their one-page document for legislators, incorporating input on transparency, mathematics education, and revenue generation.

3. Guests: [Introductions as needed]
  - a. Ben Shier, Chief Information Technology Officer, accompanied by Jasmine Davis, Executive Director OIT Applications Services
    - i. Data Management.  
 02092026\_OITGovernanceUpdate\_DataLimits\_Accessibility.pdf
    - ii. Accessibility–Task Forces?
    - iii. Enrollment Barriers ([Signed UAF resolution](#))
4. New Business & Updates
  - a. Check in
  - b. Juneau trip–Feb. 25-26. Travel will run from 24-26, with meetings on the ground Wed. and Thurs. See the  Legislative Fly-In folder in the shared drive.
    - i. We MUST get a group picture!!!
    - ii. Travel and lodging arrangements finalized. Questions?
    - iii. Finalize  2026 Shared Legislative Visits Schedule for Faculty Alliance . Sign up for the meetings you wish to attend. Propose any last minute additions.
    - iv. Finalize  2026 Talking points for legislative visits .
    - v. See also,  AIRAK Overview number 1.docx
    - vi. See also, <https://www.uaafsa.org/> (draft of their legislative priorities below).
  - c. President Search Updates will continue to originate from this site, with the latest news being the distribution of the position profile. <https://www.alaska.edu/pres/pres-search/>.
    - i. Propose members of the representative group who will meet with Pres. finalists and ask questions. Reps will work with HR to solicit those questions.

1. UAA: Matt Cuellar; Megan Ossiander-Gobeille; April Alvarez (UAA Staff Council President); Jared Stapor (UAA Staff Council Vice President; *Arel Gutierrez (USUAA President); Emily Hufford (USUAA Vice President)*); Skye Nevada (Board President, UAA Alumni Association); Maria Williams (Chair, Alaska Native Studies). [students have not yet confirmed willingness to participate and sign NDA]
2. UAF:
3. UAS:

## 5. Information/Discussion

- a. Board of Regents Meeting.  February 2026 Documents.
  - b. Academic Council
    - i. Charter revision underway.
    - ii. Program proposals can move forward after the February BOR meeting upon provosts' and chancellors' request.
    - iii. The Common Calendar proposal is on the BOR agenda, in the Academic and Student Affairs Committee.
      1.  CCC Memo to AC - AY 2029.pdf
      2.  CCC UA calendar proposal AY 2029.xlsx
      3. Link to [Common Calendar Committee google drive folder](#) Bylaws for Common Calendar Committee-signed 11\_17\_2017.pdf
  - c. Emphasize the *faculty role in enrollment, recruitment, retention, and graduation*.
    - i. Draft:  Faculty Involvement in Recruitment, Retention, and Graduation
  - d. For reference:  Faculty Alliance Chair Report to Faculty Senates 1-30-26
  - e. *Paid Consultants*. Consider a resolution or motion requesting that administration consult with Faculty Senates before hiring outside programs/consultants (e.g. Gardner Institute) to conduct analysis. Context: UA has been spending a lot of money hiring outside consultants for various academic and fiscal analysis, even though there is a great deal of internal expertise that could be tapped. We might further resolve that administration.
- ## 6. Faculty Senate Reports and Updates
- a. UAA
  - b. UAF
    - i. Approved 5 new programs (BS Data Science; BA Tribal Governance; MS Aerospace; AAS American Sign Language; CT2 Legal Assisting)
    - ii. Approved a prioritization/guidance document for the Provost to assist her if she feels that she can only forward one or two programs to BOR (hopefully at a special meeting so new programs can be included in the Fall 2026 catalog) — although the senate is concerned about setting up a “cage match of importance” between programs that serve fundamentally different student populations (e.g., certificates are different that baccalaureate programs are different than graduate programs)
    - iii. Updated guidance on regular and substantive interaction in distance (synchronous and asynchronous) courses

- iv. Passed various catalog and policy changes
- c. UAS - passed compact resolution, questions about the DEI motion after “dear colleague” letter update

