This is a hybrid meeting. Only regents, board and university staff, and individuals involved with the presentation of an agenda item will attend the meeting in person. Some regents and staff may participate via video or by conference call.

Members of the public may attend the public portion of the hybrid meeting by viewing the livestream of the meeting.

To view the livestream of the meeting please follow the instructions below.

ABOR Live is available at the following link:
https://www.youtube.com/user/abornews
- Click the top video for the livestream of the meeting.

If the above link does not work, open a browser, go to www.youtube.com or search YouTube
- Once in YouTube, use the search bar to search for ABOR News
- Click the video that says Live

If livestream fails a call-in option will be available for public access and will be posted on the ABOR website at http://www.azregents.edu/about/abor-live.

For technical assistance, click the link here ABOR Tech Support or email Tom.Merriam@azregents.edu and John.Murnane@asu.edu.

ASU COVID-19 protocols strongly recommend that everyone on campus wear a face cover when inside a university building. Face coverings are required in certain indoor settings where physical distancing may not be possible including meeting rooms.

Committee Members:
- Regent Larry Penley, Chair
- Regent Cecilia Mata
- Regent Bob Herbold
- Superintendent Kathy Hoffman
- Regent Fred DuVal, Vice Chair
- Regent Jessica Pacheco
- Regent Rachel Kanyur
- Regent Lyndel Manson, (ex-officio)
2:00 p.m. CALL TO ORDER, GREETINGS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE CHAIR

2:01 p.m. 1. Approval of Minutes

The board office asks the committee to review and approve the minutes from the May 27, 2021 Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee Meeting.

2:05 p.m. 2. Update from Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction

The committee will receive an update from Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction, Kathy Hoffman.

2:15 p.m. 3. Discussion of Board Admission Policy and Resident Attainment

The committee will engage in a discussion with the universities and the board office about how the ABOR admissions policy interacts with the board’s goal of increasing Arizona resident degree attainment.

2:35 p.m. 4. Arizona State University’s Request to Offer a Two-Year Academic Program in Conjunction with the United States Navy

Arizona State University asks the committee to recommend for board approval a new two-year academic program in Organizational Leadership to be offered solely online in partnership with the United States Navy for enlisted service men and women during 2021-2022 academic year. The committee will also engage in a discussion with the universities and board office on offering two-year degree programs.

3:05 p.m. 5. Request for New General Education Program Framework for Northern Arizona University

Northern Arizona University asks the committee to recommend that the board adopts their proposed General Education Program Framework.

3:35 p.m. 15 Minute Break

3:50 p.m. 6. Arizona Innovation Alliance Update

The committee will receive an update from the Arizona Innovation Alliance.
4:05 p.m. 7. Request for Approval of Online Metrics and Reporting

The committee is asked to recommend that the board approves online metrics for Arizona’s public universities. In addition, the board office will detail other reporting that the board receives over the course of the academic year concerning online students and online instructional programs.

4:25 p.m. 8. Discussion of Arizona State University’s Institutional University Metrics

The committee will engage in a discussion with Arizona State University regarding their proposed Institutional University Metrics.

4:45 p.m. 9. Request for Approval of The University of Arizona’s Institutional University Metrics

The committee is asked to recommend that the board approve the proposed Institutional University Metrics for the University of Arizona.

5:00 p.m. ADJOURN

PLEASE NOTE: This agenda may be amended at any time prior to 24 hours before the committee meeting. Estimated starting times for the agenda items are indicated; however, discussions may commence, or action may be taken, before or after the suggested times. Any item on the agenda may be considered at any time out of order at the discretion of the committee chair. The committee may discuss, consider, or take action regarding any item on the agenda. During the meeting, the committee may convene in executive session pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3) for legal advice regarding any item on the agenda.
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A meeting of the Arizona Board of Regents Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee was held virtually on May 27, 2021.

Committee Members Present via video: Regent Manson, Chair, Regent DuVal, Vice Chair Regent Taylor Robson, Regent Shoopman, Regent Rusk, Regent Penley, Superintendent Hoffman.

Other Regents Present via video: Regent Ridenour, Regent King, Regent Mata


From Northern Arizona University via video: Christy Farley, Provost Stearns, Gayla Stoner

From the University of Arizona via video: President Robbins, Jon Dudas, Provost Folks, Barry Brummund, Kody Kelleher, Jessica Summer, Greg Heilman, Laura Todd Johnson, Craig Wilson, Betsy Cantwell, Craig Wilson, and Steve Voeller.


ABOR Consultant: Jane Kuhn

Closed Captioner: Nicole Flaherty

Chair Manson called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Item 1)

Upon motion by Regent Manson, and seconded by Regent Penley, the committee approved the minutes of the May 27, 2021 Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee Meeting.

Regents Manson, DuVal, Penley, Taylor Robson, Shoopman, Rusk and Superintendent Hoffman voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained. Motion passed.

UPDATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Item 2)

Kathy Hoffman, Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction provided the committee with an update regarding COVID-19 recovery and relief as well as the upcoming school year’s enrollment efforts.
Regent Penley thanked the superintendent for her extraordinary efforts during COVID-19. In addition, he recognized Superintendent Hoffman’s engagement with the committee and the board, especially in the areas of attainment and financial aid assistance for students.

This was a discussion item; no action required.

**REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY’S ANNUAL ENTERPRISE-WIDE METRIC TARGETS AND FORECAST MEASURES (Item 3)**

Chad Sampson and George Raudenbush presented to the committee. Mr. Sampson began with a level set discussion about ABOR metrics and accountability and touched on the various categories which are enterprise-wide metrics, institutional metrics, online metrics and comparators.

Regent Penley offered appreciation to the board office and universities for working to get the metrics to this point. He shared that in 2002, our board focused on differentiating the three universities to better serve the state. The current institutional metrics are in line with this and is now fulfilling a vision that the board had intended almost two decades ago. In addition, Regent Penley commented on the enormous number of online students that are enrolled at the universities. He stressed that the board has an obligation to focus on the kind of measurements that assures a quality education for those students.

George Raudenbush provided an overview of the ASU targets and forecasts.

Regent Ridenour asked what constitutes the definition of an online student. Mr. Raudenbush answered in the context of the enterprise metrics and strategic forecast, an online student is a student that is enrolled in a degree program that is specifically partitioned as an online program. Regent Ridenour also asked what is driving the rapid online growth at ASU. Provost Searle said they are seeing online enrollment growth throughout all fifty states and internationally. The drive seems to be that online programs provide opportunity for students to pursue their education as well as career advancement, as they are seeing explosive growth at the master’s level as well.

Regent Manson asked about the significant increases in student retention and graduate rates. Provost Searle answered that President Crow has set out a goal of ninety per cent for retention of undergraduate students. He said that ASU deploys every tool to drive toward that goal, and for in state students, they are very close to achieving the goal.

Regent Manson also asked about the increase in the net price of tuition, the average increase in average debt per degree for Arizona students and the decrease in the percentage of resident students graduating with no debt.

Mr. Raudenbush answered that these rates were suggested in the context of the net price of tuition and the average debt per degree for Arizona residents as a high watermark not to be exceeded. It was meant to draw a conceptual line that won’t be exceeded. Rich Stanley agreed with Mr. Raudenbush and also stated that the numbers are not goals to be achieved but rather a derivative largely of their ability to provide institutional financial aid to our students.
Regent Shoopman added that the universities deserve a great amount of credit to be able to provide the level of student support that they have done, but there is only so much they can do without a greater support from the state, and legislative approval of increases in overall base funding.

Upon motion by Regent Manson, and second by Shoopman, the committee approved forwarding to the full board for approval of Arizona State University’s Annual Enterprise-wide Metric Targets and Forecast Measures.

Regents Manson, DuVal, Taylor Robson, Regent Penley, Shoopman, Rusk and Superintendent Hoffman voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained. Motion passed.

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA’S ANNUAL ENTERPRISE-WIDE METRIC TARGETS AND FORECAST MEASURES (Item 4)

George Raudenbush provided an overview of the University of Arizona targets and forecasts.

Superintendent Hoffman inquired as to why UArizona is expecting a decline in the Arizona public high school graduate enrollment share. Barry Brummund answered the major driver behind that does not reflect a decline in Arizona enrollment. They are actually planning to increase enrollment of Arizona graduates. What it reflects is the size and scale of the growth in the Phoenix metropolitan area, and since the campus is over a hundred miles away, it reduces the University of Arizona’s market share.

Regent Penley expressed concern over graduation rate and also the lag by the University of Arizona as representing itself as a major research university. He expressed that he would like to encourage more aggressive goals that will drive the kind of change that will allow this institution to catch up. Regent Manson agreed that the goals were unambitious and asked the University of Arizona to address these issues.

President Robbins agreed that there is a lot of opportunity to be more aggressive in research and added that UArizona is moving toward a strategic investment in research infrastructure which means they are going for some of the high risk, high reward endeavors.

Dr. Cantwell added that the university is clearly going to be a billion dollar a year research revenue university around the 2030 timeframe. But they are being mindful of the effort and challenges that the medical faculty have had especially during COVID times.

Regent Penley appreciated the explanation and took into account how much the university can ask of faculty members. However, he questions if there is a necessity to restructure the medical school and faculty who surround it to drive the research forward. His question about whether the metrics should be more aggressive is really a question about how strategic decisions are made at the institution, rather than pushing faculty members to put together more proposals. He tied the same questions and restructuring concepts into the graduation rate metric which is also
linked to retention, and mentioned other comparable institutions’ graduation rates. Regent Penley asked the University of Arizona to reconsider where they are with these metrics, and to come up with something that's far more ambitious, and worthy of what this university should be living up to.

President Robbins commented that the research growth in the last four years, has been substantial. He agrees that a reallocation of resources and strategies will help the university to continue to grow their research enterprise, as they have over the last four years.

Regent Shoopman brought up the other schools with higher graduation rates and presented the possibility that they may only admit A students. Our universities admit A and B students which can be a significant factor in graduation rates. Other factors that can affect graduation rates are the ability to hire faculty and the amount of support the other schools receive from their states.

Regent Shoopman supports aggressive goals if they are attainable. Jon Dudas expanded on Regent Shoopman’s comments and noted that there is not a single school on the Rutgers list that is a Hispanic serving institution. Some of the other schools on the list, rejects twice and sometimes four times as many applicants than UArizona does. All these factors need to be balanced as UArizona has an eighty-five percent admission rate because they support attainment, so he suggests balancing admissions and student success, as they are not only selecting A students to attend.

Provost Folks remarked about the impacts of the pandemic and commented on the very steady trajectory to improve retention and completion rates. She agrees strongly with Regent Penley that many of, these efforts require system level changes, by the university and their vice provost, Greg Heilman, who is a strong partner in driving systemic change that will increase retention and completion rates. However, they are struck by how challenging the pandemic has been for students and do anticipate that they are going to need to rebuild retention figures following the pandemic. They meet daily to focus on efforts that can be made right now to minimize the harm to a student's educational aspirations that the pandemic has wrought.

