

Academic Council Agenda

October 18, 2019; 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Action/Business:

1. Approve September 9, 2019 meeting notes – All, 2 min. (*attachment*)
 - a. If anything needs to be added to the minutes please let Kelly know.
 - b. No objections
2. Review Action Items (*attachment*)
 - a. The academic structure related to the reviews to decide which programs fell to which category has been stopped.
 - b. Kelly sent out a poll to find out when we can reschedule our time. Our new time is the first Wednesday of a month from 9:00-11:00 am. Jak was unable to do the Doodle poll and the new time does not work for her, but Kelly will provide the recorded meetings via Zoom. A new Google Sheet was started in the meeting folder that will provide the links for all recorded meetings.

Updates/Discussion:

3. Discussion regarding items for upcoming Academic and Student Affairs Meeting – Paul
 - a. Because we are in the middle of various levels of programmatic review, we do not have any program deletions or additions to bring forward to the Board at the next Board meeting on October 31. We may have some in the February meeting.
 - b. Status Report on Academic Reviews
 - i. At the Academic and Student Affairs meeting, there are basically five major items that Regent Purdue would like to discuss. The first will be a status report from Paul on where we are with the academic review process and that was put on the agenda a while ago. That will be a very quick report. The academic reviews are suspended and Paul will provide an update of where those committees are at. The progress reports that existed were compiled and shared with the Chancellors in accordance with the Board directive that the President and Chancellors would review the process and make recommendations to the Board on how to proceed. The reports have not been shared with the board or with others. There were 14 actually that were being worked on, the 13 that were in the motion plus one for student affairs. One committee, eLearning, had completed their evaluation and the report. There was one committee, Humanities and Social Sciences, which had not

yet started a draft report. All others had some sort of a working document that was in progress with discussions. We have to respect that those were not final, in any way, shape, or form.

The report will include that the process was suspended per Board directive and we have archived all of the material. Access to the drives has been blocked and are held in suspension. If the suspension is unsuspended for some reason for some of the committee's we can reactivate that for the committee. Right now, that process has been suspended per board decision and was not just discontinued. It was suspended to allow the Chancellors and the President to have a conversation about what to do with that process.

ACTION: Add “Statewide” to the Board agenda – will read: *Status Report on Statewide Academic Programmatic Reviews* in Board Docs.

c. Program Review Procedures

- i. Lead by the Provosts, Regent Perdue wants to look at the normal, scheduled program review procedures. Review which criteria are used, and develop an expedited process. She also requests an update on the processes that are being done at this time on each campus, to look at the process moving forward once these reviews are complete. We will need to schedule an AC meeting in early April specifically for program reviews. The Board may need to call a special meeting or wait until June. We can request and have them consider a special meeting in April. We cannot move on any changes in programs until the Board has made its final decision.
- ii. A lot of programs will be reviewed and considerations made. The Board makes the decision and then the NWCCU is notified. Acceptance from NWCCU is required prior to moving forward with deleting a program, giving faculty layoff notices, and providing notice to students of the program discontinuation.

d. Student Affairs Briefing

- i. Regent Perdue had pointed out that at all ASA meetings, the focus has been on the academic side and not the student side. The vice chancellors and Saichi will provide an update moving forward. One discussion will be student enrollment trends, and enrollment fees, to include an audit that just came out on fees.