AY 25- 26 Calendar

Day (Friday, 3:30 to 5 pm unless otherwise noted)	Tentative Agenda Items
August 22, 2025	IT Security: Jeannette Okinczyc, Ben Shier
September 12, 2025	Student Regent, Fernando Escobar Megan Buzby, Common Calendar Committee Identify FIF Reviewers Discussion Items
Saturday, October 25, 2025 - FTF Strategic planning  AI Resources scattered (just a few examples): <a href="#">Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) at UA University GenAI Policies and Guidelines</a>   <a href="#">Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) at UA The State of AI at UAF: Fall 2025 Guides: Academic Integrity &amp; AI: Artificial Intelligence (AI)</a> <a href="#">Generative AI Security Standard   Office of Information Technology</a> <a href="#">AI Resources   Information Technology Services   University of Alaska Anchorage</a> <a href="#">Generative AI Guidance</a> (UAS)	Introductions. Brunch with Regents  Legislative priorities and plan to schedule meetings. [identify committees, legislation, and legislators we might want to prioritize. Ex. HB9, 10/SB118 (regent), 12, 23, 28, 29, 30, 34, 57, 69, 76, 88, 98, 165, 176, HJR24....Textbook Cost Transparency Act]  Thought Leaders Forum or alternative for telling our stories in ways that reach a public audience  Tie our stories to the attainment framework–what is the faculty role in enrollment, recruitment, retention, and graduation? Value propositions.  Discuss definitions of shared governance and practices to foster effectual shared governance at the senate and alliance levels  AI Steering Council
November 14, 2025	Determine Juneau F-T-F dates for February/March Begin planning process Notify Noel of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Full legal name.</li> <li>● Confirmation of dates</li> </ul>
December 12, 2025	
January 9, 2026	Guests: Luke Fulp, Nickole Conley
February 13, 2026	Guests: Ben Shier

March 20, 2026	Adjusted to be after spring break by one week
April 10, 2026	
May 8, 2026	

## Legislative Priorities

1. BOR budget—adequate funding, student success
2. Funding for scholarships—Fully fund APS
3. Capital funding—deferred maintenance.
4. UAA Annual funding “Fix and Repair” \$4-6m.

HB 10 ADD FACULTY MEMBER UNIV BOARD OF REGENT (Carrick)  
 HB 28 TEACHER/STATE EMPLOYEE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM (Story) *retention*  
 HB 29 SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE (Vance and Costello)  
 HB 34 ESTABLISH THE ALASKA INNOVATION COUNCIL (Holland)  
**HB 78** DEFINED BENEFITS –TRANSMITTED TO SENATE FINANCE  
 HB 88 TUITION WAIVERS-(Eischeid)  
 HB 176 STUDENT FEES-(Carrick)

SB 5 SCHOOL/UNIVERSITY EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE. (Hughes)  
**SB 28** RETIREMENT SYSTEMS; DEFINED BENEFIT OPTION (Giessel)-COMMITTEE  
 SB 118 FACULTY REGENT (Senate State Affairs)  
 SB 107 ALASKA SUNSET COMMISSION (Hughes, Kaufman)  
 SB 157 STUDENT FEES NOTICE (Gray-Jackson)

GO Bond for deferred maintenance?  
 Defined Benefits legislation  
 Supplemental budget

Hiring new UAA Chancellor- delayed  
 Governor Election -2026

## RECAP of Finance Discussion

**Luke Fulp:** We are really at the very beginning of exploring the possibility of adjusting our tuition structure. So, in terms of the project plan, the scope, we have some general ideas about how we would need to execute this, and how much time we would need in order to have it in place for the 2027-2028 academic year, which is kind of what we're aiming for, if we do proceed with it, but we are very much exploring the concept. And so, when we talked with the board on December 5th, during a special audit and Finance Committee meeting, that was really giving the board an idea that, hey, we're looking at this, and if you do not want us to proceed, please let us know, because it does require staff time and resources from across the system to really explore and dig into this and determine whether or not it's a good fit for our universities and our programs. It's actually a great time for us to get in front of the Faculty Alliance, in that respect, and so I appreciate the opportunity.

I brought Vicki and Kathy to this meeting because they are really the technical experts. So, they've started this work, under the CIS Modernization, the Student Information System Modernization Project, and then what happened was the board engaged EAB in a separate study. And EAB issued their report in January of 2025 around the system-wide attainment framework that deals with recruitment, retention, and graduation rates. I'm sure many of you are familiar with that study. Well, within that, they validated the idea that we should take the **surcharge** and build it into tuition, and so there's more transparency around **program surcharges** for students up front. And that **spreads the cost over more years**, and not just applied to a particular class. So, the idea is that generally, very broadly, students elect a major, and we know that that happens at different times during their academic pathway, or journey. But the idea is that they elect a major, and when they elect that major, they're accepted into that program, and then all of the credits they take from there through graduation are the same rate. And the idea there is that it just makes it much more clear to students what they'll be paying semester to semester. It's still based on their course load, so it's based on the number of credits they take, but it's not dependent on a particular class. Now dependent on the program they're enrolled.

### Luke Fulp

Okay, okay, and I saw someone took themselves off mute, so let's... let's have the first question.