Regent Penley did conclude with praise for what President Robbins and his team has done in several areas, and acknowledged there has been substantial change in research over the past few years. He is hoping for more ambitious forecasts that will position this institution to be the kind of great research university that I know it is. Further, he recognized the discussions on graduation rates and the variables discussed and would still propose that the university continue to lead all students to success.

Regent Penley suggested that the university take one more look at these areas before this comes before the board.

Regent Manson agreed with Regent Penley's comments and suggested action.

Upon motion proposed by Regent Manson, moved by Regent Taylor Robson, and second by DuVal, the committee approved forwarding to the full board for approval of the University of
Arizona’s Annual Enterprise-wide Metric Targets and Forecast Measures, with the possibility of potential amendments before the board meeting.

Regents Manson, DuVal, Regent Penley, Taylor Robson, Shoopman, Rusk and Superintendent Hoffman voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained. Motion passed.

DISCUSSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA’S INSTITUTIONAL METRICS (Item 5)

Mr. Barry Brummund presented to the committee.

Regent Rusk commented that even though he will be cycling off the board, he was pleased with diversity success metric. He is excited to see this accountability metric as it is a huge issue with all the different populations in the state of Arizona. Regent Rusk will look forward to watching the board focus on these students and their future success.

There was discussion begun by Regent DuVal pertaining to comparing demographic diversity of incoming resident students, with the metric that measures student success for diverse students, which would include non-residents. The decision was made to not add an additional metric but to change it, so that it gives a consistent measure of a consistent cohort.

This was a discussion item; no action required.

DISCUSSION OF ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES AROUND ONLINE LEARNING AND INSTRUCTION (Item 6)

Helen Baxendale presented to the committee and gave an overview of the growth of online education and the need to develop accountability measures.

Ms. Baxendale proceeded to review the proposed metrics. Pertaining to the online student attrition rate, there was discussion related to timeframes used to measure, as it is typical for online students to stop taking classes and then to start at various intervals. The decision was made to measure over possibly three timeframe intervals, and over time, this measure could possibly be adjusted.

Ms. Baxendale introduced the metric pertaining to faculty who are tenured or tenured track. Provost Searle stated that it should not be differentiated between tenure and non-tenured track faculty but should be specified that the faculty be full time. Both Provosts Folks and Stearns agreed with Provost Searle.

Regent Taylor Robson asked if the board office drew from online program metrics from other institutions? Ms. Baxendale answered yes, online institution metrics were researched as well as the rankings from US News and World Online Program.

This was a discussion item; no action required.
REQUEST FOR GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL FOR UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA (Item 7)

Provost Folks presented the General Education Program for approval by the committee.

Regent Taylor Robson asked about a letter that regents received from faculty pertaining to procedural and substantive points about the General Education Program.

Provost Folks shared that the authors of the letter were not among those who regularly engaged in the development of the framework. Faculty has been regularly advised about the meetings available for them to participate in.

Regent Taylor Robson also mentioned that faculty specifically mentioned the civics education requirement. Provost Folks demonstrated how the civics courses align with the ABOR knowledge areas, and also illustrated that there will be two separate student assessments as this is relatively new to the university.

Upon motion by Regent Manson, and second by Regent Taylor Robson, the committee approved forwarding to the full board for approval the General Education Program for the University of Arizona.

Regents Manson, DuVal, Penley, Taylor Robson, Shoopman, Rusk and Superintendent Hoffman voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained. Motion passed.

REQUEST FOR NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND NEW ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA (Item 8)

Provost Folks presented to the committee to request approval to add a new academic organizational unit, the School of Mining and Mineral Resources, and two new academic programs, which are an MA in Program Design and Evaluation and an MS in Data Science.

Upon motion by Regent Manson, and second by Regent Shoopman, the committee approved forwarding to the full board for approval two new program requests and one new academic organizational unit for the University of Arizona.

Regents Manson, DuVal, Penley, Taylor Robson, Shoopman, Rusk and Superintendent Hoffman voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained. Motion passed.

REQUEST FOR CREDIT EXCEPTION FOR NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY (Item 9)

Provost Stearns presented to the committee to request to change the academic program credit requirements for the Biology, B.S. in Biological Sciences.

Regent Penley lauded Provost Stearns and NAU for leading the way with collaboration with the community colleges.
Upon motion by Regent Manson, and second by Regent Shoopman, the committee approved forwarding to the full board for approval the credit exception request for Northern Arizona University.

Regents Manson, DuVal, Penley, Taylor Robson, Shoopman, Rusk and Superintendent Hoffman voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained. Motion passed.

APPROVAL OF LIST OF QUALIFYING EXAMINATIONS FOR HIGH SCHOOL AND HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER INCENTIVE BONUSES (Item 10)

Mark Denke presented to the committee and highlighted the changes to the list which had been previously reviewed by each of the universities.

Upon motion by Regent Manson, and second by Regent Shoopman, the committee approved forwarding to the full board for approval the request for approval the Approval of List of Qualifying Examinations for High School and High School Teacher Incentive Bonuses.

Regents Manson, DuVal, Penley, Taylor Robson, Shoopman, Rusk and Superintendent Hoffman voted in favor. None opposed and none abstained. Motion passed.

AJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:06 p.m.

Submitted by:

Debbie Sale, Committee Secretary
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Item Name: Update from Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The committee will receive an update from Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction, Kathy Hoffman.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

The committee will receive an update from Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction, Kathy Hoffman.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

None
This page intentionally left blank
Item Name: Discussion of Board Admission Policy and Resident Attainment

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The committee will engage in a discussion with the universities and the board office about how the ABOR admissions policy interacts with the board’s goal of increasing Arizona resident degree attainment.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

Increasing the proportion of the Arizona population in possession of a post-secondary degree is essential to Arizona’s future economic and social wellbeing. Growing resident degree attainment is especially important because residents are significantly more likely than non-residents to remain in Arizona beyond graduation\(^1\). If current high school graduation, college-going and completion rates continue, only 18.5% of the current cohort of Arizona 9th graders will obtain a four-year degree.

As part of the ABOR’s continued focus on raising Arizona resident attainment, board staff recently conducted a series of stakeholder meetings to better understand real and or perceived barriers to college enrollment. Larry Sandigo, VP for External Relations and Community Outreach will briefly outline the scope of these consultations and the main findings. A significant theme emerging from stakeholder consultation was a concern that the 16 ABOR core competencies for university admission may be deterring certain groups capable of succeeding in university from applying and enrolling in ABOR institutions. The course requirements to graduate from high school in Arizona differ from the course requirements to be admitted into an ABOR institution. These differences are most pronounced in the areas of math, science, and second language. Stakeholders consistently noted that these differences can be a barrier to university enrollment, particularly for students from smaller, more remote schools. Stakeholders also expressed a view that ABOR admission requirements could be more clearly and widely disseminated to key audiences.

Enrollment leads at ASU, NAU and UArizona compiled data related to coursework deficiencies in admissions, denials, enrollments, and one-year retention. The data demonstrates that the majority of resident students admitted do in fact meet the 16 ABOR core requirements. When a student has a deficiency, it tends to be in math, lab science, or second language. The institutions regularly admit resident students with deficiencies. The small number of denied students are overwhelmingly deficient in two

\(^1\) See ABOR 2019 Alumni Wages Report. 76% of resident bachelor’s degree recipients earn wages in Arizona in the year immediately following graduation, whereas only 20% of non-resident bachelor’s degree recipients remain in the Arizona workforce one year after graduation.

Contact Information:
Helen Baxendale, ABOR  helen.baxendale@azregents.edu  602-229-2529
Chad Sampson, ABOR  chad.sampson@azregents.edu  602-229-2512
or more courses as well as having a low GPA across the ABOR core courses. There is a marked difference in terms of one-year retention between students admitted with no deficiencies and those who were admitted with even one deficiency.

The enrollment leads will discuss the implications of these data and make observations about the effectiveness of the ABOR core 16 requirements in maximizing resident enrollment, retention and attainment.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

ABOR Policy 2-121 “Undergraduate Admission”
Item Name: Arizona State University’s Request to Offer a Two-Year Academic Program in Conjunction with the United States Navy

☐ Action Item

**Requested Action:** Arizona State University asks the committee to recommend for board approval a new two-year academic program in Organizational Leadership to be offered solely online in partnership with the United States Navy for enlisted service men and women during 2021-2022 academic year. The committee will also engage in a discussion with the universities and board office on offering two-year degree programs.

**Background**

As provided in the board policy, new program requests may be submitted throughout the year with the approval of the Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment Committee.

ASU requests the board approve a two-year Associate of Arts in Organizational Leadership degree. ASU will offer this degree exclusively online in partnership with the United States Navy.

This would be the first two-year degree offered by Arizona’s public universities and is limited to enlisted sailors, marines and coast guards. The degree will not be offered at an Arizona location.

In recent years, public four-year institutions, including some state flagship universities, have joined community colleges and technical schools in offering Associate of Science and Associate of Arts degrees in a variety of disciplines.

**Discussion**

The new degree will be the first Associate of Arts offered at ASU (or any Arizona public university) and is designed as a partnership with the US Navy to provide training and degree opportunities to enlisted sailors, marines, and coast guards. ASU currently offers a successful BA degree in Organizational Leadership, which will provide the faculty for this AA degree. This degree will also create an opportunity for students to progress to the BA degree, if desired.

Other four-year university systems offer two-year degrees under limited circumstances. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data indicates that...
approximately forty-one four-year research I and II institutions have awarded associate degrees in fiscal year 2019. No western state public universities, however awarded an associate degree. Examples of four-year public state universities offering associate degrees include Penn State, University of Wisconsin, University of Florida, Florida State, N.C. State and the University of Maryland. These institutions generally offered these degree options at their regional branch campuses or through their online global campuses.

It should be noted that a majority of the four-year institutions awarding associates degrees are doing so as a form of “credit recovery” – i.e., they provide an option for students who have made considerable progress towards a four-year degree but not managed to complete it, to use their credits, through application to the university, for an associate degree.

In June 2021, Colorado enacted legislation that will allow four-year institutions to offer associate degrees to students who have dropped out despite making significant progress toward a bachelor’s degree. The initiative is part of larger efforts to encourage student retention, credit recovery for students who do not finish a four-year degree program and support students and workers who were dealt a blow by the pandemic.

In conjunction with ASU’s specific request, the committee is expected to discuss universities offering two-year degree programs.