e. Curricular Task Force Report

- a. Looking at policy and regulation, AC plays a role in the process. All academic program suspensions, deletions, additions need to go through the council. They then need to go to ASA and then on to NWCCU. If they are programs that were already suspended in previous reviews, the process is more straightforward. The teach-outs have already been started. The process is open and transparent so everyone will know where we are at in the process.
5. Proposed tuition rates – Paul (*attachment*)
 - a. A proposed 5% increase for the next 2 years in upper and lower division courses, with no change to the graduate level classes. The rationale for the change is that our tuition is below the WICHE average. This increase will bring us close to that average. The Graduate levels are actually above, so no increases will happen in these courses. CTE credit program has been reviewed and it is hoped that this will be expanded across other programs. Make sure that this notice is out there and the students are informed. This is a modest increase. The increase continues to make us competitive.
 6. Faculty Initiative Fund update – Paul
 - a. There will be no FIF process. In the CBA, the FIF allocated a set amount of dollars to be distributed over the life of the contract. The contract has been fulfilled. It was not written as a yearly program, but as a set amount of money. The funds have been expended at this time. We will continue the program if it is written into the next CBA.
 7. Dual Enrollment and Online Program Strategic Initiative – Paul
 - a. In our current FY20 budget, there were funds allocated to strategic initiatives to include student retention and success. One area was Dual Enrollment and online program development. This money was held at SW. To prevent SW becoming a grant provider, the decision was made to distribute the funds to the campuses for their discretion. The emphasis was to bring on full on academic programs versus individual courses. The funds have not yet been distributed to the campuses, but wanted to begin the discussion. A lot of growth has been happening with Dual Enrollment in the Mat-Su areas and it would be good to extend it across the state. These funds can encourage collaboration across the system to get more “bang for the buck”.

ACTION: Paul to meet with the Provosts to discuss the long-range plan is for each campus prior to the distribution of the funds.

8. Faculty concerns regarding student/faculty ratios – Maria

- a. The FA has the opportunity to present the status report from the curricular Task Force, as well as the Course Alignment Committee and a Common Calendar Committee. The history behind the curricular task force is that it is one of the things that the FA was tasked to do, which took three years. About three years ago, they wanted to do an alignment of all the GER courses. The GER courses were aligned, which took a full year and was a heavy lift across the three universities. The concern last spring under former chair of FA, Chris Fallon, was to maintain the GER alignment. Last spring he formed a GER maintenance committee to include leads from the different universities. The list of members can be provided. We were then going through financial exigency and looking at consolidation to a single accreditation. At that time, Maria convened the curriculum gurus and in late August held three meetings. The idea was to begin comparing notes to prepare for if consolidation happened to determine whose procedures were to be followed. Best practices were shared and a couple of interesting things had come of that. Adapting or adopting the WICHE Passport, which UAA is doing. It would alleviate the issue with GER alignment and allow easy transferability of general education courses across not only our system, but for everyone within that consortium. Not really understanding some of the mechanisms or the complexities of curriculum, President Johnson had a very fast time frame in which to create the single university structure. This would have been difficult on the curriculum side. FA will do a group presentation and talk about GER alignment and the different processes. The groups are coming together and sharing notes, knowing at some point there potentially will be some consolidation and some core sharing. With whatever model is decided upon, it is important to get the proper people to the table. Understanding how UAS does a certain curricular process versus UAA and the different flow-charts is important.
- b. Maria is looking at the processes that each of the universities goes through in terms of curricular, looking at the curriculum approval processes, and considering streamlining that process. In addition, the GER committee is continuing maintenance. The WICHE Passport will help considerably in this area. Although, the Passport only transfers once the student has completed all of the general education requirements. It does not transfer course by course. If there is new faculty teaching a GER and they decided to change, it is going to affect the alignment. What mechanism would we use so that we would be able to negotiate that, instead of having them start getting misaligned?

- c. The common calendar committee was created to align the calendar so that all of the universities start the semester starting and ending at the same time. Megan Busby, former member of FA, chaired the committee. One of the things the FA was tasked with last year was to look at course block alignment, the 50 minute credit hour versus a 60 minute credit hour. Through all of the surveys done, UAA has the 50 minute credit hour and they do not want to change to 60 minute credit hour. UAF has a 60 minute credit hour and the faculty do not want to change to a 50 minute credit hour. One of the recommendations was to look at aligning course times. Look at having Tuesday and Thursdays align course start time. The Common Calendar Committee is now examining ways that do not require everything to change and does not have to be a 60 minute credit hour or a 50 minute credit hour. All of this leads to course sharing, and those are cropping up more often. Through faculty attrition and one university, they might need a course at another university. If the courses aren't aligned, it makes a hardship for those students that are not from that campus. Research is being done right now to look at different options and will have a report by March. One area they will look at is the prime time classes. For example, every university has a time in which all of their classes are being used. It's a busy time at the university. In looking at it from that lens, they may prevent something that could cause problems for all of the classes. They could shift passing times by 5 or 10 minutes, but not as much as 30 minutes. They are looking at ways to maximize the non-primetime hours in the schedule because that won't affect as many other classes. It is important to report to the Board the progress, as this is something that comes up almost at every board meeting. Regent Anderson has brought it up several times and is on the Academic and Student Affairs Committee. He will want to have a discussion about that, as well.
- d. On November 7, the Board will have a full day Strategy workshop. It will be a facilitated discussion about roles and responsibilities, with an external facilitator. There will also be some experts and have invited guests from NCHEMS and SHEEO who will talk about university structures and what they look like in terms of the roles of Chancellor's versus a president versus a board. There will also be a discussion of election of Board officers. They will be looking at the President or the Chair of the Board. As well as sort of the committee chairs for next year beginning in January. There is an evening event at the University House. Rob Anderson is the person from SHEEO. He was here visiting us earlier in August and had a chance to go out to Bethel to see the campus there, as well as being in Fairbanks. Sally Johnstone is the current president of NCHEMS, and will answer