### **Megan Gobeille—comparing programs with and without surcharges**

So as far as taking tuition surcharges and rolling them into the program, does that mean programs that don't usually have tuition surcharges, such as, like, an English major or a math major, those would stay the same tuition, then.

### **Luke Fulp—differentiated rates with a smaller differential spread over time**

That's... yeah, conceptually, that's what would take place. So there would be differentiated tuition rates, but we don't know how many there would be. And here's the thing, a surcharge could be anywhere between 20% and 50% of that base tuition rate. And so, what we're aiming for is for those programs that have surcharges, their tuition rate for students who are enrolled in those degree programs would be somewhere between a 10% to 20% rate increase over the base. *So it would be a smaller differential because it'd be spread out over more credits, providing a more consistent bill for the student during their time with UA.*

### **Jennie Carroll—same class, different rates for different students? Major switch?**

So, if you have a student, and you know, they're going to enroll in a particular program, and this program has a particular tuition rate, right? And that's the idea. So then they pay that rate throughout their entire program, is that only for the classes in their discipline, or is that across all classes? But if a student's program has a higher rate, are they going to be paying that higher rate for your core classes? Are you going to be paying that higher rate for your electives?

Are we gonna have students in the same class paying different rates?

What happens if you change your major?

### **Luke Fulp**

Yeah, these are all really good questions, and frankly, questions that we're grappling with today. We engaged with the universities before the break, and we said, you know, because it's part of our strategy here not to get ahead of the universities. What we've done is we've said, okay, this is the idea, this is the concept, we need you all to go out to your stakeholders, we need you to go to your deans, your faculty, your students, your provosts. and engage in this dialogue, and let us know what are the big rocks that we have to maybe contend with, or the showstoppers, the things that would really prevent us from doing something like this. It's very exploratory. The idea is that we do make things cleaner and easier to understand for students.

But there could be unintended consequences along the way. I think, you know, *changing degree programs*. What we know today is that for the GERs and the core classes, the idea is that those students would be paying more, but they would be paying over time to provide more consistency for what they pay semester to semester. If, you know, students sitting in the same class paying different rates for tuition, some would say, well, that happens today with, you know, resident status and other tuition charges that we have.

But *the goal is to make it so that for students who are enrolled in those degree programs with the surcharges, which are primarily going to be engineering, business, college of health.*

**Jennie Carroll—who receives the portion of the higher differential for courses outside the degree program?**

So what's gonna happen with this extra money, right? Is that gonna go back to engineering? Even if they're taking... let's say they're taking my classes and electives, then the extra money goes back to engineering, or are we going to be duking it out for engineering students, so that we can get more money.

**Luke Fulp—should be revenue neutral**

Because the student bill is gonna just show that student, let's say it's an engineering student, it's gonna show them that same cost per credit hour for all of their courses. What we do on the backside of Banner, where the student doesn't have visibility is we make that the more complicated piece. So, the customer-facing bill is cleaner, and that's the idea, is the student receives a more transparent, cleaner bill up front, but on the back side, we do have to map that revenue, that tuition revenue. Right now, the idea is that **we want that modeling to be done so that this is revenue neutral**. We don't want to build in hidden costs for the students. This is not a tuition increase that's going to be somehow hidden in this. **The idea is they take that surcharge, they spread it out over more credit hours, it evens it out.** It makes it more clear to students what they're paying semester to semester. But with that, then the departments have to work internally with the university leadership to figure out how that revenue gets mapped and how all the departments are able to get that same level of consistent funding they have in the path through tuition revenue.

**Leah Berman (she/her)--how will tuition be allocated once surcharges are distributed across the curriculum, including requirements from other departments?**

So you're saying you don't know how the universities are going to handle the tuition allocation in the new model. Currently at UAF, it's an 80% of the tuition generated by the course goes to the academic unit, and 20% goes central. So, if I've got a ton of engineers in my class, and they're paying more, does my college get more, or does the College of Engineering and Mines get more because it's their students that are paying?

### **Luke Fulp**

There's still going to be that component of the number of students enrolled and the tuition distribution in place so that there's a scalability to the revenue that departments and colleges and schools get. But *the idea is that through modeling, we are able to ensure that a stable amount of funding gets back to the appropriate school or college.* It will require some estimates and some fine-tuning for sure, but that work has not been done, and *that modeling is what's kind of before us as part of this project,* if we do proceed down this route.