**Statutory/Policy Requirements**

ABOR Policy 2-221 “Academic Degree Programs”

ABOR Policy 2-223 “Academic Locations, Degree Programs and Organizational Units”
Request to Establish New Academic Program in Arizona

University: Arizona State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Proposed Academic Program:</th>
<th>Associate of Arts in Organizational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Department:</td>
<td>The name of the academic department or unit that will primarily administer the academic program. If the proposed program will be jointly administered across more than one department, please list the(se) additional department(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Integrative Sciences and Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Site:</td>
<td>The physical site (campus, extended campus, etc.) or modality where the academic program will be primarily delivered or administered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online modality administered by Polytechnic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Modality:</td>
<td>The primary modality of the academic program (i.e. immersion, online, hybrid).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit Hours:</td>
<td>The number of credit hours required to complete the academic program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Inception Term:</td>
<td>The term and year in which the program will be first delivered (i.e. Spring 2021; Fall 2022).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Program Description:</td>
<td>A short outline of the content and skills that the proposed program will deliver. A brief description of how the program fits into the institutional mission of the university. If relevant, please provide succinct information about existing related or complementary academic programming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This degree is designed for a partnership with the US Navy to provide training to enlisted personnel sailors, marines, and coast guards. The Associate of Arts in Organizational Leadership uses transdisciplinary methods to prepare students to become leaders in organizations across all sectors: private, nonprofit, government and military. Students develop the skills that leaders need to solve problems, communicate effectively, assess programs, manage resources, and evaluate emerging technologies. This associate degree will draw from the successful BA in Organizational Leadership at ASU, and students who complete the AA can continue in the BA without any loss of credit. The flexible AA degree allows students to complete general education coursework and concentrated coursework in a second, disciplinary field to prepare them for leadership in a specific industry.
Learning Outcomes and Assessment Plan:
Define the core concepts and competencies that the program will convey and stipulate how these key learning outcomes will be measured and assessed.

Learning Outcome 1: Students will demonstrate associate degree-level proficiency in written communication.

- **Concepts:** Audience, Purpose, Genre
- **Competencies:** Ability to write effectively through clear and logical structure appropriate for the intended audience.
- **Assessment Methods:** Students' writing in the final project of first-year composition (ENG 102, ENG 105 or ENG 108) will be evaluated to determine proficiency. The project directions will identify purpose, audience and writing situation, and the project will involve sustained writing engagement. A standardized rubric considering context and purpose for writing, content development, conventions of organization and conventions of syntax and mechanics will be employed.
- **Measures:** Faculty-designed rubrics will be used to evaluate students' abilities to demonstrate the competencies identified to meet outcome 1. Performance metrics will be disseminated to program faculty to guide program revisions.

Learning Outcome 2: Students will understand and recognize traits and skills of successful leaders.

- **Concepts:** Management, Leadership, Decision-making
- **Competencies:** Ability to evaluate their own leadership characteristics. Demonstrate the ability to make decisions through a variety of leadership scenarios.
- **Assessment Methods:** Students' projects in OGL 200 Introduction to Organizational Leadership will be evaluated with faculty-designed rubrics to determine proficiency. Assignments will require students to utilize leadership skills to analyze and improve their own leadership performance. Faculty will also assess assignments in which students articulate the difference between management and leadership activities.
- **Measures:** Faculty will assess results from the scoring rubrics used to identify patterns of competence and to revise curriculum to better meet student needs.

Learning Outcome 3: Students will assess and illustrate their leadership strengths, weaknesses, characteristics, values and skills.

- **Concepts:** Self-assessment, cultural understanding, group dynamics, motivational theories
- **Competencies:** Students will demonstrate the ability to utilize organizational behavior and interpersonal relationship skills and strategies.
- **Assessment Methods:** Students' projects in OGL 220 Behavioral Dynamics in Organizations will be evaluated with faculty-designed rubrics to determine proficiency. In the course, faculty will assess student coursework in which students demonstrate their ability to self-assess, reflect, and present achievements. Faculty will assess student coursework in which students demonstrate their ability to apply organizational
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- learning and motivation theories in diagnosing the root cause(s) of performance problems at work and develop performance-related interventions.
- **Measures:** Faculty will assess results from the scoring rubrics used to identify patterns of competence and to revise curriculum to better meet student needs.

### Projected Enrollment for the First Three Years:
Please provide anticipated enrollment numbers for each of the first three years of the proposed program

- **First Year** – 350 students
- **Second Year** – 700 students
- **Third Year** – 700 students

### Evidence of Market Demand:
Please provide an estimate of the future state-wide and national demand for graduates of the proposed academic program. Please specify the source (e.g. Burning Glass; Jobs EQ; US Department of Labor) of workforce demand data and detail the assumptions that underpin these projections. If job market data is unavailable or not applicable please explain why and elaborate another justification for the proposed program.

In 2020 there were 12,851 degree completions in organizational leadership nationally across 382 institutions, according to Emsi Analyst data. ASU Online currently holds 2.5% of this market share. Since 2012, distance education programs in organizational leadership have experienced over a 467% growth, while in-person immersion programs have grown by just under 59%. However, only 965 of the 12,851 degree completions were in credentials at the associate degree or lower level, meaning there is significant market share available for an associate degree program in this academic discipline. Graduates with credentials in organizational leadership obtain positions such as business analysts, operations managers, product managers, and business development managers in top companies such as Anthem, Oracle, Deloitte, and Amazon using skills such as communication, leadership, presentations, planning, and problem-solving. Between September 2016 and August 2020, there were over 10.5 million unique job postings for qualified individuals in organizational leadership. An associate degree in organizational leadership represents a flexible path for learners to earn a credential and enter better paying jobs across all sectors. The market demand for this degree has been determined via a partnership with the US Navy.

### Similar Programs Offered at Arizona Public Universities:
List existing programs at Arizona public universities that deliver similar concepts and competencies to the proposed new program.

Neither of the other Arizona Public Universities offers an associate degree in this field. The University of Arizona Online offers a Bachelor of Applied Science in Organizational Leadership, and Northern Arizona University offers a Master of Organizational Leadership. The University of Arizona degree is a transfer degree in which students must already have an associate degree, i.e. the degree would be another opportunity in the state for holders of the proposed AA to complete a bachelor’s degree with no or minimal loss of credits.

### Objection(s) Raised by Another Arizona Public University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Has another Arizona public university lodged a written objection to the proposed program with the proposing university and the Board of Regents within seven days of receiving notice of the proposed program?
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Yes, Response to Objections:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide details of how the proposing university has addressed the objection. If the objection remains unresolved, please explain why it is in the best interests of the university system and the state that the Board override it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Resources Required? (i.e. faculty and administrative positions; infrastructure, etc.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide an estimate of the personnel and infrastructure requirements of the proposed new program and the corresponding costs. Please specify if the proposed program requires new resources (e.g. new faculty lines; a new laboratory; new teaching assistantships or scholarships) or whether resource needs may be met through the reassignment or extension of existing ones. If resource extension or reassignment will impact extant programs and/or operations, please make this clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No new resources will be required to support this program which will be managed initially by existing faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to Request Program Fee/Differentiated Tuition?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Amount: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Fee Justification:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If planning to levy a program fee, please justify the estimated amount.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None

Note: The fee setting process requires additional steps, and forms need to be completed. Please work with your university and the ABOR Finance team (Leatta.McLaughlin@azregents.edu) to complete a fee request.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialized Accreditation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredivor:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The name of the agency or entity from which accreditation will be sought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item Name: Request for New General Education Program Framework for Northern Arizona University

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: Northern Arizona University asks the committee to recommend that the board adopts their proposed General Education Program Framework.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

Discussion

Northern Arizona University seeks to implement a new General Studies Program effective for newly admitted students in Fall 2023.

In 2018, NAU completed an academic program review for the Liberal Studies Program. Feedback from internal and external reviewers highlighted the need to articulate a clear relationship between the University-wide U.S. Ethnic Diversity and Global Diversity requirements and the Liberal Studies Program and to better differentiate the Program’s four Distribution Blocks. In the summer of 2019 (revised policy in Feb. 2021), ABOR created a policy for General Education (ABOR Policy 2-210 General Education.pdf; See item 2: Proposed Revision to ABOR Policy 2-210) that articulated specific goals for the three Arizona state universities’ general education programs. These two processes were the catalyst for the Liberal Studies Task Force to create the revision that is before you today.

Throughout AY 2019-2020, the Task Force met biweekly to develop a proposal that was then widely discussed with campus constituents twice in AY 2020-2021: October and February. Following the feedback and revision cycle, the proposed program was approved by the Liberal Studies Committee, Diversity Curriculum Committee, University Undergraduate Committee. The unanimous recommendation of each committee resulted in the proposal that was presented to the NAU Faculty Senate in March 2021 and approved nearly unanimously at the April 19, 2021 meeting.

The proposed General Studies Program fulfills all aspects of ABOR’s policy 2-210, as evidenced in Appendix E. The intentional integration of skill development as students complete their breadth (content) requirements is crucial to address the needs of employers and workforce development. Every single course in the Knowledge Areas and Diversity Perspectives must engage students in Critical Thinking and Information Literacy specific to the area of breadth. In addition, courses incorporate high-impact practices by engaging students in the following skills, as appropriate to the assignments
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of the course: Civil Discourse in Writing, Civil Discourse in Speaking, Civil Discourse in Collaboration and Teamwork, Quantitative Reasoning and Applications. Practice in these breadth areas, along with discipline-specific work in the major, will ensure students receive the opportunities to excel in these employer-sought skills.

NAU is currently working on an implementation plan for the revised program. Starting in AY 23-24, students will enter the university under the new requirements. Students who entered the university prior to AY23-24 and are mid-stream in their academic careers would maintain the requirements from the old program. In addition, it is expected that some students who entered prior to AY23-24, as well as some transfer students, would adopt the requirements of the new program. This is quite a rapid timeline in relation to the breadth and depth of changes being implemented to the Program. Possible strategies for a phase-in are the focus of our implementation deliberations.

The depth in skill development and breadth of knowledge of a general education program is such that prioritizing assessment approaches is necessary. As we pivot to the implementation of the new program, we will initially focus our assessment on the areas articulated in ABOR policy. The Tri-University Assessment Working Group is piloting assessment for Written Communication in AY 2021-2022. Subsequently the Working Group will focus on Quantitative Reasoning, Civic Knowledge, and Critical Thinking assessments. Once we near the end of the completion of our first cycle of assessing these four areas, we will re-evaluate the resource requirements of the assessment endeavors and consider potential opportunities to expand the university-wide assessment to encompass additional content and skill areas of the program.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

ABOR Policy 2-210, “General Education”
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**University:** Northern Arizona University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Proposed Academic Program:</th>
<th>Northern Arizona University’s General Studies Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Department:</strong></td>
<td>The Office of the Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Site:</strong></td>
<td>All available sites of Northern Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Modality:</strong></td>
<td>All available modalities at Northern Arizona University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credit Hours:</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Inception Term:</strong></td>
<td>Fall 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief Program Description:**

NAU’s General Studies Program is designed to create well-rounded graduates who possess knowledge from a variety of disciplines and implement a range of crucial transferable skills. Students begin their journey with foundations in English (Writing) and Mathematics (Quantitative Reasoning). Students develop a firm understanding of past and contemporary contexts by taking courses in each of the following areas: (a) Arts & Humanities, (b) Social & Political Worlds, (c) American Institutions, and (d) Scientific Literacy & Methods. For each area, students have intentional engagements to apply fundamental critical thinking approaches and methods of information literacy. This provides students the skill to obtain high-quality information, evaluate its efficacy, and make critical, thoughtful decisions within all of these areas and apply it to their personal, local, state, national and global worlds.

