

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

August 28, 2023

Members and Officers present: Ryan Alverson, Terrance Anderson, Rachael Banks, Michael Baranowski, Ginger Blackwell, Janel Bloch, William Boyce, Andrea Brooks, Carole Cangioni, Ronnie Chamberlain, David Childs, Josh Cooper, Joe Cress, Chris Curran, Jacqueline Emerine, Irene Encarnacion, John Farrar, Richard Fox, Kathleen Fuegen, William Herzog, Steven Johnson, Boshra Karimi, Ken Katkin, Edward Kwon, Isabelle Lagadic, Chris Lawrence, Zeel Maheshwari, Marcos Misis, Robert Salyer, Hans Schellhas, Laura Sullivan, Jessica Taylor, Brandelyn Tosolt, Monica Wakefield, Zach Wells, Kim Yates, Junxiu Zhou

Members and Officers absent: Olu Ekundayo, Steven Gores, Kajsa Larson, Jitana Lee, Michael Providenti, Brittany Sorrell

Guests: Bonita Brown (Interim President), Matt Cecil (Provost), Grace Hiles (Faculty Senate Office), Amal Said, Suk-hee Kim, Caroline Macke, Brooke Buckley, Vicki Cooper, Emily Detmer-Goebel, Brianna Marshall, Alar Lipping, Danielle McDonald, Dolores White, Holly Riffe, Kristi Horine, Matthew Zacate, Shauna Reilly, Erin Strome, Bob Alston, Bethany Bowling, Kevin Kirby, Mahdi Yazdanpour, Rob Zai, Stephanie ?

Call to Order, Adoption of Agenda

The meeting was called to order by Senate President John Farrar at 3:06 pm with a quorum present.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes from the May 5, 2023 meeting were approved.

Guest Reports:

- **Interim President** (Bonita Brown):
 - The president welcomed everyone back to campus.
 - Retention and graduation rates are trending in the right direction due to the hard work of the faculty. There is concern though about enrollment and regional campuses' numbers.
 - She thanked Senate President John Farrar for his leadership during this time.
 - In response to a question, she said that UC's enrollment is high due to the fact that they no longer have a wait list and are accepting anyone who applies.

- **Provost** (Matt Cecil):
 - The provost welcomed all back for the fall semester.
 - He reiterated the significant increase in fall retention (from 70% to 79+). This reflects that students are having a good experience in the classroom.
 - He addressed two recent issues raised by faculty/staff and provided data for clarification:
 - This is the second year that NKU has dropped students for nonpayment. Last year 460 students were dropped; 91% of those were reinstated. This year, of the 486 students dropped, 360 of those had been reinstated as of this morning, and he believes NKU is now closer to a 90% reinstatement level. Students

discovered during COVID that NKU pushed back deadlines; however, deadlines are now needed and NKU is trying to reestablish some student responsibility in that area. Students, like last year, received substantial communication on potentially being dropped for nonpayment. He acknowledged the stress on students. Even with added phone lines, redeployment of staff, there was a massive volume of calls to Financial Aid. Both of these issues are related and all is being done to help students work through these problems.

- The second issue is the change with Help Desk availability. During the summer, the average number of calls student workers received was four. The decision was made to no longer have two students working 10 hours on Saturday and Sunday, and a new process established for people to call in, leave a message, and receive a call back. The call back occurs on the same day the call is made. There was a larger volume of calls during the first week of classes and all who called received a call back that same day. The provost believes the cost savings of \$30,000 is worth the process change, especially as callers are still receiving timely assistance.
- In response to questions/concerns:
 - A senator asked if dropped students could still have access to Canvas if it is likely they will be reinstated. That way they will still have access to their assignments and not fall too far behind in their course work. The provost acknowledged that issue and said he would look into it.
 - Some senators raised concerns about students who were dropped, including whether students were being dropped too early. The president said that they had changed the drop period based on feedback from last year.
- **Faculty Regent** (Michael Baranowski):
 - The Board of Regents will meet on September 13.
- **Staff Congress Representative** (Amanda Andrews):
 - Staff Congress met throughout the summer and they have continued with Norse Appreciations. They will also continue with employee Lunch Hangouts.
 - The annual Benevolent Association Chili Cook-Off will be in November.
- **SGA Representative** (Lucy Burns):
 - She is SGA vice president this year. SGA is currently in need of members to meet the number needed to pass resolutions.
 - SGA is happy to work with Senate on any academic issues.

Officer Reports:

- **Senate President** (John Farrar):
 - The presidential search is ongoing. The Advisory Board will be having interviews with two candidates, and there is hope that there is a presidential announcement on the BOR's agenda in September.
 - Senate Joint Resolution 98 directed the Council on Postsecondary Education (CPE) to study placing a new regional, residential, four-year university in southeastern Kentucky and the allocation of responsibility between the Kentucky Community and Technical

College System and regional universities. Ernst and Young have been hired for the study and they will be holding small group discussions with faculty.