### **Jennie Carroll—potential to decouple enrollment efforts from resource allocation incentives?**

Yeah, it totally makes sense, but it also... and of course, the university's gone in this direction already, but it completely decouples your actual enrollment and the effort that you put into getting more students and new students and offering, you know courses you can share across units. It completely decouples all of those efforts from the money we get, because these kinds of algorithms are not going to ultimately support these additional efforts. I agree we need to simplify things for students. So, on the student-facing end, maybe this'll be great. On the back end, as to how this money gets distributed, this is just gonna be a mess, and it's gonna be a dogfight. And it's gonna be decided based on somebody's perception of what programs are valuable, not the effort that's being put in. That's my guess.

### **Luke Fulp**

Before we move on to David, I just want to allow an opportunity for Kathy to jump in. Kathy's been real involved in this project from the start, so...

### **Cathy Ewing—a model of smoother distribution over the life of the program is not necessarily a resource reallocation model**

So I want to talk just briefly about what other schools do. When the CIS Modernization group came to the AR team, because we have that technical knowledge, you know, we started talking about how this would go. Our vision in presenting it and starting the dialogue. Luke is

100% right. It opens up, *what are we doing on the back side, and we need to have those conversations.*

But from the direction that we look at with other schools, let's say, and the direction that we were thinking when we started, *you have a base tuition rate that sits there, you know what it is, right?* So we kind of all start at this base tuition. *And then we roll in a smaller tuition surcharge, because it's not just on that class, it's on the program as a whole. So the student, as they go through that program, it's the same rate.* The idea would be that that surcharge would be going back to the program that originally had it. *Our goal was never to move money around.* Our goal was to change the tuition model. Now how revenue is distributed on the back side is shared, right? We all talk about it and make decisions. But *from a technology standpoint, we could definitely just give the money back to where it started,* in the same way that it does now. Or we may, in the back, put it as two lines, and then roll it up into one in the bill. So, the model isn't designed to change the way that we move revenue throughout the university.

When we look at the **University of Oregon**, which is one of the universities of many that use this program model as opposed... *so we're attaching to the student as attaching to the... instead of attaching to the course.* Here's what happened with them. They went through and they have programs, just like we do, business, engineering, that have additional surcharges, you know, their tuition is slightly higher. And then, *what ended up happening over time was they ended up coming back in with a fee.*

Basically, a tuition surcharge for their arts and humanities.

Because what was happening was they were teaching all the GER classes, right? Everybody's getting more tuition, and they're not. Our hope is that we can find a way to make tuition work for everyone, where those slightly higher cost ones, they're getting their funding, like they were, but we've smoothed the amount that they're getting, *so that the person doesn't have sticker shock at a certain point,* right? Like CBPP or the business college at UAA, it's on high... upper division courses, so the rate that the student is paying is really growing quickly, all at one time. So the idea is to smooth it over time as part of that program, *so it's really clear to that student what the program cost is.*

But the model does not require that we duke it out on the back side for revenue.

The model says we can do exactly what we're doing now. Now that we've opened the conversation, we may choose other things, but we do not have to do that because of the model. The model can support exactly what's happening now. Does that make sense?

And the algorithms that are going to come in are to determine that rate.

Because what happens if they take classes at another university and the surcharge isn't on that, necessarily? *Maybe we decide we're not going to do cross-university surcharges.* I have to make sure that that engineering program or that college of business program gets what it really needs. And at the same time, looking at the other programs to say, are you getting what you really need, and can the student look at the website and figure out what their bill is, and can we get more flexibility in the way that we charge for programs? Because now it's attached to the college, you know, the student, instead of attached to the courses. It gives us a little bit more flexibility in the way that we look at tuition in the future, potentially. So, our goal was, when we started doing this, it does open up the whole conversation in the back, but it does not require that we make a change to what we're doing. Jenny, does that kind of answer the question? There's not a technological reason that we would have to make a change, but there are many reasons we might want to.

### **Jennie Carroll**

Yeah, no, that, that, that answers the question, I mean, because if we're charging the higher tuition for a particular program, it's because that particular program ostensibly needs the higher tuition, right? It should go back to them, but I could totally see other models being utilized as well.

### **Cathy Ewing**

Yeah, we were just trying to attach it to the student, and the way to attach it to the student is through their major. What are they versus the course. And so that was what we were aiming for. But we have heard a lot about 80-20. I've been in a number of meetings, and I don't do the back side of where the money going. I just support it, and we will support. Whatever it is, as long as it's not so insane that we can't pull it off, you know, which... we've had a couple of those before, you know.

### **Jackie Cason—analogue to the 9 over 12 payroll distribution**

So...If I may, I would just say it might be analogous to the desire of faculty to have their pay distributed over 12 months instead of 9. Same pay, just distributed a little bit differently.

Leah, I know you jumped in moments ago, but you still had a question, I think, and then we'll go to David and Brian.