structural questions. And then the third is Barbara Reading, the president of the New England Council for Higher Education, the accrediting group for the New England states. She has been engaged in some of the efforts that were going on in the Maine system as they were looking at changing their structure. The Connecticut State system was going through a change in their structure, and the University of Northern Vermont underwent a change in their structure. She is very familiar with accreditation. She is not from Northwest, but she is familiar with accreditation and also with the roles and responsibilities in different kinds of systems. We have not found a facilitator yet, but the president is working with the Chancellor's to go through some possible candidates. In terms of the roles of a central board and a central administration versus those that are a little bit more of a confederation or a lesser one, we will look at those models. The Board is open to looking at those in their discussions. On Friday will be the normal board meeting. We don't have any action items from our committee, or the consent agenda. There will be the usual governance reports, and they will begin thinking about the FY21 budget and what that might look like going forward, considering the parameters for the budget. The President has been talking to the Chancellor's about the frameworks and planning for FY21. Paul will be working to look at that timeline for the academic reviews and giving us time to be able to review those recommendations. Then it has to go to Academic and Student Affairs for their consideration, and then to the Board, and then notifying Northwest if there are recommendations to delete programs. If there are programs that have already been suspended in previous reviews, that process is a little bit more straightforward, in that we've already dealt with issues of teach out for those programs. If there are some that, as a result of this process, are slated for elimination or discontinuation, we would have to discuss what that timeline is or teach out for those programs and relative to faculty contracts. There are a lot of moving parts. It's not straightforward and simple as just getting rid of program X. We have to consider what's there for the students, what's there for the faculty in that program, which is going to be a big discussion.

- e. At the Board meeting in September, we presented to the board a proposal for tuition rates for the next two academic years and what we have proposed to the board was a 5% increase in lower and upper division for the next two years, with no change in graduate and nonresident surcharge tuition. The Regents will be voting on that tuition proposal at the November meeting. Make sure that everyone is aware of this and that this is getting

out to the campuses for potential feedback from student groups and other groups as well. The rationale for the change is that within our four-year institutions, our tuition is below the WICHE average and western states average. The 5% per year for two years, brings us closer to the WICHE averaged tuition for an average undergraduate program. Our graduate tuition and nonresident tuition are actually above the WICHE average at this point in time. We will continue with the 25% CTE tuition reduction that is out there for career and technical education programs. Would like to be able to see if we can extend that to other community campus, CTE type programs, as well. Our engineering and our management programs have a tuition surcharge. The super tuition is also noted in the proposal because it is a percent of whatever the base tuition is, and not a flat fee. If tuition goes up, the net surcharge, because it's a percentage, goes up as well.