- The Academic Commons work group is currently working on a recommendation and hope to have that ready for input from the campus community sometime in September.
 - There is ongoing discussion on Academic Partnerships (AP) and the new contract. This has not been signed/finalized. AP has generated a list of programs they would like to be considered. The administration is committed to having more conversations about this.
 - He and the provost responded to concerns expressed about AP negotiations.
 - A work group to review Senate representation for Schools began work this summer. If anyone is interested in serving on the group – either from a College or School – let him know.
- **Vice President** (Jacqueline Emerine):
 - A faculty group currently teaching AP wants to review curriculum expectations AP may be putting on faculty. While there is nothing in the AP contract that states AP has control over any aspect of a course, there is concern that some faculty, such as adjuncts, have been given specific directives related to their courses.
 - **Secretary** (Laura Sullivan):
 - No report.
 - **Parliamentarian** (David Childs):
 - No report.
 - **Faculty Advocate** (Brandelyn Tosolt):
 - No report.
 - **Graduate Council Chair:** (Ginger Blackwell):
 - No report.

Committee Reports:

- **University Curriculum Committee** (Richard Fox):
 - The committee's first meeting is next Thursday; all meetings this semester will be via Zoom. Due to spring break, there is only one meeting scheduled in March, though this may cause difficulty due to end of March deadlines. The committee will determine if an additional meeting should be scheduled.
 - The 2023 UCC report is available (See attachment).
- **Budget** (Janel Bloch):
 - The first committee meeting is September 20 and all meetings will be via Zoom this semester. If anyone is interested in joining the committee, let her know. Anyone is welcome to attend a meeting even if not interested in being a committee member.
- **Benefits** (Charlisa Daniels):
 - Their first monthly meeting is September 6 via Zoom.

- **Professional Concerns** (Kathleen Fuegen):
 - The committee's first meeting is Thursday, September 7, in person, with a Zoom option. Please email her if there are any issues PCC should address.
- **TEEC** (Chris Lawrence):
 - TEEC's first meeting is in two weeks. Some deans are being contacted to replace members on the committee.
- **General Education Committee** (Andrea Brooks):
 - GEC will begin meeting next week. They will discuss our priorities for the year at that first meeting.
 - New courses will be accepted into the program. As indicated in the spring, when evaluating new proposals, GEC will be looking for clear, compelling rationale as to why the course should be added to the General Education program. They welcome creativity and want students to have access to a variety of subjects to study, while also being mindful of enrollment and faculty numbers. Stay tuned for more information as the committee finalizes a timeline and process.

New Business:

- There was no new business.

Old Business:

- There was no old business.

Announcements (John Farrar):

- Consider applying for the Kentucky Faculty Advisory Network (KFAN). This group provides valuable insight to CPE's president on state-level priorities. He is on the group which has been meeting via Zoom. One topic KFAN has been discussing is Senate Joint Resolution 98. Applications are due by September 8. More info is at <https://cpe.ky.gov/ourwork/facultyadvisory.html>. Let him know if you are planning to apply in case he needs to recruit members.
- The Academic and Admissions Policy Committee (AAPC) nominations are being accepted for Colleges of Informatics and Arts and Sciences. AAPC usually meets on the third Thursday from 1:30p to 3:00p, starting September 15.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Laura A. Sullivan
Secretary

Faculty statement regarding Academic Partnerships

As the Northern Kentucky University Board of Regents considers whether to renew the University's contract with the online program management company, Academic Partnerships (AP), we, the faculty, issue this statement. As set forth in the NKU statement on collegial governance, faculty bodies have primary responsibility for recommendations in academic matters, and their recommendations should be implemented except for compelling reasons. Academic matters include, but are not limited to, "approval of agreements with external organizations which directly affect academic matters." Herein, we exercise our responsibility for making recommendations regarding the agreement between NKU and AP.

In preparation for this report, a subcommittee of the professional concerns committee solicited feedback from faculty across colleges who teach courses in AP programs. Such feedback was provided in written form (see Appendix) and through interviews. The feedback these faculty members provided is based on five years of observation and analysis. It is evident that the faculty are concerned about pressure to weaken academic standards to boost enrollment, lack of accountability regarding marketing of programs, and deception of students regarding program requirements.

Several faculty members perceive that information provided to prospective students by AP agents undermines student success at NKU. AP does not require that students be oriented to their degree program or advised by faculty. Consequently, some students are unaware of, or do not understand, program requirements. Poor understanding of requirements can delay graduation. The accelerated nature of AP programs means that all courses must be taught in a 7-week online format. This "one size fits all" model does not meet the needs of all online students, nor does it dovetail with the expectations of community partners. Faculty teaching in programs with a field placement requirement report that it is difficult to place students "mid-semester" (i.e., in March and October). More generally, the rigidity of the AP format can make it difficult for instructors to incorporate evidence-based teaching practices in their courses. Consequently, AP programs strip away the most productive and fulfilling aspects of the educational experience for instructors and students. AP prioritizes convenience and enrollment growth over education.