**Leah Berman (she/her)--how does this all work out over time with tuition increases and students coming and going? Might we dispense with the current 80/20 distribution model in the process?**

So I actually had... you had said that we're trying to keep the tuition rate constant for students throughout their time at the university. I wonder how that works in the context of, presumably there are going to be tuition increases, and students stop in, they stop out, they drop to part-time, they drop to full-time. And how that would interface with this new tuition model. And as a... as a comment, you know, we've... if you think about engineering students, that sometimes they're taking engineering courses, sometimes they're taking mostly not engineering courses. And it's definitely going to be a concern how their higher tuition is allocated to the people that are actually teaching them. Honestly, and this is heretical, I would like to see us use a different allocation model entirely. I don't like the 80-20 model. I think it has some pernicious effects on how people approach dealing with enrollments. So, I would be very interested to hear how other places allocate with program-based tuition models.

**Luke Fulp--not currently considering the 80/20 allocation as part of the project. Tuition increases would still be incorporated as they currently are.**

I do want to... although I said at the front end of the call that this project is not fully scoped because we're so early into it, but I don't really think, as a part of what we're trying to explore right now, is the 80-20 concept as a part of this project, you know, but I, you know, I don't want to get ahead of the universities either, because this like Kathy said, while it doesn't require that we change what revenue, tuition revenue departments or colleges and schools are receiving today. The universities may use this as an opportunity to engage in those discussions around revenue mapping, because it's done on the backside. So the 80-20 It's not part of the scope, but it certainly could be discussed at a university level.

But that's... that's to be, you know, determined at a later date. I would say that, Leah, to your questions, though, regular tuition rate increases that would be approved by the regions would apply to students as they move through the program, so while we're trying to ensure some level of consistency with what students are charged, that would continue to be something that

would change what they pay, year to year. If they stop out or move from full-time to part-time, the idea is that this same tuition rate would be applied on a credit hour basis, so that would... it would allow for them to make those decisions. It would be the same rate per credit hour, but it would be based on credit hours that they are enrolled in from semester to semester.

**Leah Berman (she/her)--clarification**

I'm sorry, so what is the difference between our current model and what is being considered...

**Luke Fulp**

The current model is based on a class, a particular class. And applied to a credit, a number of credits? The new model would be based on a program and applied to credit hours.

**Cathy Ewing**

Luke, I could show one slide that I think would help with that. We don't need to look at the whole slideshow, but there is a slide. I think it will make this clearer for you, if you guys don't mind if I share it for a second.

Okay, and a lot of them are what Luke's talked about, but this one in particular, I think, will... will help with that, but I know Brian and David have questions, so while I pull up that particular slide, if you want to keep having a talk, I'll get it together so that we're just looking at that one. Give me one second.

**David Cox II--How will fees factor into the process or scope of the project?**

I can hop in. I've got two now. My first one is hopefully quick, which is that this is just talking about tuition-type charges and not fees, correct? It could probably balloon into looking at fees or not, right?

**Luke Fulp**

Well, fees are... Yeah, right now, right now, we're still scoping that, but fees... so what we're trying to do is, we're trying to make the student bill less jumbled, if you will, and make it cleaner for the students. So while we're focused on the surcharge right now, we are asking universities if there's a willingness to consider rolling in fees, some fees, that are not going to go away as part of this as well, to help streamline and make more clear to students what they're paying, but there's not been a decision on that.

**David Cox II**

Okay. I know at the Egan Library, a large part of our budget actually comes from, like, the Juneau campus, only student consolidated fee at UAS that then, like...gets weird when students are taking courses across Ketchikan and Juneau online, or something like that.

### **Luke Fulp**

Yeah. And if something like that did happen, David, it's the same thing that Kathy said earlier, I appreciated how she framed that, is that it wouldn't have to change anything with how that distribution is working, it just wouldn't be so apparent to the student, where it would, you know, their bill would be cleaner, and then on the back end of that, we would distribute the revenue.

### **Cathy Ewing—current project does not address consolidated fees**

And I would like to add to that, David, we aren't talking about consolidated fees at all. This is *just a tuition surcharge*. So, just kind of keep in mind that it's that tuition slide and not... I just realized when I pulled this up, I want to go back two slides. So, if we could go back two slides, and then we'll talk about this slide, because it won't make sense in, in its own context without looking at this other slide.

So... Luke, do you mind if I just go through a couple of slides?

### **Luke Fulp**

Yeah, go for it.

### **Cathy Ewing—potential to incentivize acceleration to graduation with a tuition cap that shifts to a flat rate after 15 credits, encouraging students to enroll in more credits.**

Quickly. Okay. So...I think everyone here knows that the university has peer institutions, we have aspiring institutions that we look at. All of them are universities, and we went through and started looking at a number of universities, and asked what were they doing, and how were they handling tuition, overall.