- f. The faculty initiative funding. For the last two years, this was the time of the season when we started talking about Faculty Initiative Fund and the proposal process, etc. There will be no Faculty Initiative Fund process. In the CBA, the Faculty Initiative Fund allocated a set amount of money, a million dollars, to be distributed during the life of the contract. Because the contract started late, we were able to do this in two \$500,000 increments in the two years of the process. By doing that, we have fulfilled the contract. It's not written as annual allocation, it was written as a set amount of dollars and we have provided that amount of money to the faculty. We are compiling reports from the faculty. We only had essentially two years to give out the money. When we do a negotiation for the next unit contract, that is something that may be discussed and whether that's a program that will continue. In our current FYI 20 budget, there was funding put into the budget for some strategic initiatives, some of which were submitted by the universities to enhance areas related to goals in workforce in research in student retention and success. One of the areas that we set aside some money was in the area of Dual Enrollment for \$300,000 and online program development for \$700,000. The money is held in Statewide in terms of trying to think about what to do with the money. We did not want to get into a proposal process here at statewide, so we've talked to the provost about this a bit and will continue to talk. It is suggested to disperse this funding out to the universities, so that they could help to prioritize, but also collaborate on some of these initiatives here. Develop some Dual Enrollment programs, reinvest in certain areas, and also to discuss what kinds of programs at each of our universities we might want to consider bringing online. The emphasis here was to bring full on academic programs available for students, as opposed

to simply courses. There are other areas of focus as well, so we have not yet dispersed money to the campuses. Karen requests that the provost and Paul meet to talk about that before the money is allocated out to the three universities, because the provosts should be working much closer together on these programs before just handing out the money to different universities for Dual Enrollment. A discussion should be had about what the long-range plan is for Dual Enrollment for each campus will be and how to work together rather than stepping on each other's toes. It would actually get us more bang for the buck.

- i. There is a dual enrollment subcommittee meeting scheduled for next Thursday, and this can be added to the agenda. Terri met with Susan Kalina this morning about that and it's already on the agenda to discuss.
- g. Maria wanted to have a brief discussion again about looking at student-faculty ratios. Right now with our current process suspended that's not as maybe as quite as relevant, but it is out there because it's not a criteria. Faculty Alliance noticed that in several of the past PowerPoint presentations that President Johnson has given, he talks about the 1 to 11 faculty to student ratio. The concerns is where is the data to support this? The numbers are being conflated. What about those disciplines like nursing or music or automotive or aviation, where are art studio classes. By accreditation standards, you can have big giant classes. The faculty request a more nuanced analysis of the data. Ideally we would start having people that can actually talk to the board who actually know about class sizes and know the details, rather than flying over it at 50,000 Feet. It also depends on what direction you're coming from. When you look at that metric, if you're a student. And the reason they use that metric for trying to encourage students to come here is because it's a positive thing for students. The business that we're in is serving students and educating students to providing for their futures so that Alaska has a bright future. It just depends on what your perspective is and if the perspective is a business perspective where we could squeeze a lot more money out of this if we stuff more students in that class. That's one perspective, the other perspective, though, is the one that faculty share and that is serving students. We've had a 20 to 25% drop in enrollment since 2011, but we've seen the same drop, and actually even bigger drop, in the number of faculty in the department. We still have the program. We still have developmental math English studies, but we have a lot fewer faculty teaching it. We need to be talking about serving students and students access. If there was more transparency on this data that would also be helpful. It is important to see how we are doing relative to our peers. There are other metrics that are

student-quality metrics in terms of retention and graduation. There are other ways we could look at the data, as well, to see how we're doing as an institution to meet those needs. Similarly, student outcomes that is improved or a recruitment because of that.

- i. The Individual IR offices are looking at some of those data on a college or programmatic area. Research intensive faculty are not counted into those data. The question is, how do we count our part time faculty or adjunct faculty in calculating those numbers? It is something that has to be considered, as well.

9. Roundtable and future agenda items - All

ACTION: Paul would like an update from the 3 provosts on where they are on the review processes added to the next agenda.

Karen – Nothing

Larry – Nothing

Maria – Nothing

Priscilla – CCDC will be meeting on 10/30 and 10/31 – add update to next agenda

Anupma – FA is having a fall retreat – There are discussions on active program reviews and discussion with NWCCU. Would like to be involved in any discussions. Maria – All FA meetings are open. They are recorded and available for all to listen.

Jeff – Nothing

Susan – Nothing. Would like if the retreat could be recorded

Teri – Nothing

Heather – Nothing

Jak – Nothing

Paul – invites everyone to review policy and regulation regarding what our council is about.