Another theme that emerges from faculty feedback is the perception that AP programs "cannibalize" traditional programs. NKU allows AP to charge less per credit hour for courses in the same program. When tuition for AP programs is lower than tuition for face-to-face or hybrid programs, cost-conscious students are pulled away from traditional programs. Consequently, enrollment in traditional or hybrid programs—wherein the university keeps 100% of tuition revenue—declines. For example, tuition for students enrolled in the AP master's in social work (MSW) program is \$599 per credit hour, inclusive of fees. Tuition for students enrolled in the traditional MSW program ranges from \$669 to \$999 per credit hour (depending on residency). One hundred forty-nine students are currently enrolled in the AP MSW program. Those 149 students generate less than \$500,000 in additional tuition revenue compared to the 54 students enrolled in the traditional MSW program. The traditional program could generate the same amount of tuition revenue as the AP program by adding just ten students. Sunsetting the AP

program would also significantly reduce instructional costs because fewer faculty would be needed.

There is widespread concern among the faculty that AP is not being held accountable for meeting their obligations in marketing. Despite NKU being responsible for approving AP marketing plans, the faculty know little about how AP is marketing our programs or recruiting students to our programs. AP staff have conceded that they will not recruit from regions with universities who also utilize AP services. Because AP marketing strategies are proprietary, we can only guess whether they target students outside of our traditional market audience. That AP has been able to recruit some students who reside outside the traditional marketing area for NKU does not necessarily mean that such students would not have enrolled in a traditional program. Some traditional programs have recruited from outside of the three-state market since inception.

Finally, the faculty suspect that students are being misled by AP. Students may believe that they are being recruited by NKU when, in fact, they are being recruited by an AP agent. Additionally, students are led to believe that they may begin their courses immediately, even though their financial aid has not been processed. Consequently, enrollment must be delayed. Further, and importantly, because it is in AP's best interest to maximize enrollment, there is pressure from AP on NKU faculty, including program directors, to weaken admissions requirements and program curricula. This pressure is applied to NKU administrators who, in turn, pressure the faculty to make admissions and curricular changes.

In summary, the only service AP now provides to NKU is in marketing and recruitment, and the NKU faculty is unable to evaluate if that service is meeting any goal or objective.

Faculty Senate Recommendations Regarding the University's Agreement with Academic Partnerships

We strongly recommend that an analysis be conducted *on every AP program* at NKU to determine how many students must be enrolled for the University to generate revenue. Such an analysis should be done with input from the program and/or school director. If the enrollment in any program does not meet the break-even point, that program ought not be included in a contract renewal. Programs that have sufficient enrollment to generate revenue for the University, *and that attract students who are unlikely to enroll in a traditional or hybrid program*, ought to be renewed, pending the agreement of *the program and/or school director and the tenured faculty, and following consultations with non-tenure-track faculty, who teach in those programs.*

Formatted: Highlight

We strongly recommend that NKU administrators and faculty not acquiesce to high-pressure tactics that would weaken NKU's admissions standards or program curricula. "Quality matters" must be more than lip service. Actions that erode the quality of the educational experience harm students, faculty, the degree program's reputation, and the university's long-term viability.

We strongly recommend that NKU exercise greater oversight regarding the marketing of AP programs. AP must be held accountable for increasing enrollment *in every program*. Those NKU individuals responsible for the oversight of course mapping, marketing, and general oversight

Formatted: Font: Italic

must be clearly identified. Such individuals must incorporate faculty input, including that of school or program directors, into their interactions with AP to ensure that programs are being marketed appropriately.

We recommend the creation of working groups within departments whose purpose is to solicit feedback from instructors of AP courses and to liaison with the university curriculum committee (UCC). The UCC should make recommendations to the university's AP point person, and the university's AP point person should be responsible for reporting back to the UCC.

We recommend that NKU exercise greater flexibility in making decisions regarding low-enrollment courses offered through the AP program. If low-enrollment courses must be offered, such courses ought to be made available to traditional students. If traditional students enroll in these courses, care must be exercised to ensure that these traditional students are not counted as AP students.

Appendix: Feedback from the faculty regarding Academic Partnerships

(Some identifying information has been removed and some comments edited for clarity.)

Theme: the quality of the educational experience for students and instructors is weakened in AP programs.