And part of why this came up was the CIS modernization. Laura Volden, before she left, said, if we could just tell a student how much it would cost for their term, for the classes that they're signing up for, it would be amazing, because right now it's very difficult to do that. So that's where we started with this conversation. And we went and looked at all of these universities, and here's some things we found. Basically, what we found was that most universities charge, in fact, most of these, it should have been all of these universities, charge per credit tuition based on the student's degree, college, or program, with no differentiation based on upper and

lower level courses. In other words, it's attached to the student and what the student is studying.

Many institutions, one of the reasons that they do this is many institutions have implemented a *tuition cap, where the student pays a flat rate for all credits above a certain threshold*. So maybe you're paying the same rate for your classes that are between 12 and 18 credits. That's how I went through school. When I went to the university in another state, you know, up to 15 was a certain rate, and then 18 was the rate, so I took an extra class. Universities have been doing this to try and accelerate to graduation.

Not something new. But in order to be able to do that, you need to be attached to the program. *It's very, very difficult to do that when it's attached to the course*. So, there's other reasons that institutions have also implemented this, things that in the future, you know, we could look at: program-based rates and other accelerators that we can't do right now based on the way that we've got the system set up and what we've attached our items to. I will note that I went back later and looked at community colleges that are now beginning to offer bachelor's programs, because that's becoming more popular in the lower 48, and it's fairly new, and they are doing those dual levels.

But they can't do some of the other interesting things that we're doing, and I think they just started and said, God, what do we charge for this one bachelor's we have? So that's where those are sitting. But most of them charge based on the college or the program.

So, when we looked at this model, we just, right now, we said, you know, tuition is based on the course, and if you look at UAA and UAS, lower and upper division courses are different rates, I think all of you know that. And then there are additional fees, depending on the college offering the course. UAF has their... they have a single rate, and then the community campuses have a different rate. It's a slightly more lower 48 model, I guess I would call it. But again, they also have additional fees, depending on the college offering the course, that tuition surge fund.

### **Jennie Carroll—differential upper/lower division rates?**

Wait, wait...Don't we have... doesn't UAF... I know that we have a different rate between the community campuses and the... the urban campus, but don't we also have upper and lower division rate differences?

**Leah Berman (she/her)**

Not anymore.

**Jennie Carroll**

Boy, that... that... Blew past me! Okay, thank you!

**Leah Berman (she/her)--How might this affect graduate students?**

Are graduate students involved in any of these discussions?

**Cathy Ewing**

Graduate courses are not in here, because graduate courses are at a single level, but the surcharge piece is what I would like to talk about. You know, we have certain graduate programs where the surcharge is 50% of the cost of the program as a whole, and I get emails ever so often that are like, is this right? And I'm like, yes, that is correct. But attaching it again to the program would allow them some flexibility in what their tuition would be. So graduate programs, I believe if we move to this new model, will be like winner-winner chicken dinner. Maybe that's not the right way to put that, sorry. But they'll still have a higher rate, like.

Oh, yes. Absolutely. Graduate education is on its own level. It's a different course level, yes, so it will have its own. But it will have that same kind of freedom that we have to put the rate where it should be for that graduate program, so that it makes sense. So, the exploratory structure we're looking at looks at the admitted university, where you're going.

Is there residency, right? Non-resident versus resident, versus WUI versus the exceptions. What is your degree level? Is it going to be an associate's OEC or certificate, or is it a bachelor's, post-bac certificate, or is it graduate and PhD?

And then, we look at the college, because that's where that surcharge lives, okay?

So, we gave one example. I only picked a UAA example because it's the most striking, because UAF already made their lower and upper division the same price.

This is generalized, fictional, not real tuition rates, you know what I mean? So I just want to be really, really clear that this is no one's suggested rate, we're only looking at the model. But this demonstrates how the model would work.

So right now at UAA or UAS, if you had these courses.

If they're taking a 200-level course, the tuition is different than a 300-level course. If they're taking an engineering, then there's a surcharge that gets added on to that. And of course, this is a 300-level course that doesn't have a surcharge, this one does have a surcharge, and this one has a surcharge.

But if we did the program model, when the person is trying to determine what is it going to cost me to go to school, we're saying every single one of your tuition credits is going to be this single amount, no matter which classes you choose to take. And you can see that it's not 282 plus 56, it's a lower rate, because we're smoothing it over time. The idea is not to get engineering more money, the idea is to keep engineering with the same amount of money, and have the student pay it over time, so that they don't get those bumps when they take classes that have surcharges, and also so that they don't get that junior-senior bump rate, because financial aid really doesn't do that. That bump rate also lives in there between your junior and senior year.

