

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

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

- 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

- 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

structural questions. And then the third is Barbara Reading, the president of the New England Council for Higher Education, the accrediting

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,

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 concern 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