- The 7-Week course requirement basically eliminates the opportunity for instructors to solicit student feedback on how to improve the course mid-way, in real-time. Due to the hyper-compressed mandated timelines, by the time the instructor receives feedback from students, or detects ways to improve a course, especially a new course, mid-way, there are only a couple weeks left, which denies the instructor the opportunity to make course improvements and denies the students opportunities for an improved learning experience. Both students and instructors “lose” because of these dynamics. Such dynamics then often create additional stress and problems for instructors to manage e.g., students then complain about the 7-week course structure, etc. within the anonymous course/instructor evaluations.
- As currently deployed, AP extracts and strips away most, if not all of the most productive and fulfilling aspects of the educational experience for instructors and students. Yes, many students may be initially seduced by the perceived convenience, discounted tuition rates and (recklessly) accelerated/fast timelines. However, once students start the class, many express dissatisfaction and regret about the AP “rules.” What many students report they seek, cherish and value above all else is a meaningful connection, relationship and communication with their instructor and their fellow students however AP approaches undermines, sabotages and largely eliminates opportunities for such interactions. However, the student is faced no choice but to enroll in the class and by the time they realize how horrible, restrictive, etc. the AP approaches, structure and “rules” are, it’s often too late for them to get a refund on tuition from NKU so they just suffer through it. As do their instructors. Yet by then the students are often “angry, frustrated AP customers” and just blame everything on their NKU instructor vs. the faceless, nameless, bureaucratic corporate AP entities.
- Students in asynchronous online 7-week classes appear far less engaged and connected to NKU which, based upon initial observations and experiences, may be contributing to severe, precipitous declines of rates of student participation in completing course evals. This denies the instructor the opportunity to receive important feedback from students and significantly erodes the opportunity for instructors to improve their courses’ pedagogy and be responsive to student input. This results in lower quality education and learning experiences for students and makes the instructor’s efforts to promote student success even more unnecessarily challenging.
- Faculty and administrators from numerous universities and colleges around the country continue to express disillusionment and disappointment at how and why NKU would ever enter into such an obviously extremely predatory corporate, anti-student, anti-public education contract with AP that undermines the integrity of public education and exploits their own instructors and staff at every turn. The fact that NKU has done this remains unconscionable within many amidst national and global educational communities.

- AP disregards, dismisses any and all respect for pedagogy or student's educational experience and learning process in their sole pursuit of corporate profits. This has quickly become obvious to students. One student, when frustrated and complaining about AP having learned she had to enroll in such course asked, "Does AP really stand for 'Always Profits?'"
- AP rules for advising are not in the best interest of the student: AP does not want any students to be required to meet with an NKU advisor any time while they are in the program. It has been communicated they do not want anything to impede a student from registering for courses. While this may work with graduate studies, it does not work with undergrad as these students often need gen ed and/or additional upper division level credits in addition to the program requirements in order to graduate. AP does not communicate this to potential/new students (or at least not very well) because students will get to where they think they can graduate and find out they need several more courses to fulfill NKU graduation requirements. Students are furious and this creates a poor reflection on NKU, not AP.
- Students who graduate with AP courses have NOT encountered all of the content that we are able to offer students in our traditional programs.
- As stated before, all courses are 7-weeks, which does pose a problem for field as it is designed as a semester or 2-semester course. Having students starting field at these different 7-week term times becomes confusing for the agencies and they are not wanting to take students and are adamant about only taking students during the "typical" times (i.e., August, January, and May). This is hurting our relationship in the community with our agency partners. When this was addressed with AP, we were told to just get more agencies. This is NOT the issue. We have partnered with close to 75 new agencies and have over 200+ placement options. The issue is that the agencies do not want students that are not on their time lines. One of the biggest impacts is for the students that want to work in schools or hospitals. They find out later that they cannot do their internship at a school/hospital because of when they are slated to take field and this has upset some of the students as well.
- ... if the 7-week classes are as rigorous as our 16-week class, then two 7-week classes should amount to more than 12 credit hours of course work. If the student enrolls in 3, 7-week classes, it should amount to more than 18 hours of course work in those 7 weeks. A traditional student needs permission from the Dean to enroll in extra credit hours. The Dean pays attention to student capacity to engage in additional coursework; however, that process is eliminated with A|P|. Thus, relinquishing enrollment oversight may increase students' chance to fail a course or to earn more than 2 "C" grades which would terminate the student from all NKU graduate programs.
- Online students, are not regularly checking emails, and have missed Field orientation or all important things related to field because of this. They seem more confused about the field process because they are not checking emails where they receive the necessary information.
- Requirement of course development in a packaged style so that any adjunct could teach any of our courses. This results in lower quality teaching, and ultimately negatively impacts our students.

Theme: AP exerts pressure on NKU to weaken admission standards and program curricula.

- Program faculty were promised that there would be a cut off for admissions, this has not been followed. In fact, NKU will admit transfer students 2 and 3 days after the first day of a 7-week term. This leaves the student NO time to get the textbook. By the time they are settled in, it's week 2, which is the equivalent of week 3 1/2 to 4 in a 16-week program.
- Program faculty were promised that if courses were in the carousel, they would be offered. It was acknowledged that they would be low enrolled at times, but they would be offered. Now, because of HUGE mistakes made in admin, we are being told those courses will be canceled if they are low enrolled and that we will need to find a substitute. It's insulting because if there were a suitable substitute, we wouldn't teach the class that was canceled.
- AP disregarded NKU admission standards for programs.
- We do a better job of admissions to enrollment if we (collectively) communicate and can reach out to applicants. Right now, only AP is supposed to reach out to applicants – we are allowed to once they are admitted.
- Their deadlines are also not realistic – not because we can't get them admitted and enrolled in time - but because financial aid can't be set up that quickly. We have a lot of students drop courses because they can't get financial aid worked out if it is three weeks or less before classes start.
- ... since we have kept our courses rigorous, faculty in our program have received lower course evaluations from AP students because some other programs have greatly reduced what is necessary for a student to complete an AP 7-week course. And, we have lost students to these programs, hurting our enrollment numbers. Leading to lowering admission standards and discussions about lowering course requirements to help boost enrollment
- Control of offerings should be determined by programs so that program requirements can be met.
- Curricular decisions—particularly about programs-should be under faculty control.
- Inability to offer synchronous online courses
- Inability to offer anything but 7-week courses, regardless of curricular needs
- Inability to offer our own orientation to incoming MSW students
- Pressured/forced to admit all applicants, even those with minimal qualifications.
- Inability to include necessary course content due to the condensed presentation of AP courses.
- AP value came early in the relationship, and they have been paid for this value. They force development of online programs, carousels, and course design. They provide, albeit poorly, behind the scenes: marketing, student support and instructional design.
- Since then, the behind-the-scenes support is inadequate.
- The administration overpromised and did not provide the faculty resources to deliver.