In addition to learning about the academic disciplines that have shaped these knowledge areas, our program recognizes that students benefit from the examination of societal and cultural influences represented in four Diversity Perspectives: U.S. Ethnic Diversity, Global Diversity, Indigenous Peoples, and Intersectional Identities. These courses ensure that students develop a range of intercultural competencies.
that will serve them in the workforce and as active and engaged citizens of their local, national, and global communities.

Courses in the program encourage students to actively investigate how contexts and value systems frame issues or problems. By exploring viewpoints, perspectives, and expertise that differs from their own, students practice and refine skills necessary for engaging in civil discourse. This program design will guide our students to understand who we live and work with, and how we can civilly engage each other in our shared physical and online/virtual spaces.

The General Studies Committee will continue to oversee two requirements within a student’s major. The Junior-Level Writing Requirement focuses students in practicing the art of writing in the approaches of their major discipline. The Senior Capstone requires specific skills of application appropriate to each discipline to ensure students are prepared to fully integrate their knowledge and skills into real-world experiences aligned with their major.

**Foundation Requirements** (Descriptions in Appendix A)
- English (4 units)
- Mathematics (3 units)

**Knowledge Area Requirements** (Course Design Requirements are located in Appendix B)
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- American Institutions (3 units)
- Arts and Humanities (9 units)
- Scientific Literacy & Scientific Methods (9 units)
  - Scientific Literacy (6 units)
    - Physical/ Life/ Space or Earth Sciences (3 units)
    - Social Sciences (3 units)
  - Scientific Methods (3 units)
- Social and Political Worlds (6 units)

**Diversity Perspectives** (Course Design Requirements are located in Appendix C)
Students will meet the Diversity Perspectives while fulfilling their Knowledge Area requirements, as Diversity Perspectives are embedded within the content of the disciplines.

- U.S. Ethnic Diversity
- Global Diversity
- Indigenous Peoples
- Intersectional Identities

**Essential Skills** *(Descriptions in Appendix D)*
Courses in the General Studies Program develop a range of essential and transferable skills:

- Applications
- Quantitative Reasoning
- Civil Discourse in Writing
- Civil Discourse in Speaking
- Civil Discourse in Collaboration/Teamwork

**Habits of Mind**: An overarching set of values called the “Habits of Mind” will be integrated throughout all General Studies Requirements: Curiosity, Intellectual Integrity, Persistence, Self-Awareness.

**For Transfer Students**: The Foundation, Knowledge Areas and Diversity Perspectives would continue to be transferred as a package for the AGEC, IGETC, CSUGE.

**Overlap with the Major Prefix**: Students will continue to be able to use up to nine units from the students’ major prefix to fulfill the Knowledge Areas.

**Requirements Embedded in the Major**
All students, including transfer students, will need to complete two course-specific requirements within their major at NAU: (1) Junior Level Writing Requirement; (2) Capstone Requirement. Each major will demonstrate how they infuse, or
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

incorporate, Ethics in a disciplinary-appropriate manner into their courses and degree requirements.

**ABOR Policy 2-210 Comparison**
A comparison of NAU’s requirements to ABOR Policy 2-210 may be found in Appendix E.

**NAU’s General Studies Program Proposal Process**
The General Studies Program was developed to (a) incorporate improvements identified by NAU’s 7-year Academic Program Review of the Liberal Studies Program, and (b) integrate ABOR’s General Education Policy Requirements.

Following an extensive feedback and revision cycle (two full cycles of review and feedback by all academic committees and colleges, and the student governing body), the proposal was recommended by the Liberal Studies Committee, Diversity Curriculum Committee, and the University Undergraduate Committee to the Faculty Senate for their consideration and approval. In April, 2021 the proposal received 91% approval (yes votes) from the Faculty Senate, with the understanding that the changes would require NAU to conduct capacity and implementation modeling. A modified Faculty Senate-charged Curriculum & Assessment Coordinating Committee (CACC) will work with the Provost Office to oversee implementation.

**Learning Outcomes and Assessment Plan**

Engagement in assessment provides the most rewarding elements of the educational experience: the opportunity to understand what our students learned from the design of our programs, and how to continue to adjust our methods and design to meet the learning needs of our students. The highest quality assessment that delivers the most useful results is a resource-heavy endeavor. NAU is deeply grateful for the assessment funds provided by the Arizona Board of Regents, as these funds allow us to continue to use the successful design principles from our previous university-wide assessments of Writing, Critical Thinking, Oral Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, and Scientific Inquiry.

The depth in skill development and breadth of knowledge of a general education program is such that prioritizing assessment approaches is necessary. As we pivot to the implementation of the new program, we will initially focus our assessment on the areas articulated in ABOR policy: Writing, Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning and Civic Knowledge. The Tri-University Assessment Working Group is piloting assessment for Written Communication in AY 2021-2022. The Working Group is currently planning a Quantitative Reasoning assessment initiative and will subsequently plan Civic Knowledge and Critical Thinking assessments.

Once we near the end of the completion of our first cycle of assessing these four areas, we will re-evaluate the resource requirements of the assessment endeavors and consider potential opportunities to expand the university-wide assessment to encompass additional content and skill areas of the program.

The full list of learning outcomes and course design principles for the General Studies Program may be found in Appendices A through D.
Four Assessment Areas

**Writing**

*Learning Outcome:*
Write toward a context, purpose and audience; Develop content; Apply conventions of organization; and Apply conventions of syntax and mechanics.

*Assessment Endeavor:* The Tri-University Assessment Working Group charged a group to develop the Writing Assessment that will be carried out in AY21-22. It is designed to obtain a sample of writing materials from courses across all disciplinary branches of the university at entry and exit points of the students’ academic career (English Foundations and Capstone). Samples of artifacts will be compiled for review by faculty trained in using the Tri-U Writing Rubric. NAU will conduct an internal assessment aligned with NAU learning outcomes to incorporate findings for the assessment into NAU-focused continuous improvement initiatives.

**Critical Thinking**

*Learning Outcome:*
Critical Thinking is defined differently depending on the Knowledge Area or Diversity Perspective, but follows the same basic principles: interpret and analyze from multiple perspectives, withhold judgment until you have assessed the evidence, advance an argument or problem solve to suggest solutions. See Appendix B and C for a full review of Critical Thinking by Knowledge Area and Diversity Perspective.

*Assessment Endeavor:* To be developed by Tri-University Assessment Working Group

**Quantitative Reasoning**

*Learning Outcome:*
Quantitative Reasoning is the application of numerical, visual or symbolic reasoning for the purposes of drawing inferences, understanding phenomena or making predictions.

*Assessment Endeavor:* To be developed by Tri-University Assessment Working Group

**Civic Knowledge**

*Learning Outcome:*
- An understanding of how the history of the United States continues to shape the present,
- The basic principles of American constitutional democracy and how they are applied under a republican form of government,
- An understanding of the United States Constitution and major American constitutional debates and developments,
- Knowledge of the essential founding documents and how they have shaped the nature and functions of American institutions of self-governance,
- An understanding of landmark Supreme Court cases and their effects on law and society, and
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The basic economic knowledge necessary to critically assess public policy options and to succeed professionally and personally.

Assessment Endeavor: To be developed by Tri-University Assessment Working Group

Projected Enrollment for the First Three Years:

NAU is planning a phased implementation of the revised program starting in AY23-24, thus first year students will enter under the new requirements, whereas transfers students may elect to be in the new program. Most students who entered the university prior to AY23-24 will continue in the existing program.

As such, the following estimates reflect approximately 5,500 first year students, as well as ~500 lower division transfer students and ~500 upper division transfer students who would have the opportunity to begin taking the program in AY23-24. In subsequent years, we size up the enrollments using the same estimates.

- Year 1: AY 2023-2024: ~6,500
- Year 2: AY 2024-2025: ~13,000
- Year 3: AY 2025-2026: ~19,500

This is quite a rapid timeline in relation to the breadth and depth of changes being implemented to the Program. Possible strategies for a phase-in are the focus of our implementation deliberations.

Evidence of Market Demand:

Throughout the examination of NAU’s general education program, the task force and committees evaluated numerous studies of high-impact practices and what employers value in order to provide a solid design of the breadth of knowledge and skill development rooted in general education curricula. Detailed information may be found here:

https://www.aacu.org/2021-report-employer-views-higher-education

Further, we note that our program requirements include the following high-impact practices recommended by the AAC&U. These high-impact practices foster student achievement and have been typically unavailable to underserved students:

https://www.aacu.org/node/4084

Similar Programs Offered at Arizona Public Universities:

University of Arizona and Arizona State University will also provide general education programs that are aligned with ABOR’s policy 2-210.

Objection(s) Raised by Another Arizona Public University?    NA    YES    NO

If Yes, Response to Objections:
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

New Resources Required? (i.e. faculty and administrative positions; infrastructure, etc.):

Our capacity and implementation modeling suggest that we will need to consider how to redistribute existing resources, as well as identify specific areas to invest faculty lines, as we transition to the new program to meet student capacity.

Program Fee/Differentiated Tuition Required?  YES  NO

Specialized Accreditation?  YES  NO

Appendix A. Foundation Requirements

English Foundations: The English Foundations offers students a valuable experience during their first year to help them develop the writing skills necessary for success at the university and on the job.

Mathematics Foundation: The Mathematics Foundation requirement helps first year students develop foundational skills necessary for future mathematical reasoning within their discipline. Courses that fulfill this requirement introduce students to mathematical skills necessary to understand and thrive in an ever-changing world. These skills include problem solving, critical thinking, creating mathematical models to understand complex processes, and interpreting and communicating technical results.

Appendix B. Knowledge Area Requirements

Information Literacy
The Information Literacy Essential Skill is a course design requirement for every course in the program. Information Literacy includes the ability to effectively find, evaluate, and use information. Information literacy requires an understanding of how information is generated, vetted, and stored within the discipline, as well as how it is consulted and re-used to create new knowledge. For this area of study, students should be able to (all three are required):

a) Recognize and describe how professionals working in social disciplines generate and vet new information, and how they communicate information to each other and the general public;

b) Effectively find, evaluate, and use information sources in social disciplines; and

c) Judge the utility and quality of social information in making decisions.

