

Academic Council Notes
September 9, 2019; 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Action/Business:

1. Approve August 12, 2019 meeting notes – All, 2 min. (*attachment*)
 - a. Kelly will send out a Doodle poll to find a new monthly meeting time. (not Friday at 3:00 pm)
 - b. Notes from last month are Paul's from the meeting, as the meeting was recorded, but if there is anything that can be added, please send to Kelly.
2. Program discontinuations
 - a. Science Education K-8 – UAS (*attachment*) – Susan
 - i. The admission to the program was suspended in 2016. There are no students in the program and the teach out is complete. Would like to terminate the program at this time. No objection – consensus recommendation from the committee will be forwarded to the Board.

Updates/Discussion:

3. Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting update – Paul
 - a. ASA Committee approved all of the motions for new programs and deletion of program. Most were approved unanimously. Those will move forward to the consent agenda.
 - b. M1 0 0 1 126.02 346.25 Tm0 g0 G{Most)-3(we)6(re)7(a)4(pp)-9(rove)7(d 91.1/F5 12 Tf1 0 0 1 117

- i. Maria is concerned the timeframe is very tight. Looking at the fact that a number of faculty participated in the previous meetings with only a short report from the facilitator. Tasked in a very short time period to do everything and is worried this is all for naught. Does not understand why it has to be done so quickly. – Paul – The timeliness of this is due to the requirement of needing to provide faculty with layoff notices.
- ii. Looking for 3 people representing each group (3 students, 3 faculty, etc).
- iii. Are the community campuses just part of the academic reviews? Paul – That is how Paul is viewing this from conversations with Chancellor Caulfield. We are not looking at any administrative structures for the community campuses. This is more of a program focus. The faculty at the community campuses needs to be taken into account when reviewing programs.
- iv. Confusing to call it Academic Program Review because it does not follow the regular academic program review.
- v. Neutral leaders – people who do not have a vested interest in the outcome. Paul wants someone to be engaged who has knowledge of the areas. The people who were chosen were chosen for being unbiased. They are not being asked to make a determination on location.
- vi. Concern of predisposing how programs will be in terms of arts, social science, biological (natural) sciences and humanities.
- vii. Layoff notices – If the Board accepts some of the reduction in faculty and staff, there is a 3 month timeline for staff. Even if the Board were to make some academic program decisions, based on the consolidation recommendations, the notice period is a year. This is something to consider. If we are trying to glide

ACTION: Academic Structure - Look at which programs fall under which category and breakout each into it's own group.

6. Program review – Paul

7. Student-Faculty ratio data – Paul/Gwen (*attachment*)

- a. Given the short timeline, we cannot generate a lot of new datasets. UA in Review has some of our statistics that talks about student-faculty ratios for regular faculty in our system. This is what is reported nationally. These are the numbers the president uses. It is good for internal comparison. Maria – The concern for the FA is the data is very conflated. Looking at research faculty that do not teach, music, art studio courses, limited number of slots, etc. There isn't the detail. It makes it sound like every single class is only 11 students.
 - i. When compared to peers, many institutions have the same instructional faculty. We do have low-enrollment programs that are very important. This is an aggregate, so there are large enrollment programs that upset the numbers. Are we the right size for the number of students that we have. This is a way of looking at the data, not the only way.
- b. Why are student equivalents that are taught by adjunct faculty excluded when it is the largest area?
 - i. A lot of our GERs are taught by adjuncts, but not all of them. That is a different way of looking at the data. How are we using our regular faculty is a different question than how we are using our adjuncts. Karen – presenting this to the board is misleading. Paul – This table is available in the UA in Review.
 - ii. FA has a problem with how the data is captured and how it is presented. There needs to be a lot more detail for the faculty-student ratio.
- c. Gwen – There are so many different options for data. We want things that are quantitative that are comparable, common, across different pools/groups. Would want data that is readily available and easily understandable. We need to look at holistically. There are different ways to structure costs that wouldn't normally be seen in student-faculty ratio. Looking at the job market projections. There are a number of items that have been presented to the board over the last few years. We also have a lot of good information in university level program review reports. What they have as far as specific needs and measures (graduates, etc). A smaller, simpler set of items that are easily digestible would be more useful.

- i. What came out of the working groups was course time alignment, other than the evening hours due to the changes in start times.
- c. GERs – Did manage to get GER alignment. Concerns were brought up last year about maintaining this alignment. Also dealing with potential consolidation of programs, etc, did consider starting a curricular task group, addressing each university deals with curriculum, how does the process work, using the CMIS, etc. We think it is important to at least identify where we are at with our curriculum profile. The direction the BOR takes us is integral. The process does not move fast, which is a huge concern with the current request by the Board.
 - i. Is there discussion about taking a look at how many GERs are available? – Maria – having many options avai

Larry – We have been talking about research trying to get our research more aligned. Trying to move forward on some of the issues. Research integrity, metrics, etc. The committees can work all of those out.

- UAF has prescribed to a consultant group to help identify opportunities. There is a proposal to extend to the rest of the campuses.
- We oftentimes submit limited submission proposals. Depending on how we move forward with the structure, we may put an end to the ability to submit multiple proposals. NIH requires separate DUN numbers. NSF requires separate office of sponsored programs.

Karen – Nothing

Saichi – Nothing

Susan K – The provost did ask that she suggest a data point on student credit hours per faculty.

There is a balance.

Alex – Nothing

Teri – Nothing

Maria – Have a good day, everybody

Kathy – Will pass this on to Jeff. Did request a list of council members for CTC to Teri.

ACTION: Kelly will send out a Doodle poll to find a new regular monthly meeting time.