So the exploratory model replaces lower division rates and upper division rates and surcharges with a single per-credit rate. Then, the students can actually use a simple chart on the website to see exactly what they'll pay for tuition before registering, because it'll be like.

College of Business, you know, is this. College of Arts and Sciences is this. *The goal is revenue neutral.* It's ensuring students don't experience tuition increases when transitioning to this model. It's just a different model. That's really the idea. And then behind the scenes, we had no preconceived notions about making a change to the way that money would flow.

Technically, yes, there's gonna be some technology changes, but, when we started discussing this in the bursar's office, you know, it was *revenue neutral for everyone.* Every day it's the same thing, we're just trying to make it easier for the student to understand what it is, and it just happened to dovetail really, really well into the EAB. There are many questions, and I've got to tell you, this is complex.

You know, I mean, I was the Director of Admissions at UAA, I understand, and I have those same heart palpitations that everyone is having, and yet I'm continuing to review this and look at it and explore it, because there's some really cool stuff that could happen if we went to this model. Okay, so I...

**Luke Fulp**

I just want to be... I want to be clear, though. We... we don't have any preconceived notions that the distribution changes, but that will really rest... *that decision will lie with the universities as they dig deeper into the modeling and try to understand this*, and the universities will lead those conversations, on that side of things. Thank you, Kathy, really appreciate that.

### **Cathy Ewing**

I want to do a quick time check with Jackie.

### **Jackie Cason**

Yeah, I think we can go another 10 minutes, just to make sure people can ask questions, and I'm sure there'll be more follow-up. I really appreciate, Luke and your whole team, because I think this upstream engagement of being able to have this dialogue early in the process rather than after a lot of decisions are made is really helpful, but I realize it's still in formation, so I'm sure we'll have some back and forth after this meeting, but this is really helpful.

### **Luke Fulp**

Great. Well, do we want to continue on with David's questions and then move to Brian? Brian's had his hand up for a while.

### **David Cox II—how does a delayed decision on declaring a major affect the model?**

I'm wondering if Brian has the same question as me, because I'm thinking about this from our spring startup presentations yesterday at UAS, which was a discussion of how one of our big goals is to try and get more people to actually declare a major at all, instead of coasting through as, like, non-declared, then declare right before graduation. I mean, like, ideal world, yes, everybody figures out exactly what major they want at a really reasonable and good time, and they sign up for it, understanding the full, like, process and everything and all. not what actually happens, and, you know, maybe it's more UAS problem than other places, maybe it's across the system, I don't know, right? But, could someone completely miss this whole improvement process by not declaring a major. Could someone game this by being like, oh, I'm just getting an associate's right now, like, oh, but now I'm getting a major. Could somebody game it being like, oh, I'm a... I'm an English major, right up until their last semester or something, and they came ready to apply for a graduation? Like, oh, actually, I was an engineering major the whole time, you know, whoops, sorry about that. Will there be a massive balloon payment suddenly to, like, catch up with the difference, right?

Someone's usually going into a graduate program knowing what graduate program they're pursuing, right? And it's like, yes, you're like... That makes sense, so we could smooth that, seems real easy. That's not the undergraduate experience. I feel like we probably resemble those community colleges for... especially, like, UAS, where we've got a whole bunch of associates, we've got a whole bunch of, you know, bachelor's students, and that's kind of a different experience going on at the same place, so...Are... how and are we taking all into account? Yeah.

### **Luke Fulp—we might find ways to incentivize a declaration**

Yeah, I would say, David, I think your questions are spot on. Those are all the questions that we're currently discussing and circulating, and I think that, we're, you know, from UAS's, the leadership representatives that are, you know, engaged in the early dialogue around this, they're asking the exact same questions.

You know, it really is dependent on the student profile at each university, at the campuses. And what we're trying to do is help the students, and we want to see them graduate, we want to see them succeed, and so, we certainly don't want to create a system where it feels like someone has to navigate it in a way where they're like, well, the lowest cost to me is if I don't declare for 2 years, and then make my decision in my, you know...And it impacts what they would otherwise do, to pursue and attain that degree, so we're thinking through that. I think one of the things that helps with that would potentially be for either a lower differential between pursuing an associate's, and a bachelor's degree, so we would probably want to make sure that there's not a large differential there, or undeclared, rather. But then also, there's maybe ways that we can incentivize this. Like, one way could be that, you know, like Kathy mentioned, the cap on semester, you know, so if we had a cap, like 15 credits, that's all you're charged for. Anything beyond that, you're going to be charged the same rate every semester. Well, maybe that's only available for students who have declared majors. There's lots of different ways to look at this and maybe navigate it, but *we want it to eventually be something that serves students well and benefits them, and that's the intent*, and that's kind of how we're going to approach it, but you are asking all the right questions, I can assure you that.