Knowledge Area: American Institutions
Students take 3 units in this Knowledge Area. All courses must accomplish the following learning outcomes:
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2) Content and Critical Thinking (all must be included)
   a) An understanding of how the history of the United States continues to shape the present,
   b) the basic principles of American constitutional democracy and how they are applied under a republican form of government,
   c) an understanding of the United States Constitution and major American constitutional debates and developments,
   d) knowledge of the essential founding documents and how they have shaped the nature and functions of American institutions of self-governance,
   e) an understanding of landmark Supreme Court cases and their effects on law and society, and
   f) the basic economic knowledge necessary to critically assess public policy options and to succeed professionally and personally.

3) Information Literacy

Incorporates one of the Essential Skills that expressly engages Civil Discourse*:
   - Civil Discourse in Writing
   - Civil Discourse in Speaking
   - Civil Discourse in Collaboration and Teamwork

(Can include any additional Essential Skills deemed appropriate for the course.)

*Following feedback on an August draft, we are interested in highlighting that the Civil Discourse skills will be structured into courses across our curriculum. We are calling out the intentional inclusion of Civil Discourse in the American Institutions Knowledge Area. English Foundations and Junior Level Writing incorporate Civil Discourse in Writing. Further discussion with relevant curriculum committees will help us consider additional opportunities for skill development in this area.

Knowledge Area: Arts and Humanities

Students take 9-10 units (3 courses) in this Knowledge Area. All courses must accomplish the following learning outcomes:

1) Content: (include both)
   a) Recognize how works of the Arts and Humanities not only reflect or express what it means to be human, but also produce meaning, culture and/or history.
   b) Examine how Arts and Humanities build civic identity, connection and/or engagement.

2) Critical and Creative Thinking in this knowledge area (select at least one):
   a) Analyze and interpret the meaning of works of human expression or reflection by identifying and examining distinct connections between the work and its various contexts.
   b) Identify and consider the unique features and perspectives of varied cultural traditions through the study of creative works such as oral or written literature, religion, artistic creations and so forth.
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c) Apply analytic frameworks that increase awareness of how cultures and histories vary and shape human experience.
d) Support interpretations with evidence from close observation/ awareness of the subject area.
e) Withhold immediate judgment of a work to reflect on the possible breadth of meanings related to the work before making informed judgments.
f) Examine how cultures impact and influence other cultures.
g) Create artistic expressions characteristic of the fine, performing, and literary arts.
h) Generate and evaluate innovative approaches to problem solving.

3) Information Literacy

Knowledge Area: Scientific Literacy and Methods

Scientific Literacy: Course Design Description
Students take 6 units (two courses) in this Knowledge Area, one in Physical Sciences/Life Sciences/Space and Earth Sciences, and one in Social Sciences. All courses must accomplish the following learning outcomes:

1) Content: Include (a) and (b)
   a) Explain theoretical frameworks developed in a range of subject areas, to include:
      i) Physical Sciences/ Life Sciences/ Space and Earth Sciences and
      ii) Social Sciences
   b) Examine how scientific theories impact civic identity, connection, and engagement.

2) Critical Thinking (select at least one):
   a) Transform curiosities or observations into questions that can be evaluated using the scientific method
   b) Develop and implement an approach to investigate the question raised
   c) Analyze the data/evidence using approaches in the subject area and examine the validity of arguments based on the evidence presented
   d) Make interpretations (based on the evidence) by connecting to other observations, theories, and approaches in the subject area
   e) Communicate findings in the manner that is appropriate to the subject area
   f) Generate and evaluate innovative approaches to problem solving.

3) Information Literacy

Scientific Methods: Course Design Description
The purpose of the course is for all students to engage in the full experience of carrying out the scientific method within one of the Physical, Life, Space, Earth or Social Sciences. Students would take 3 to 4 units in this Knowledge Area; courses might be a 3-4 unit course with an embedded lab, field, or other engaged, active learning experience conducting the scientific method in the specific field of science, or
a 2-3 unit course with a 1 unit co-requisite lab, field, or other experience conducting the scientific method as appropriate to the specific scientific discipline of the course. All courses must accomplish the following learning outcomes:

1) **Content**
   a) Explain theoretical frameworks developed in a range of subject areas, to include:
      i) Physical Sciences/ Life Sciences/ Space and Earth Sciences and
      ii) Social Sciences

2) **Critical Thinking** (all five are required):
   a) Develop a research question or problem statement, and/or examine how research questions or problem statements are used to understand phenomena,
   b) Plan and carry out an investigation (use the subject area’s scientific method to collect data, make observations, etc.), and/or examine how investigations are developed to understand phenomena, to potentially include strengths and weaknesses of methods used in the investigation.
   c) Analyze and interpret the data/evidence,
   d) Conduct interpretations from evidence, and/or connect interpretations to other knowledge in the field of study; and
   e) Communicate the results.

3) **Information Literacy**

**Knowledge Area: Social and Political Worlds**
Students take up to 6 units in this Knowledge Area. All courses must accomplish the following learning outcomes:

1) **Content**
   a) Examine multiple forms of social systems and interactions within and/or outside of the United States.
   b) Examine how Social and Political Worlds impact civic identity, connection and/or engagement.

2) **Critical Thinking** (select at least one):
   a) Apply historical, economic, observational, comparative, and analytic methods to understand human identities, systems of communication, and interactions in local and global institutions.
   b) Examine how facts and opinions of different kinds are viewed by local and global societies, institutions and traditions.
   c) Examine critically the multiple aspects of social life that influence all types of communities (such as those that are inherited, voluntary, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious, political, ideological, as well as causes and movements, etc.).
   d) Analyze how ideologies, institutions and traditions contribute to and interact within local and global communities, including their systems of communication.
e) Examine how U.S. institutions have impacted local and global societies.

f) Withhold immediate judgment of situation/case/work to reflect on the possible breadth of meanings related to the work before making informed judgments.

g) Generate and evaluate innovative approaches to problem solving.

3) Information Literacy

Appendix C. Diversity Perspective Requirements

Global Diversity

1) Content (including assignments/assessments, discussions, lecture, reading materials, etc.)
   a) The majority (at least half) of course content focuses on the voices, expertise and viewpoints of non-Western peoples [outside of the Euro-North American world, such as peoples from Africa, Asia, Oceania, and the Americas south of the U.S. border], including their theoretical, historical, social, political, economic, cultural, geographic, environmental, religious, scientific, artistic, and intellectual traditions and ways of knowing. (Indigenous Peoples are incorporated in the requirement under the Indigenous Peoples Diversity Perspectives category.)
   b) Additional substantial, in-depth content examines the intersectionality of voices, expertise and viewpoints, examining how at least one (at minimum) additional element of social identity, including race and racism, gender, sexuality, socio-economic class, disability, nationality/geography, indigeneity combine to impact an individual or group’s experience.
   c) AND select at least one more from the following:
      i) Inclusion of theoretical approaches emerging from post-colonial, neo-colonial contexts
      ii) Issues of difference with respect to non-Western/global populations and other under-represented groups
      iii) Contributions of non-Western groups (global populations) to culture and history
      iv) Terminology, vocabulary, and means of conceptualizing the social world by global minorities
      v) The complexity of historical and cultural influences and how they manifest within an individual or group’s identity
      vi) Anti-colonial or resistance movements
      vii) Diasporas, migrations, and borderlands

2) Critical Thinking:
   a) Evaluate how influences of inequality, power and privilege affect perspectives and ideologies
   b) AND select at least one more from the following:
      i) Analyze one’s experience when viewing, engaging, or applying the
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course’s content
   ii) Examine how our actions influence and are influenced by cultural paradigms
   iii) Recognize and articulate the ways in which mainstream culture reflects, influences, perpetuates, and resists other cultural ideologies
   iv) Withhold immediate judgment of a work to reflect on the possible breadth of meanings related to the work before making informed judgments
   v) Develop an understanding of the complex identities, histories and cultures of self and others

3) Information Literacy

Indigenous Peoples

1) Content
   a) The majority (at least half) of course content focuses on Indigenous Peoples, such as:
      i) The voices, expertise and viewpoints of Indigenous Peoples [those who share collective ancestral ties within a geographic region and who continue to maintain a distinct culture from the colonizing, and now-dominant, group. This requirement addresses Indigenous Peoples of the world, including but not limited to North and South America, Europe, Asia, Africa, etc.], including their theoretical, historical, social, political, economic, cultural, geographic, religious, environmental, artistic and intellectual traditions and ways of knowing.
      ii) An examination of the historical forces that have had, or continue to have, an impact on an Indigenous group or groups either pre- or post-contact with non-Indigenous peoples, including governance, self-determination, and sovereignty
      iii) An examination of academic research methods based on the traditions and oral traditions of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous research methodologies, scholarship of Indigenous academics, or the traditional processes of knowledge acquisition of Indigenous peoples
      iv) Elements of modernity which intersect in a significant way with the lives, traditions, and future of Indigenous peoples and persons such as politics, globalization, health, representations in the media, academia, innovations, technology
      v) Historical and contemporary governance, self-determination, and sovereignty, federal Indian policy and intergovernmental relations, and policy, politics and administration by Indigenous nations.
      vi) An exploration of language teaching, perpetuation and revitalization efforts in Indigenous communities.
   b) Additional substantial, in-depth content examines the intersectionality of
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voices, expertise and viewpoints, examining how at least two elements of social identity, including race and racism, gender, sexuality, socio-economic class, disability, nationality/geography, indigeneity combine to impact an individual or group’s experience.

c) AND select at least one more from the following:
   i) Contributions of Indigenous Peoples to culture and history
   ii) Terminology, vocabulary, and means of conceptualizing the social world by Indigenous Peoples
   iii) The complexity of historical and cultural influences and how they manifest within an individual or group’s identity
   iv) Anti-colonial or resistance movements
   v) Diasporas, migrations, and borderlands

2) Critical Thinking:
   a) Evaluate how influences of inequality, power and privilege affect perspectives and ideologies
   b) AND select at least one more from the following:
      i) Analyze one’s experience when viewing, engaging, or applying the course’s content
      ii) Examine how our actions influence and are influenced by cultural paradigms
      iii) Recognize and articulate the ways in which U.S. culture reflects, influences, perpetuates, and resists other cultural ideologies
      iv) Withhold immediate judgment of a work to reflect on the possible breadth of meanings related to the work before making informed judgments
      v) Develop an understanding of the complex identities, histories and cultures of self and others