Theme: Students are being misled by AP agents.

- Communication – from AP (who represent themselves as NKU agents) to students.
- AP representatives are allowed to say they are from NKU when in fact they are not and continue to provide bad advice to students

- AP lies to incoming students about upcoming course and instructor expectations. AP also makes promises about course dynamics that they are totally ignorant of e.g. "Your instructor won't require students to complete assignments on the weekends." Then, once the class starts, AP's impossible promises, of which course instructors are totally unaware of, immediately prove false and then the students blame everything on their NKU faculty/instructor. In general, AP appears utterly useless, only existing as a parasitic, greed-fueled entity to NKU and represents an enormous squandering, excessive waste of State and University funds. What if any "staff" they have seem non-existent e.g., seemingly "no-show jobs." Whatever "marketing or recruitment" efforts they engage in remains invisible and/or non-existent. Instead, ALL the responsibility of creating new, online AP classes is dumped upon existing NKU faculty while AP remains devoid of relevant, or evident "checks and balances" or accountability and just collects the money in the manner of a corporate "cash grab" that is occurring on the backs of existing, overworked, underpaid public education teachers and staff.
- Communication errors from AP to students: AP has encouraged students who have a general associate degree to apply to the program and then request admission to the degree completion track, without clearly having met the admission requirements. This is surely a way for AP to get more students in the program but not acceptable. Also, when speaking with students they are often misadvised about the program, requirements, tuition, etc. This could be from false information relayed from AP at the time of recruitment/admission but also due to the lack of advising requirement.
- This is not an accelerated program.
- We call this an accelerated program, but unless students find an online 16 week to couple with their 2/2 7-week classes or attend over the summer, it will take a student more than 4 years to graduate.
- If the AP classes are as rigorous as the 16-week classes, students should not be enrolling in more than 2 during each 7-week period. When I asked about this during the AP meetings right after the contract was signed, both AP and the Provost said, well accelerated means the classes are accelerated, not the time it takes to graduate. However, all marketing by AP focuses on students graduating in less than 4 years. It appears AP wants us to enroll students in more than 2 classes every 7 weeks.

Theme: AP programs cannibalize traditional programs.

- We need to look at cannibalization data.
- AP advocates or requests the tuition be lower than our same program that isn't AP; we wouldn't be able to get our tuition lowered to match AP (for our hybrid programs) so that essentially cannibalizes our on-campus program since cost is a big factor for students. Ex: Advanced Standing MSW (AP tuition, regardless of residency, \$599 per credit hour and all fees included= \$18,500 30-hour program) (Hybrid program, KY resident: \$669 per credit hour; cost \$20, 120; breakdown: 613 resident rate + 16 rec fee + 40 for online course fee) (Hybrid program, Grad metro: \$630 per credit hour; cost \$20, 630; breakdown: 630 metro rate + 16 rec fee + 40 for online course fee).
- My department began offering our BA degree as part of NKU's partnership with Academic Partners. The data indicated that from 2000 to 2023 fall BA enrollment has increased dramatically. It has been proposed that online AP programs maybe cannibalized our native BA enrollment. If this is the case, one would expect that as the

AP BA numbers increased that there would be a corresponding decline in the on-campus BA's. This was not supported by the data I reviewed with native BA's increasing from 2018 to 2022.

Theme: AP is not being held accountable for meeting their marketing obligations.

- Lack of program specific marketing: I have yet to see any specific marketing tactics for [our program] from AP. In meetings with AP, when asked how they are advertising the program, it is always a generic answer. In AP reports showing the work of their outreach team, [our program] has never been mentioned. In quarterly reports with AP, I have provided various professions where marketing should be targeted but have yet to see anything done with it. My point is that six years into this relationship, AP does not know how to market my program and when given suggestions of what was successful when NKU marketed the program, they go nowhere. This is obvious given our enrollment is significantly down in comparison to where it was pre-AP.
- When we entered into the partnership with AP they had been primarily offering graduate level programs in business, healthcare and education. Offering undergraduate programs was a relatively new venture for them. I do not believe that there was any in-depth marketing analysis to see which undergraduate programs would be of interest to the target market. The target market being nontraditional adult learners who had some previous college course work and are seeking to obtain a degree while working and managing family demands. Further analysis of the enrollment data needs to be done to determine if this is the demographic that we have been able to reach with AP. Specifically, a comparison of the age, marital status, and location of AP students to our native population would be insightful. As we move forward there should be a market analysis to determine which programs are more appealing to this nontraditional demographic.
- ... after AP took the initial programs, existing online programs that were not included became invisible. For instance, if a student interested in Organizational Leadership online called the 'NKU Online Admissions' or completed an online admissions application, they were told that it wasn't available online and it wasn't an option on the online admissions application.
- ... if some programs ... are removed, when new students apply, they will no longer see the online options for programs not included in the [AP] contract and conclude the program is not offered online.
- ... each program needs their own link to the application process, and AP needs to agree to provide information to students calling about online programs that are not in their contract. Simply provide a contact to someone at the university, so those students aren't left in a vacuum.
- AP Revenue shares are too large.
- Data from AP—unsourced, unreliable.

