

Minutes of the CUCAO Meeting of July 30, 2018

In attendance: Pam Benoit (via phone), (Caterina Bristol?), Greg Carnes, Christine Curtis, Joe Delap, Tim Edwards, David Johnson, James McDonald, Charles Nash, Matt Ragland, Kevin Whitaker, Daniel Wims, and Emmett Winn.

I. Dr. Daniel Wims called the meeting of the Council of University Chief Academic Officers to order at 10:00 a.m. and welcomed all present.

II. Minutes of the May 30-June 1, 2018 meeting were approved as submitted, and the Agenda for the current meeting provided.

III. Dr. Curtis provided the Treasurer's report. With Dr. Wheelan's expenses and charge for the meeting rooms, the account balance was down to \$148.06. Dues notices were sent out and a reply was requested. The question of an increase in fees was discussed. Perhaps not including the cost of food could be considered. Meeting with two-year institutions was found valuable. Report was approved.

IV. In an open discussion of the value of the Retreat, it was judged to be informative to meet with the two-year institutions. Negotiations with location providers has begun.

V. Drs. Whitaker and Johnson recapped the events and discussions leading up to today's document on Accountability Measures for Higher Education. Strategic planning development began last year at the request of Senator Marsh, along with the formation of a Task Force to knit the Plans together. Over 100 goals / objectives were ranked and themes of importance identified, including accountability, funding, workforce preparation, and innovation.

The current focus is on accountability. The document provided today comes from ACHE.

Dr. Johnson noted he was added late to the Task Force, where he saw a shift from Performance Based Funding (PBF) to ACHE enforceability and authority. He heard no explanation provided for the shift, but the Plan was well received by the group in general for its concepts. As Provosts, we should continue to shape this document and its components. Now is our opportunity.

A question was raised about how the Community Colleges were faring under its PBF system. The current financial impact is apparently minimal.

Issues discussed with the document from ACHE before the group included a discussion about financial stability and tuition discounting. It was also discussed how public universities' circumstances differ with regard to ACHE authority.

VI. Performance Based Funding discussion continued after lunch, beginning with questions of how professional development of trustees could meet with differing reception among their

ranks. A move toward a statewide system of higher education could be part of the philosophy behind the Accountability Document under discussion and consideration.

The group had concerns about the Financial Stability area of the metrics proposed and noted we as Provosts need to determine a direction we want to go.

The requirement that undergraduate tuition be limited to percentiles of ACHE-determined peer institutions was noted to be problematic, along with limitations on scholarships. It was asked whether our institutions could not show how they are keeping comparative scores themselves, as our trustees show interest.

The question was raised as to where state dollars to support an Endowment Fund would come from. Would this not be a budget-line item?

There was also some question of why a limitation would be placed on debt-service payment. It makes better sense to base that on overall revenues.

The importance of showing ACHE and the legislature that we do keep track of these metrics and report them to our accreditors was noted. There was discussion of whether a smaller numbers of goals/ metrics make better sense to focus on.

Under the topic of Student Success, remediation has gotten protracted discussion, with focus on the role of K-12 preparation.

The question of state and local needs and concerns included the observation that guidelines on acceptance rates into graduate schools is not as helpful as expected.

One final question had to do with whether institutions really had a choice when it comes to accreditation and how the costs are to be covered.

Next step: Communicate where we agree with and where we have concerns about the proposed metrics to Dr. Purcell.

VII. There was an update concerning the SACSCOC issue with the Governor serving as Trustee. More schools are changing their Boards to comply. Some are having to seek legislative action.

VIII. A Fall 2018 meeting was proposed as being needed. At that time, we can check to see where the Presidents are with the accountability plan. An October meeting was seen as good.

IX. Dr. Wims will confer with the two-year institutions to arrange for a joint meeting in Spring 2019.

X. Meeting adjourned at 1:15 pm.