3) Information Literacy

Intersectional Identities

1) Content (including assignments/assessments, discussions, lecture, reading materials, etc.)
   a) Select one of the following:
      i) Option 1
         (1) The majority (at least half) of course content focuses on the voices, expertise and viewpoints that center perspectives oriented on gender, sexuality, disability/ableism, or class, including their theoretical, historical, social, political, economic, cultural, geographic, environmental, religious, artistic and intellectual traditions and ways of knowing.
         (2) Additional substantial, in-depth content examines the intersectionality of voices, expertise and viewpoints, examining how at least one (at minimum) additional element of social identity,
including race and racism, gender, sexuality, socio-economic class, disability, nationality/geography, indigeneity combine to impact an individual or group’s experience.

ii) Option 2
(1) The majority of the course content examines the intersectionality of at least three voices and viewpoints, examining how elements of social identity, including race and racism, gender, sexuality, socio-economic class, and disability nationality/geography, indigeneity combine to impact an individual or group’s experience.

b) AND select at least one more from the following:
   i) Inclusion of theoretical approaches emerging from experiential contexts (includes all of the groups’ experiences identified in (a))
   ii) Issues of difference with respect to other under-represented groups
   iii) Contributions of under-represented groups to culture and history
   iv) Terminology, vocabulary, and means of conceptualizing the social world by other under-represented groups
   v) The complexity of historical and cultural influences and how they manifest within an individual or group’s identity

2) Critical Thinking:
   a) Evaluate how influences of inequality, power and privilege affect perspectives and ideologies
   b) AND select at least one more from the following:
      i) Analyze one’s experience when viewing, engaging, or applying the course’s content
      ii) Examine how our actions influence and are influenced by cultural paradigms
      iii) Recognize and articulate the ways in which U.S. culture reflects, influences, perpetuates, and resists other cultural ideologies
      iv) Withhold immediate judgment of a work to reflect on the possible breadth of meanings related to the work before making informed judgments
      v) Develop an understanding of the complex identities, histories and cultures of self and others

3) Information Literacy

U.S. Ethnic Diversity

All courses must accomplish the following learning outcomes:
1) Content (including assignments/assessments, discussions, lecture, reading materials, etc.)
   a) The majority (at least half) of course content focuses on voices, expertise and viewpoints of U.S. Ethnic minority groups (such as African American, Asian American, Latino/a, Pacific Islander peoples), including their theoretical, historical, social, political, economic, cultural, geographic, environmental, religious, artistic and intellectual traditions and ways of
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

knowing. (Indigenous Peoples are incorporated in the requirement under the Indigenous Peoples Diversity Perspectives category.)

b) Additional substantial, in-depth content examines the intersectionality of voices, expertise and viewpoints, examining how at least one (at minimum) additional element of social identity, including race and racism, gender, sexuality, socio-economic class, disability, nationality/geography, indigeneity combine to impact an individual or group’s experience.

c) AND select at least one more from the following:
   i) Inclusion of theoretical approaches emerging from critical race theory and similar contexts
   ii) Issues of difference with respect to U.S. ethnic minorities
   iii) Contributions of U.S. ethnic minorities in U.S. democracy and western civilization
   iv) Terminology, vocabulary, and means of conceptualizing the social world by U.S. Ethnic Minorities
   v) The complexity of historical and cultural influences and how they manifest within an individual or group’s identity
   vi) Anti-colonial, Latinx social movements, and resistance movements and struggles
   vii) Diasporas, migrations and borderlands, particularly in the Southwest.

2) Critical Thinking:
   a) Evaluate how influences of inequality, power and privilege affect perspectives and ideologies
   b) AND select at least one more from the following:
      i) Analyze one’s experience when viewing, engaging, or applying the course’s content
      ii) Examine how our actions influence and are influenced by cultural paradigms
      iii) Recognize and articulate the ways in which U.S. culture reflects, influences, perpetuates, and resists other cultural ideologies
      iv) Withhold immediate judgment of a work to reflect on the possible breadth of meanings related to the work before making informed judgments
      v) Develop an understanding of the complex identities, histories and cultures of self and others

3) Information Literacy

Appendix D. Essential Skill Descriptions

Civil Discourse through Writing: Effective writers engage in civil discourse through an awareness of audiences’ expectations and needs. This involves decisions about the purpose of the writing assignment, about research, about the interpretation of information using appropriate theories or frameworks, about formal, generic, and stylistic conventions, about rhetorical approaches. Effective writers consider opposing
viewpoints or counter-arguments, and offer reasoned analysis of these perspectives. All of these approaches open the possibility for a shared dialogue and open debate.

**Civil Discourse through Speaking**: Effective speakers engage in civil discourse through an awareness of audiences’ expectations or needs, and gauging reactions and connections that are also embodied in nonverbal gestures and personal interaction. To be an effective communicator, a speaker's purpose must be clear. An effective speaker has completed essential research, interpreted information using appropriate theories or frameworks, has assembled an argument based on logic, rhetorical modes, and developed an approach that is aware of the best formal, generic, and stylistic conventions. An effective speaker creates an opportunity to consider opposing viewpoints or counter-arguments and offers reasoned analysis of these perspectives. In many instances, effective communication in speech relies on the skill of listening, of pausing and considering alternative perspectives, and synthesizing, refining, and drawing attention to the limits or possibilities of different interpretations.

**Civil Discourse through Collaboration and Teamwork**: Effective collaborations and teamwork depends on the ability to engage in civil discourse. Working together toward a common goal is an essential competency in many educational, professional, and personal settings. Effective communication is a key component of teamwork and ensures that each individual’s role is clearly defined, that deadlines and priorities are mutually understood, and that others’ skills and talents are respected and/or amplified for the collective good. Team members facilitate a positive working environment to accomplish shared goals. Team members communicate effectively, which includes active listening and respect for individuals, and a willingness to civilly debate or argue about analysis or methods. Team members fulfill their own individual responsibilities and support the collective priorities of the group. Team members look for innovative ways to find solutions that meet the common goal.

**Quantitative Reasoning**: Quantitative Reasoning is the application of numerical, visual or symbolic reasoning for the purposes of drawing inferences, understanding phenomena or making predictions. This includes elements related to the ability to: Identify and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis; convert relevant information into various numerical, visual, or symbolic forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words); Calculate accurately and comprehensively to solve a problem; Explain information or phenomena presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words); Make judgments, make predictions, and draw inferences based on the quantitative analysis of data, while recognizing the limits of this analysis.
Applications: Applications involve the analysis and synthesis of content and theoretical approaches (provided in the course) within a context relevant to the area/field/discipline. Applications result in a product appropriate to the area/field/discipline that can be used to evaluate students’ understanding and ability to apply the course’s content. Examples align with area/field/disciplines, such as: Performance Project(s); Case Studies; Civic Engagement Project(s); Laboratory Project(s); Studio Project(s); **Disciplinary Project(s) that combine multiple skills, in any combination, from the list above**—for example, a research project, with a written element assigned individually, and an oral portion completed in teams. (Information Literacy + Written Communication + Speaking + Teamwork). This provides the opportunity for students to practice applications and for faculty to implement multiple skills into a course, where appropriate to the course’s design.

**Appendix E. Comparison of ABOR Policy 2-210 to NAU’s General Studies Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABOR Knowledge</th>
<th>NAU General Studies Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature, Fine Arts, Humanities</td>
<td>- Arts and Humanities (9-10 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>- Scientific Literacy in Social Sciences (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Option to take Scientific Methods in Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Institutions</td>
<td>- American Institutions (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>- Scientific Literacy in Physical/Life/Space/Earth Sciences (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Option to take Scientific Methods in Physical/Life/Space/Earth Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition, Communication, and Rhetoric</td>
<td>- English Foundations (4 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Junior Level Writing (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Skill: Practice Civil Discourse Through Writing in Knowledge Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>- Mathematics Foundations (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Scientific Methods (3-4 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential Skill: Practice Quantitative Reasoning in Knowledge Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABOR Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAU General Studies Program: Habits of Mind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABOR Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written and Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Management</th>
<th>Time and Priority Management Modules Embedded in First-Year Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information and Data Literacy | Information Literacy is Taught in each Knowledge Area:  
|                              | - American Institutions (3 units)  
|                              | - Arts and Humanities (9 units)  
|                              | - Scientific Literacy and Methods (9 units)  
|                              | - Social and Political Worlds (6 units)  
| Data Literacy: | Data Literacy:  
| | - Mathematics Foundations (3 units)  
| | - Scientific Methods (3 units)  
| | - Essential Skill: *Quantitative Reasoning* in Knowledge Areas |
| Ability to Engage in Civil Discourse | Essential Skills practices in Knowledge Area Courses:  
|                               | - Civil Discourse through Writing  
|                               | - Civil Discourse through Speaking  
|                               | - Civil Discourse through Collaboration and Teamwork |

- **Arts and Humanities (9 units)**
- **Social and Political Worlds (6 units)**
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Northern Arizona University’s General Studies Program Proposal

Provost Karen Pugliesi
September 9, 2021
General Studies Program
34 units

Foundations
- Mathematics Foundations 3 units
- English Foundations 4 units

Knowledge Areas
- American Institutions 3 units
- Embedded Diversity Perspectives
  - Global Diversity
  - Indigenous Peoples
  - Intersectional Identities
  - U.S. Ethnic Diversity
- Arts & Humanities 9 units
- Social & Political Worlds 6 units
- Scientific Literacy & Scientific Methods 9 units

Major
- Junior Level Writing
- Essential Skills Overlap w/ Major:
  - Applications
  - Civil Discourse thru Writing
  - Civil Discourse thru Speaking
  - Civil Discourse thru Collaboration/Teamwork
  - Quantitative Reasoning

Ethics Embedded In the Major
Up to 9 units of Knowledge Areas may overlap with Major

Senior Capstone
Item Name: Arizona Innovation Alliance Update

Action Item

Requested Action: The committee will receive an update from the Arizona Innovation Alliance.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

The Arizona Innovation Alliance (AIA) is a TRIF funded tri-university partnership that seeks to enhance the performance of higher education in Arizona in the arenas of student success, technology solutions, general cost effectiveness, and best practices for resource allocation through sharing of innovative practices and cooperative development and deployment of support structures.

The AIA is modeled on the University Innovation Alliance, a coalition of 11 universities including ASU. Each university commits university liaisons and fellows to implement the work at the university level.

Discussion

Initial AIA work focuses on three areas.

1. Improving overall student success (retention, graduation, academic performance) with particular attention on traditionally under-served populations.

2. Deploying educational practices and programs which combine high standards of student outcomes with cost effective teaching and student support.

3. Optimizing resource allocation between the proportion of student tuition and state appropriations available for the delivery of educational programs and the funding needed to assure accessibility and affordability.