Theme: AP "point persons" at NKU are not responsive to faculty concerns.

- Resistance from those at NKU managing AP programs: Those who are in charge of managing AP programs at NKU seem to be pro-AP and are resistant to hearing

otherwise). They also make any small change request an ordeal and are steadfast in their support of AP, instead of what is best for our NKU program and NKU students. They disregard any/all feedback from me as a program director who has managed this program for 10 years.

- Lack of any enrollment growth: When AP took over [our program], we had [twice as many] enrolled students. As of Spring 2023, we have [half as many] students currently enrolled. I have tried to professionally communicate my concerns to deans, Sam, etc. but it is met with extreme resistance. Those making decisions/reviewing the data do not know the history of the program/tracks and AP is presenting information about program growth that is not accurate.
- Control of scheduling—unable to make cuts to carousel, had to appeal. There is only one point person outside the college who was characterized as having AP interests rather than NKUs at the forefront-- Point person should advocate for university, not AP.

Theme: Faculty workload has increased since entering the agreement with AP.

- NKU instructors are excluded from whatever "orientation" AP purports to engage in; however, once the class starts, the NKU faculty are besieged with trying to dispel AP myths, provide accurate, current information to students yet by then it's too late. Students then complain about and blame everything on their NKU instructors via their teaching/course evaluations, which then just creates more work, stress and problems for NKU faculty to manage. These dynamics mean that AP forces NKU instructors into a constant state of "damage-control" as NKU instructors attempt to explain all the lies that AP tells incoming students. It's profoundly time-consuming and demoralizing. Students and instructors all lose in this scenario. Meanwhile, AP just sits on the sidelines, does nothing and collects massive corporate profits.
- The fact that existing NKU faculty are forced to create the curricula, materials, Canvas courses, etc. for new AP courses represents an enormous burden on top of already exploding/excessive instructor workloads, especially during a global pandemic. The fact that NKU faculty are not monetarily compensated for these additional, enormous expenditures of labor is tantamount to a university-wide scheme and a potentially legally actionable instance of class-action labor/worker wage theft.
- The intense additional burden that AP places on NKU faculty is not fairly distributed across NKU colleges or departments. Some colleges and departments are forced into using AP which means their faculty, staff and advisors endure enormous extra, additional uncompensated work while other colleges and departments are allowed to continue as if AP does not exist. These colleges and departments reap alleged potential benefits from the illusion that AP is somehow benefitting NKU (which it obviously is not) while carrying none of the extreme burden that AP and NKU forces upon existing NKU faculty in other departments and colleges regarding curriculum development.
- Too much pressure to meet deadlines during AP course development
- High pressure tactics—timetable, content, style

Theme: The decision to enter an agreement with AP was inconsistent with collegial governance.

- NKU hires world-class faculty from around the country who possess areas of expertise such as (but not limited to) business, finance, law, contracts, torts, private and government contract negotiations, executive management/budgeting, etc., however NKU Administration made the (reckless) decision to not meaningfully include such faculty into the decision-making process prior to signing the contract with AP. Sadly and tragically, had NKU Administration chosen a path which included such parties, which have a preponderance of relevant expertise, such would have likely resulted with FAR greater, more positive monetary and educational outcomes for NKU in general. Yet unfortunately and regretfully, NKU faculty were largely shut out from the decision to enter into this contract with AP. Had faculty been included in the process, there could have been some "checks and balances" and NKU perhaps wouldn't be \$28 million in the red, much of which can be blamed on what can only be described as abysmal contract negotiations (at least for the interests of NKU) with AP.
- I'm really concerned about the university ending 7-week programs after the AP contract is dead. We have students that have been admitted into these programs without any knowledge of the AP contract or it possibly ending. While there are a lot of problems with AP and what the university has set up, I don't want our program to be forced to end the 7-week program or alter it greatly just because the university made a bad decision. We need to find a way to allow it to continue allowing each program to make changes necessary for their success. i.e., faculty governance, which seems to be unheard of these days at NKU.

Theme: Outcomes of the agreement with AP are inconsistent with NKU's values.