Brian?

### **Brian Blitz**

That was my question, was, you know, the major thing, and like, if you're undeclared, I guess, is that... is that gonna be cheaper than everyone else? And...Is everybody gonna play that

game? And the surcharge, when you talk about surcharges, That is completely different from a course fee for a lab. because those are for, like, to get the lab supplies, right?

### **Luke Fulp**

Those are different, yeah, there's program surcharges, and then there's course fees, and those are different. And we're treating them differently.

### **Brian Blitz**

that's a different animal altogether, that's... that would stick. Yes. That would stay the way it is, so to speak. Okay.

### **Luke Fulp**

But it's very... we're very much exploring, and we're... we're looking at ways to make things, easily understood for students and families, so we can't... we can't say, you know, 100% that course fees are out. We definitely want to think about those, and, maybe there's a way to roll them in that makes a difference for students. But it's not the central focus. The central focus is the surcharge.

Kathy, did you have something else?

### **Cathy Ewing**

I was just gonna say, talk to your financial aid officers and registrars as well, and the bursars, of course. It's our bursar's team that does this. We have a team of 30, right? And this is our, it's coming from them. But, for example, UAF's financial aid office really speaks to the federal government and is starting to make us certify that the classes that you're taking are actually working towards your major in the same way that the VA does, right? [CPoS].

This helps that because I mean, this may or may not help that, but one of the things that we have, right, are lagging majors. People change majors, but they don't tell us. Not that they stay undeclared, but they pick a major, and then they move off, and they start doing something completely different. They take classes in another one, and we're constantly aligning them.

There are a few things that can be done about that. On the academic side, it does narrow what you're doing so that it's... you're in a major that's going in that direction, you know, in the classes that you're taking, and then you're changing majors if you want to change pathways.

So it's not as widely exploratory, potentially. You know, I find that we... we provide about as open an opportunity to take courses as anywhere that I've ever seen. And I do believe that this could need to narrow that, just so that you don't end up with someone undeclared taking all engineering courses and then graduating. You know, we... I don't know, you guys have seen it where they don't pay the... like, they didn't used to get admissions, right? They would go non-degree seeking, because they didn't need financial aid until the end, because they didn't want to pay for the admission application. And we have also... we are also exploring those. We are all... we've all been around the system for a long time, so we have a very good feel for exactly the things that you're talking about, and we want you to talk about them as well. And what are you finding at other institutions? Because those are what we're grappling with, too. Those are the questions that we have as well, as we go through and attempt to do this.

So...I just want you to know we're... we're all in it together, and you know, it's... it would be a change. It would definitely be a change, you know, a model change for us.

**Leah Berman (she/her)**

Especially in the context where we're having to implement course program of study.

As a faculty member, I would be really excited to see a strong discussion of tuition caps, so that you pay for 12 credits, or you pay for 15 credits, and then you're allowed to take whatever you want. Because my concern is that Students are going to be blocked from being able to take minors, or they're going to get messed up. Well, if a Bachelor of Science degree program does not have a requirement that you take a minor. then... If there's not elective space in that degree, you can't take courses towards the minor.

**Cathy Ewing**

Oh, I see what you're saying. I think that'll be more of a financial aid question. Yeah. This model lives on the top.

**Leah Berman (she/her)**

I'm really excited about the tuition cap model as part of this.

**Cathy Ewing**

Yeah, great. That would be great.

**Luke Fulp**

Thanks for that feedback.

**Cathy Ewing**

**Jackie Cason**

Well, yeah, thank you guys. We probably are coming to time now, unless there's any last-minute things you want to say, but again, as I said, I think this is just the early part of a dialogue, and really, really appreciate your time to come and meet with us.

**Luke Fulp**

Thank you so much, thank you for the time. Each of your universities will be leading their own communication effort to seek feedback, and then, Jackie, if you ever want us to come back and talk with this group, we're happy to do so as we progress through this.

**Jackie Cason**

Thank you. Well, thank you. I think this will help us be able to engage in those conversations on our own campuses going forward a little bit better, yeah.

**Luke Fulp**

Excellent, thank you.

**Jackie Cason**

Alright, thanks again.

**Luke Fulp**

Have a nice weekend.

**Jackie Cason**

You too.

**Jennie Carroll**

Thanks, bye.