The Board will receive updates on operational progress, hiring, initiatives that have commenced such as educational access in Yuma, Arizona and community college joint admissions, and planning for work during the Fall semester.
This page intentionally left blank
Arizona Innovation Alliance

Update: Arizona Board of Regents: Thursday, Sept. 9th, 2021
Arizona Innovation Alliance

Goals

One
- Improving overall student success with particular attention on traditionally underserved populations
  - First year retention, 4 and 6 year graduation rates, and other ABOR-established metrics
  - Increase the number of Pell-eligible students enrolled and graduating across institutions
  - Enroll resident undergraduate cohorts that reflect the income and ethnic diversity of the overall population of Arizona high school graduates

Student Success and Access

Two
- Deploy educational practices and programs which combine high standards of student outcomes with cost effective teaching and student support
  - Develop a mix of program design and delivery methods that best meet the needs of each institution’s goals
  - Design and deploy technology-based solutions and innovative structures: education, student support, and administrative services
  - Create innovative partnerships among the three universities, with other universities, and with the private sector where greater effectiveness or cost advantages can be gained

Student Support

Three
- Optimizing resource allocation between the proportion of student tuition and state appropriations available for the delivery of educational programs and the funding needed to assure accessibility and affordability
  - Through innovations in program design and service delivery, limit the resource requirement from resident undergraduate tuition rate while achieving the student success goals
  - Collaborate on innovative approaches to financial aid that support access, educational goals, and optimal use of resources.

Affordability
Arizona Innovation Alliance
Our Approach

Share.
Innovate.
Scale.
Diffuse.

- Deepen our collective understanding of promising practices state and nationwide.
- Test and verify new methods for improving student success, accessibility, and affordability.
- Scale what’s working across our institutions.
- Share “lessons learned” across AIA institutions to increase our effectiveness system-wide.
- Leverage funding opportunities to scale promising programs, practices, and strategies.
- Build and strengthen partnerships that enhance our learning and deployment of strategies.
- Share what we learn to enhance collective engagement and diffusion of promising practices across the state.
Arizona Innovation Alliance
Organizational Structure

AIA Core Team
- Appointed institutional liaisons, assistant director, and AIA fellows
- Ensure the effective strategic management of AIA-efforts and affiliated outcomes in service to the AIA mission.

Student Success Teams
- Established at each university
- Represent key leadership across departments for AIA efforts
- Serve to engage strategic planning, support the exchange of promising practices/innovations across institutions

Project Teams
Developed on an as-needed basis
- Plan, develop, and launch AIA-affiliated efforts under the appointment and support from AIA institutional leadership.
Arizona Innovation Alliance

Liaisons

Rich Stanley
Senior Vice President and University Planner
Alliance Convener and Liaison
Arizona State University

Anika Olsen
Vice President, Enrollment Management
Northern Arizona University

Barry Brummund
Chief Information Officer
University of Arizona
Arizona Innovation Alliance
Hiring Updates: Meet the AIA Team

Brittney Paulk, MPA
Assistant Director
Arizona Innovation Alliance

- University Innovation Alliance Fellow Alumni
- Innovation Fellow Alumni, ASU
- Projects Director, Office of the University Provost, ASU

Andrew Sarracino
AIA Fellow
Arizona State University

- Senior Project Manager, Global Partnerships
- Program Manager, U.S. Pakistan Centers for Advanced Studies in Energy
- Commissioner, Commission for Native American Affairs - NAU

Marcela Pino Alcaraz
AIA Fellow
Northern Arizona University

- Diversity Fellow (active), NAU
- Assistant Director, Center for International Education, NAU
- Assistant Manager, Global Supply Chain transformation, General Mills Inc.

Mary Venezia
AIA Fellow
University of Arizona

- Chief of Staff, Enrollment Management
- 15 years experience in Tri-U system
- Designed and/or launched 50+ initiatives at UAZ
Arizona Innovation Alliance and Arizona Western College Partnering for Student Success
Arizona Innovation Alliance and Arizona Western College

Current Initiatives

Overarching Goals

- Support AWC’s Goal of doubling baccalaureate attainment in Yuma and La Paz counties by 2035
- Increase awareness of educational pathways and options for residents in the region
- Identify collective methods for improving and/or expanding academic programming and student services to meet the needs of current and future students

Academic Programming Committee

Deepening understanding of current and future workforce needs and alignment of AIA academic programming

Collaborative Recruitment and Outreach Committee

Expanding tri-university+ AWC efforts to increase awareness of degree pathways and options.
  - Targeted efforts will focus initially on high school students and currently enrolled AWC students

Student Support Services: University Center Model

Improving student support services by identifying services that could be optimized through centralized planning and integration-creating a space for tri-university student engagement
Arizona Innovation Alliance

Future Initiatives

Increasing College Enrollment Rate among AZ High School Students
ASU Decision Center for Educational Excellence

• High school outcomes module (developed through partnership with ADE) provides a set of progress indicators at the course and student-level for AZ college readiness

• Discovery: Collaborative utilization of tools and future tri-university initiatives
  • Communications intervention study
  • Informing students of their progress: ABOR core competency requirements and automatic admission
Arizona Innovation Alliance

Future Initiatives

Community of Practice: Communications and Retention

Establishment of a Tri-University Community of Practice

• Deepening understanding of current practices for University messaging as interventions for retention

• Sharing promising practices, technology-based solutions, and analytic tools for personalized engagement
Predictive Analytics
In 2015, the UIA launched a predictive analytics initiative focused on increasing student outcomes by leveraging institutional data to identify early alerts that generate proactive interventions.

- **21% increase** in Pell graduates after implementing predictive analytics.
- **200% increase** in advising participation among students receiving targeted outreach.

Completion Grants
In 2017, the UIA launched a three-year completion grants initiative to support students facing modest financial hurdles that restrict their ability to enroll, persist, and complete their degree.

- **$3.6 million** in completion grants awarded.
- **5,000 Students** awarded grants.
- **83% retained & graduated** within 2 semesters.

Chatbots
In 2019, the UIA launched a chatbot initiative. Chatbots and data science tools were leveraged to increase students’ access to key information and remove routine, frequent, and/or duplicative questions from the scope of frontline staff so they can engage in more substantive student needs. Eleven campuses implemented chatbots in key areas including financial aid, student services, and admissions.
Arizona Innovation Alliance

Fall Priorities

- Fellow Hiring and Onboarding: September
- Establish Student Success Teams: September
- AIA Campus Kick-Off: October
- Website and Social Media Branding: December
- Presidents Briefing: September
- AIA Kick-Off: November
- Launch: Project Work Streams: December
- AIA Annual Report: January
Executive Summary

Item Name: Request for Approval of Online Metrics and Reporting

☑ Action Item

Requested Action: The committee is asked to recommend that the board approves online metrics for Arizona’s public universities. In addition, the board office will detail other reporting that the board receives over the course of the academic year concerning online students and online instructional programs.

Background/History of Previous Board Action

In recent years Arizona’s public universities have significantly grown their online programming and enrollments. Since 2016 online degree program enrollment across the ABOR system has almost doubled – increasing 98.7 percent. Last fall, online degree program students comprised 32.5 percent of total system enrollment.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Undergrad Online Headcount</th>
<th>Percent of Total Undergrads Enrolled</th>
<th>Graduate Online Headcount</th>
<th>Percentage of Graduate Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Total Online Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>40,485</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>13,508</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>53,993</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAU</td>
<td>4,168</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UArizona</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>6,486</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the University of Arizona Global Campus (a nonprofit affiliated entity) is anticipated to have an approximate enrollment of 35,000 students.

Given the amount of growth and university activity in this area, the board has directed the universities to work with the board office to develop online education success metrics for Arizona’s public universities which will also be applied to evaluate outcomes at the University of Arizona Global Campus.

Discussion

The committee is asked to review and approve the following six online accountability metrics. These online focused metrics are intended to supplement and support existing enterprise-wide metrics, forecast measures and academic reports that provide information and insight into the universities’ online activities and programs. These six metrics focus on and provide additional insight into the quality of the online student experience, and universities’ online brands and reputations.

¹ See generally Arizona Board of Regents Fiscal Year 2021 Enrollment Report.

Contact Information:
Chad Sampson, ABOR  chad.sampson@azregents.edu  602-229-2512
### Draft of Online Metrics with Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/ Purpose</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Metric Definition</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Online Student Experience</td>
<td>1. Online Course Completion Rate</td>
<td>The ratio of total online course credits completed (for an A-C grade or a pass in a pass/fail course), to total online course credits attempted across an academic year.</td>
<td>Needed to ensure that students are completing courses in good standing. (Proxy for student persistence over the short-term).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Online Student Attrition Rate</td>
<td>The number and percentage of students that have stopped-out for the following time periods: 12 to 24 months, 25 to 36 months, and for more than 36 months.</td>
<td>Needed proxy for persistence over the long-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pace of Progression to Online Degree</td>
<td>Average credits completed per student in an academic year</td>
<td>Needed to show average length of time it takes students to earn a degree, irrespective of credits in hand. (Proxy for time to degree). Students that have graduated in the measurement period will be excluded from the denominator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Courses taught by faculty with Doctorate or other relevant Terminal Degree</td>
<td>The percentage of online courses taught be faculty with a doctorate or other terminal degree in the field of instruction</td>
<td>Needed to safeguard that students are being taught by those with requisite academic training and expertise in the field of instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Courses taught by faculty who are benefits eligible</td>
<td>The percentage of online courses taught by instructional faculty who are benefits eligible</td>
<td>Needed to encourage oversight and custodianship of online instruction by universities’ core personnel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| University Brand and Reputation | 6. Online Program Rank (USNWR) | USNWR Online Program Rankings - Best Online Bachelor's Programs | Needed to understand the national reputation of the online program. |

### Statutory/Policy Requirements

A.R.S. 15-1626 “General Administrative Powers and Duties of Board”
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Online Metrics and Reporting

Chad Sampson
Vice President, Academic Affairs and Institutional Analysis
### Online Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/Purpose</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Specific Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Online Student Experience</td>
<td>1. Online Course Completion Rate</td>
<td>The ratio of total online course credits completed (for an A-C grade or a pass in a pass/fail course), to total online course credits attempted across an academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Online Student Attrition Rate</td>
<td>The number and percentage of students that have stopped-out for the following time periods:12 to 24 months, 25 to 36 months, and for more than 36 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pace of Progression to Online Degree</td>
<td>Average credits completed per student in an academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Online Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/Purpose</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Specific Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Online Student Experience</strong></td>
<td>4. Courses taught by faculty with Doctorate or other relevant Terminal Degree</td>
<td>The percentage of online courses taught by faculty with a doctorate or other terminal degree in the field of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Courses taught by faculty who are benefits eligible</td>
<td>The percentage of online courses taught by instructional faculty who are benefits eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Brand and Reputation</strong></td>
<td>6. Online Program Rank (USNWR)</td>
<td>USNWR Online Program Rankings - Best Online Bachelor's Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Online Oversight Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Metric/Forecast/Report/Board Action</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Online Academic Program</td>
<td>Board Vote Required</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Course Completion Rate</td>
<td>Online Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Student Attrition Rate</td>
<td>Online Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace of Progression to Online Degree</td>
<td>Online Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught by faculty with Doctorate or other relevant Terminal Degree</td>
<td>Online Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Program Rank (USNWR)</td>
<td>Online Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught by faculty who are benefits eligible</td>
<td>Online Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Enterprise Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduating Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Enterprise Metric</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td>Forecast Measure</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Graduate Enrollment</td>
<td>Forecast Measure</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Forecast Measure</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Graduate Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Forecast Measure</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Research Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>Forecast Measure</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Professional Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Forecast Measure</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Online Oversight Reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Metric/Forecast/Report/Board Action</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Enrollment by Program</td>
<td>Academic Program Inventory Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt at Graduation</td>
<td>Financial Aid Report</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages of Graduates</td>
<td>Financial Aid Report</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online First-time Full-Time Retention</td>
<td>First-time Student Report</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online First-time Part-time Retention</td>
<td>First-time Student Report</td>
<td>Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td>Enrollment Report</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Degrees Awarded Report</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Graduate Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Degrees Awarded Report</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Research Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>Degrees Awarded Report</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Graduate Enrollment</td>
<td>Enrollment Report</td>
<td>Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Professional Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>Degrees Awarded Report</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This page intentionally left blank
Item Name: Discussion of Arizona State University’s Institutional University Metrics

☐ Action Item

Requested Action: The committee will engage in a discussion with Arizona State University regarding their proposed Institutional University Metrics.