- AP exists and depends upon a "one-size-fits-all" approach. However, not every college, department, class, discipline or topic is equally able to be effectively taught within their "one-size-fits-all" approach. For example, a class on policy or literature may be able to be transitioned to a 100% online 7-week, accelerated asynchronous environment with some ease; however attempting to teach nursing students how to bandage wounds, insert IV's, de-escalate psychotic individuals, train students how to best triage gunshot victims, how to intervene immediately after a patient or client is murdered, how to best supportively and effectively reveal to a patient/client that they have just tested positive for HIV/AIDS, etc. are all essential to provide effective training to current and future public health leaders yet these topics and educational imperatives do not transfer or fit AP's "one-size fits all" approach. This appears to represent NKU choosing alleged "profits" over "people" and makes NKU more of a potential threat to public health, safety and the State/Region's standards of healthcare vs. the trusted, health-advancing community institution NKU was historically regarded as.
- NKU spends millions of dollars on, enables and permits AP to operate in a "Ponzi-scheme" like manner where existing, already chronically underpaid, overworked, doctorate-level expert faculty are forced to engage in even further unpaid overwork in order to create courses that AP gets all the monetary remuneration and "credit" for. In this regard, AP acts like a silent, invisible, "no-show" "investor" in NKU's educational infrastructure that simply collects the huge corporate profits from the highly-expert, highly educated labor and expertise of others at NKU.

- AP does not align in any evident way with existing NKU DEI initiatives and commitments as announced and stated by NKU. In fact, the exploitation of often diverse, expert, underpaid existing labor and the parasitic nature of AP aggressively undermines ALL alleged NKU DEI commitments.
- NKU purports to care about reducing gender-based oppression that women experience however considering the majority of NKU instructors are women, entering into and continuing the massive AP wage/labor-theft scheme further oppresses women and other minorities.
- NKU has at least voiced a desire to rectify the "crisis of non-belongingness," low-morale, etc. that NKU faculty/staff report experiencing en masse; however, AP remains one of the most potent mechanisms for creating and proliferating NKU's current toxic work environment and culture.



Kentucky Faculty Advisory Network Application

The purpose of the Faculty Advisory Network is to convey their perspectives on state-level policies and initiatives and advise CPE President Aaron Thompson on matters of interest to the faculty. The group will share information from their respective institutions and provide valuable insight to CPE's president on state-level priorities. Members will also serve as a conduit of information between CPE and their institutions. The monthly meetings are typically held on Fridays at 10:00am (ET)/9:00am(CT).

Submit this form and your curriculum vitae by email to cpe.news@ky.gov. Please include "Faculty Advisory Network Application – [the name of your school]" in the subject line.

Due September 8th

Name: _____

Institutional e-mail address: _____

Title: _____

Institution: _____

Employment type: Full-time Part-time

Faculty status: Tenured Non-tenured Adjunct

Describe your teaching experience and how it would inform your role as a Kentucky Faculty Advisor. *You may include your areas of expertise, any innovative pedagogical techniques you have employed, your lessons learned and successes with employing those techniques, and anything else about your teaching experience that would inform your role as a faculty advisor.*

Describe examples of your experience in one or more of the following areas, focusing on how your expertise in the area would serve the goals of CPE's Kentucky Faculty Advisory Network.

1. *Promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion and how you have put your beliefs into practice:*
2. *Promoting academic quality through the Kentucky Graduate Profile:*
3. *Analyzing curricular complexity to facilitate student success:*
4. *Expanding and evaluating high impact practices:*

Please elaborate on why you would like to be a member of the Kentucky Faculty Advisory Network.

Northern Kentucky University Statement on Engagement with the Board of Regents

As Northern Kentucky University recruits its next president, and continues to confront structural budget challenges, we must focus on our shared mission, values, and identity. Since its inception, NKU has embraced its role as a regional, public, teaching-focused university. Among our core values is a climate of collegiality built on respect and characterized by open communication and shared responsibility.

The search process for the next president has brought together faculty, staff, students, community members, and regents to discuss our priorities and values. The faculty is encouraged by the receptivity of regents involved in these discussions. Nonetheless, a divide exists between the Board, as a whole, and the faculty, as a whole.

We believe that the Board shares the faculty's commitment to the well-being of the university. Nonetheless, several decisions made by the Board weaken the confidence of the faculty that the Board shares our understanding of the core values and mission of NKU. In this statement, we enumerate those decisions and identify a path toward better mutual understanding. The faculty recognize that some decisions were made when the composition of the Board was different than it is today. However, the current Board is responsible for the effective governance of the University for successful operations to meet its mission.

The University currently is suffering an unprecedented financial crisis. A primary role of the Board of Regents is to safeguard the financial stability of the University. At all times, the regents have regularly received audited quarterly-financial-statements of NKU's revenues and expenditures. Therefore, NKU's current financial crisis stems, in part, from the failure of the regents to review and act upon financial information that was presented to them in the ordinary course of business.

