1. Announcements / Updates
   A. Exec Committee working on draft ACC Bylaws; will bring draft to ACC in September.
   B. Updates from President’s Cabinet Meeting (July 19, 2011)
      1) Changes for December commencement: separate ceremony for graduate degree students; Graduate College reception afterwards.
      2) Fall 2011 overall enrollment likely up, but first-year student enrollment likely not as high as in Fall 2010.
      3) Two new buildings opening and three remodeled buildings reopening this Fall: Health & Learning Ctr (HLC, Aug 29), SkyDome (Sept 9), HRM (Oct 3), Native American Cultural Ctr (Oct 14), and Liberal Arts.
   C. Updates form Provost’s Academic Leadership Council Meeting (August 10, 2011)
      1) Changes in ABOR requirements for the university to submit the year’s Academic Strategic Plan mean that any curriculum / program changes needing Board approval will need to be approved by the respective University curriculum committees no later than their February 2012 meetings (UCC 2/7/2012; UGC 2/15/2012).
      2) Hardcopy of Provost’s workload study distributed and discussed at PALC; for tenure track faculty (433) shows 33% taught 12 hours or less in 2010-11; 28% taught 12 to 18 hours; and 39% taught 18 or more hours. For non-tenure track faculty (260): 24% taught 19 hours or less; 20% taught 19 to 24 hours; and 56% taught 24 or more hours. The Provost will discuss the report with the ACC at the September 21st ACC meeting.
      3) Changes to be implemented in indirect cost policy resulting from committee work during the last academic year (2010-11).
      4) Student success initiatives a high priority for the year; including addressing courses (and faculty) with high DFW rates. Retention and student success will be major factors in new Performance Funding Model being finalized by the Board and likely adopted by the Arizona Legislature.
      5) Task force on the evaluation of teaching will be put together by Dan Kain, with ACC representation to be determined.

2. Discussion of the FYLI (First Year Learning Initiative) program Blase Scarnati & Michelle Miller
   A. Focused on courses that have a high proportion of first-year students. Goal is to structure courses to promote student success. Three key concepts socialization, design, alignment (see handout).
   B. Courses will be “certified” so as to develop an identity with students. Initially courses are certified by Blase and Michelle; later a coordinating committee will take on that role.
   C. Program is requesting that chairs be willing to establish a “safe zone” for faculty teaching in the program, i.e., that student course evaluations in FYLI sections not be used to penalize faculty in the program, as faculty are experimenting with pedagogy and structure of a course.

3. Discussion with President Haeger
   A. Performance Funding, Retention and Student Success
      1) President Haeger noted that the FYLI program is consistent with his top agenda items for the year: the university will need to change things systemically to better foster student success.
      2) At the Federal level, universities can expect to be held more accountable for graduating students. In some cases, the Feds may require return of financial aid. At the state level,
expectations are that we will have more students to educate and fewer dollars from the State with which to do it. This will require a fundamental shift in how we deliver courses.

3) The Legislature will adopt performance funding of the universities; beyond some base dollars, additional monies will be based on the number of student credit hours completed (may be C or better) and degrees awarded; not on the number of students enrolled. This is a national trend.

4) ABOR has established 37 specific performance metrics for the University in line with performance funding (including metrics based on increases in external research dollars).

5) Our past performance where about 1/3 of our students don’t make it will have to change (editor’s note: figure is actually approx. 28%). The state and ABOR are looking for a retention rate of 80 to 85% (up from the current 72%). President is concerned enough with this that he is scrutinizing a list of all classes and their DFW rates. As an institution we can’t make progress in student success with DFW rates over 40% (and we can’t get the additional funding we need).

6) Chairs are key in changing the mindset of the faculty: chairs need to sit-down with faculty who have DFW rates 40% and greater; and re-allocate their teaching efforts out of the first-year.

7) The President is prepared to put significant monies behind improving student success; including possibly hiring a cadre of teaching faculty to focus on the freshman year; putting our best teachers in the first-year; incentifying faculty to take on the freshman year experience. Though there will not administratively be a “University College”, these ideas come from that proposal.

8) This will require changing the faculty culture; faculty must understand that student success is their responsibility. Why the concern? Even beyond the performance funding model at the state level, it is likely that in the next 2 years the Feds may be asking the same questions. (The accountability of the Federal program No Child Left Behind effectively may be coming to higher education.)

9) President will bring in Bob Zemsky, and possibly others with expertise in developing commercial products for alternative delivery of course content. Chairs are asked to participate w/ Zemsky when he comes to campus.

10) There is a tension between making sure students are successful versus teaching a quality course. The President is asking that faculty maintain quality and improve success of more students.

11) Evaluation of faculty by chairs should include measures of the faculty member’s students’ success.

12) Required class attendance is one strategy that should be considered by all faculty (currently being discussed by the Faculty Senate).

13) At the same time, need to deliver courses more cheaply, allow technology to change our delivery system; reserving faculty time for “critical touch” with students.

B. Salary “technical” adjustment. Several chairs who did not get anything in the recent technical salary adjustment AND in last year’s market adjustment expressed that it felt like a “kick in the teeth”. The President indicated that there might be opportunity for merit-based adjustments in the future, but that this recent adjustment was very unpopular with the legislature.

C. A proposal for changes in the health insurance program for faculty and staff is under consideration. The goal is to save $1.8 million off of the university’s base budget. Changes will likely require higher contributions from employees and added co-pays (e.g., on surgeries). As of yet undetermined whether or not the program will move to a deductible.
4. Discussion with Vice Provost Karen Pugliesi concerning Student Success Initiatives
   A. Continuing the discussion of Student success initiatives from the previous two items:
      1) The Report of the Task Force on the Freshmen Year from several years ago (available on
Karen’s website) is still relevant. We have a good sense of who are students are and which
ones are at risk for failing courses or not being retained.
      2) Examples of several efforts in this arena: have established “coaching” of a couple of
populations of at risk students, including EPS 101 students, math at risk students (via the
“Peak Performance” program).
      3) Focus groups with students indicate they are not challenged in the first 2 or 3 weeks of the
semester. We need to challenge them early – this is a part of the FYLI program. Will
collect more data on this in Fall 2011. Can we predict student disengagement? We lose
students if a course is too easy, or if it is too hard.
   B. The annual DFW rate report will go out from the ACC Executive Director immediately after
the meeting: last year in roughly 1300 courses, 216 had DFW rates greater than 50% (of
courses with at least 15 students).
   C. Is the GPS (Grade Performance Status) reporting system working? The administration is
pleased with its use by faculty, but do not yet have data on its impact on student success.
   D. One ACC member suggested that the President’s rhetoric concerning “changing faculty
culture” needs to be changed. Many faculty find the implication that they do not care about
student success deeply offensive. Rather than scrutinizing /evaluating faculty based on their
DFW rates, look at the faculty member’s efforts to prompt student success.

5. Student Regent Selection process: Johan Bodaski (President NAU Graduate Student Government)
The timeline for the selection was included with the agenda as an attachment. Chairs were
encouraged to nominate students by e-mailing Johan Bodaski at gsg@nau.edu or e-mailing the
ASNAU President at dominiccaudill@nau.edu.