The regents have reacted to this financial crisis by making decisions that have had the effect of decimating NKU's academic programs. These decisions have resulted in the elimination of one-sixth of the university's full-time faculty positions over a period of just three years, leaving some academic programs to be taught entirely by part-time adjunct instructors. Recently, the Board offered raises to certain athletic coaches just one week after 23 tenure-line faculty members were paid to resign and 17 additional faculty members were laid off. This decision and its timing suggest the success of the basketball program is more important to the Board than the success of the academic programs that have been devastated by cuts. NKU's mission is as a teaching-focused university. The cuts to academics means that, more and more, we rely on grossly underpaid part-time instructors to teach and nurture students. This cannot continue. Additionally, this increased athletic spending only exacerbates the financial crisis.

NKU's current financial crisis stems, in part, from the decision to hire the University's most recent president. The prior president was the first president NKU ever hired using a search process in which no finalists made public presentations on campus to the University community. Consequently, the faculty had no opportunity to raise any concerns prior to his appointment.

Such exclusion is contrary to the Statement of Collegial Governance which states that "[g]ood faith consultation with faculty bodies is routine in the ... [s]election of the President and Executive Officers," and that "[f]aculty opinion in these matters should be strongly considered."

Because NKU's current financial crisis stems, in part, from the trust that the regents placed in our previous president, the Faculty Senate resolved on November 28, 2022, regarding the presidential search process, "that faculty, staff, and students should have a meaningful role in the presidential search process, which should include opportunities to attend public presentations on-campus from finalists and to provide input before a hiring decision is made." While the Faculty Senate agrees with the concern to maximize the quality and diversity of the candidate pool for the presidential search, we believe that it is possible to build a quality pool in a search that is confidential to protect the privacy of the candidates but is also transparent and accountable to the members of the university community. Ultimately, the search process cannot prioritize unknown candidates over the involvement of the university community.

Trust and confidence can only be restored by openness, transparency, and understanding built through professional relationships between the Board, as a whole, and the faculty, as a whole. The Faculty Senate holds that this can be accomplished while maintaining the healthy restrictions on the actions of both groups that is outlined in the *Bylaws of the NKU Board of Regents*. We propose these steps to begin:

1. Commit to a transparent process in the search for the next University president. All finalists must deliver public presentations on-campus that provide an opportunity for faculty, staff, and students to provide meaningful input before a candidate is selected.
2. Commit to respecting the role of faculty bodies in the shared governance of the University as reflected in the *Collegial Governance at NKU* document.
3. Commit to receiving regular updates from Faculty Senate and Staff Congress, in addition to ongoing input from the faculty and staff regents, on items of importance to these groups.
4. Commit to the regular engagement of individual regents with various campus groups throughout the academic year, for example, attendance at events such as the *Celebration of Student Research and Creativity and Experiential Learning Week*, and the *Academic Affairs Faculty and Staff Awards*.

NKU Faculty Senate statement on support of the NKU LGBTQ+ community

The Faculty Senate of Northern Kentucky University is concerned by the recent passage of Senate Bill 150, which bans gender-affirming care to minors; restricts the use of a student's preferred pronouns; requires school districts to form bathroom policies based on biological sex; and limits discussions about gender identity and sexual orientation in school curricula.

NKU faculty fully adhere to the core values of the university, which assert we are to “foster a community of belonging by embracing equity, diversity, and inclusiveness.” We affirm the right of all students, faculty, staff, administrators, and personnel at NKU to lead fulfilling lives free of discrimination, whether due to age, race, color, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, or disability status. As such, we voice our strong support of the NKU LGBTQ+ community.

UCC Report, 2022-2023 Academic Year

1. Overview

The UCC has 29 voting members, one from each academic department/school (except for SOTA which has three members) plus one member each from Steely Library and University Programs. Ex-officio members come from the Office of the Registrar and the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs. The UCC meets the 1st and 3rd Thursday, September through April (except December and January which have a single meeting each). The second March meeting was held on the 4th Thursday to avoid a conflict with Graduate Council. During the 2022-23 academic year, all meetings were held by zoom. Four meetings were changed from zoom to email votes only, a fifth email vote took place in May, and one meeting early in the academic year was canceled. Average attendance was 72%.

Sara Runge represented the UCC on AAPC. The college committee curriculum chairs were Mike Bush (COAS), Nancy Lang (COB), Ginger Blackwell (COE), Hallie Sylvestro (COHHS), Richard Fox (COI). The UCC chair was Richard Fox and the secretary was Kim Kattus.

2. Curriculum Changes Approved

No new degree programs came through the process, but we did approve the Transformational Thinking for Community and Career (STAR) program. Three new minors were approved. Other curriculum approved is as follows (all numbers are approximate):

- Number of program changes: 86
- Number of new courses: 36
- Number of course changes: 342
- Number of course deletions: 36

3. Other Efforts

- Modified the definition of the Focus to permit interdisciplinary areas of study and to permit programs to enforce minimum grades on courses that count toward a Focus.
- The UCC discussed ways to create an SLO bank and we hope to have this built during the upcoming academic year.
- We spent some time discussing whether we should modify undergraduate graduation requirements to help students graduate in fewer hours but decided not to pursue this topic at this time.
- Improved Curriculog forms.

4. Expected Initiatives for 2023-2024

- Building the SLO repository.

Submitted by Richard Fox, UCC Chair