Background and Discussion

Throughout 2020 and into 2021 the board has been engaged in the development of new institutional metrics as well as metrics unique to each institution to better reflect the distinctiveness of Arizona's three universities.

Over the past year, the board has worked with Arizona State University to develop institutional metrics that reflect the university’s distinct mission and the board’s vision for the university’s future.

In January, the committee had a preliminary discussion regarding the proposed institutional metrics and associated goals. Since January, ASU has worked with board staff and regents to refine the list of metrics and associated goals. The revised list of institutional metrics is included below.

Statutory/Policy Requirements

A.R.S. 15-1626(B) “General Administrative Powers and Duties of the Board"
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Revised Proposed Arizona State University Institutional University

Revised August 25, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Metric</th>
<th>Specific Measure</th>
<th>ASU Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering as among the most significant engineering schools in the United States</td>
<td>1.1 Bachelor's engineering degrees awarded</td>
<td>Number of bachelor's degrees awarded by the Fulton Schools of Engineering in a given year</td>
<td>Fundamental measure of impact and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Doctoral engineering degrees awarded</td>
<td>Number of doctoral degrees awarded by the Fulton Schools of Engineering in a given year</td>
<td>Fundamental measure of impact and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Research expenditures</td>
<td>Total expenditures attributable to Fulton Schools of Engineering researchers as reported in annual NSF HERD survey</td>
<td>Consistent with broader Enterprise goal on total research expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Learning outcomes</td>
<td>Percentage of students who meet specified ABET accreditation standards around problem-solving, design, and communication</td>
<td>Measure of student success, including impacts of investments in learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Further develop ASU as an engine of social mobility</td>
<td>2.1 Pell Grant student success</td>
<td>The gap between the six-year graduation rate of Pell Grant recipients and the six-year graduation rate of non-Pell Grant recipients</td>
<td>Consistent with commitment to undifferentiated outcomes expressed in the Mission &amp; Goals associated with the ASU Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Student success by race/ethnicity</td>
<td>The six-year graduation rates reported separately by race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Consistent with commitment to undifferentiated outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mission &amp; Goals</th>
<th>Expressed in the Mission &amp; Goals associated with the ASU Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establish ASU as a leading global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery, and development</td>
<td>Consistent with broader Enterprise goal on total research expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Integrate cutting-edge technological innovation and scalability in all realms</td>
<td>Consistent with the goals set in ASU’s National Service University articulation; measure of investments in learning environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creating solutions and improving the lives in Arizona and beyond</td>
<td>Consistent with the commitments made as part of the New Economy Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 3: Establish ASU as a leading global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery, and development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expressed in the Mission &amp; Goals associated with the ASU Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Interdisciplinary/Transdisciplinary research expenditures</td>
<td>Total interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research expenditures as reported in annual NSF HERD survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Course enrollment in adaptive learning or other technologically enhanced (i.e., Neo-STEM) courses</td>
<td>Number of students enrolled in adaptive learning courses in a given year</td>
<td>Consistent with broader Enterprise goal on total research expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Retention of students in Adaptive learning or other technologically enhanced (i.e., Neo-STEM) courses</td>
<td>Percentage of first-time, degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled in adaptive learning course retained the proximate academic year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item 4: Integrate cutting-edge technological innovation and scalability in all realms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expressed in the Mission &amp; Goals associated with the ASU Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 ASU Digital Prep enrollees in rural and underserved Arizona</td>
<td>Number of rural and underserved high school student FTE enrolled in ASU Digital Prep through a partnership with an Arizona high schools.</td>
<td>Consistent with the commitments made as part of the New Economy Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Science and Technology Centers</td>
<td>Number of industry partners that provide financial or employee support to an ASU established Science and Technology Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### ASU Institutional Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Metric</th>
<th>Specific Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish the Ira A. Fulton Schools of Engineering as among the most significant engineering schools in the United States</td>
<td>1.1 Bachelor’s engineering degrees awarded</td>
<td>Number of bachelor’s degrees awarded by the Fulton Schools of Engineering in a given year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Doctoral engineering degrees awarded</td>
<td>Number of doctoral degrees awarded by the Fulton Schools of Engineering in a given year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Research expenditures</td>
<td>Total expenditures attributable to Fulton Schools of Engineering researchers as reported in annual NSF HERD survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Learning outcomes</td>
<td>Percentage of students who meet specified ABET accreditation standards around problem-solving, design, and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Further develop ASU as an engine of social mobility</td>
<td>2.1 Pell Grant student success</td>
<td>The gap between the six-year graduation rate of Pell Grant recipients and the six-year graduation rate of non-Pell Grant recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Student success by race/ethnicity</td>
<td>The six-year graduation rates reported separately by race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ASU Institutional Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Potential Metric</th>
<th>Specific Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Establish ASU as a leading global center for interdisciplinary research, discovery, and development</td>
<td>3.1 Interdisciplinary/Transdisciplinary research expenditures</td>
<td>Total interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research expenditures as reported in annual NSF HERD survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Integrate cutting-edge technological innovation and scalability in all realms</td>
<td>4.1 Course enrollment in adaptive learning or other technologically enhanced (i.e., Neo-STEM) courses</td>
<td>Number of students enrolled in adaptive learning courses in a given year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Retention of students in Adaptive learning or other technologically enhanced (i.e., Neo-STEM) courses</td>
<td>Percentage of first-time, degree-seeking undergraduate students enrolled in adaptive learning course retained the proximate academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creating solutions and improving the lives in Arizona and beyond</td>
<td>5.1 ASU Digital Prep enrollees in rural and underserved Arizona</td>
<td>Number of rural and underserved high school student FTE enrolled in ASU Digital Prep through a partnership with an Arizona high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Science and Technology Centers</td>
<td>Number of industry partners that provide financial or employee support to an ASU established Science and Technology Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Item Name: Request for Approval of The University of Arizona’s Institutional University Metrics

☑️ Action Item

**Requested Action:** The committee is asked to recommend that the board approve the proposed Institutional University Metrics for the University of Arizona.

**Background and Discussion**

Throughout 2020 and 2021, the board has been engaged in the development of sets of metrics unique to each institution to better reflect the distinctive brands, histories, cultures, and roles of Arizona’s three universities.

The 13 institutional metrics proposed by the University of Arizona are distinct from but complementary to the 15-board adopted enterprise-wide metrics that apply to all three public universities.

Over the past year, the University of Arizona has worked with the board office and a regent working group to develop this list of institutional metrics that reflect the university’s distinct mission and the board’s vision for the university’s future.

Since November 2020, the committee has engaged in multiple preliminary discussions with the University of Arizona leadership regarding the university’s proposed institutional metrics and associated goals. After each of those committee discussions, the University of Arizona continued to work with board staff and Regents to refine the list of metrics and associated goals.

The following table includes current list of institutional metrics for board approval that have resulted from all the past discussions.

---

**Contact Information:**
Chad Sampson, ABOR  
[chad.sampson@azregents.edu](mailto:chad.sampson@azregents.edu)  
602-229-2512
### University of Arizona Institutional University Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Specific Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategically recruit prospective high-potential undergraduate students</td>
<td>1.1 U.S. News and World Ranking</td>
<td>UA’s position in the annual U.S. News and World Report National University Rankings (overall and public universities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 High performing students in incoming class</td>
<td>The percentage of UA’s incoming immersion class that graduated in the top 10% of their high school class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Pell student success</td>
<td>Gap between 6-year graduation rate for Pell recipient immersion students and non-Pell immersion students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Demographic diversity of incoming resident students</td>
<td>The degree to which the racial/ethnic profile of UA’s incoming class matches the racial/ethnic profile of Arizona High School graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Diverse Student Success</td>
<td>Gap between the 6-year Graduation Rate of Diverse immersion students and non-Diverse immersion students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tackle Critical Problems at the Edges of Human Endeavor</td>
<td>2.1 Space science research</td>
<td>Total NASA funding per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Health and Medical Research</td>
<td>Total annual medical school research expenditure, as reported on NSF HERD survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Technology transfer</td>
<td>Licenses and options income generated per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Raise the profile and prestige of UA’s academic programs</td>
<td>3.1 Medical School Ranking</td>
<td>The Medical School Ranking is to be calculated as the average of: - US News Graduate School/Program Rankings in Medicine: Primary Care and Blue Ridge Institute for Medical Research in Anatomy/Cell Biology, Physiology, Family Medicine, and Schools of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Health Science Ranking</td>
<td>Health Science Ranking is to be calculated as the average of: - Pharmacy (currently 20) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking - Nursing DNP (currently 31) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking - Audiology (currently 10) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking - Speech-Language Pathology (currently 6) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking - Public Health (currently 32) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3 Resilient Agriculture, Science, and Engineering Ranking</th>
<th>Resilient Agriculture, Science, and Engineering Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Plant and Animal Science (currently 15) – US News Worldwide Subject Rankings (US Rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environment/Ecology (currently 18) – US News Worldwide Subject Rankings (US Rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Biological/Ag Engineering (currently 23) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4 Space, Optics, and Aerospace Ranking</th>
<th>Space, Optics, and Aerospace Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Space Sciences (currently 8) – US News Worldwide Subject Rankings (US Rank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Geology (currently 3) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Atomic/Molecular/Optical Physics (currently 10) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Aerospace Engineering (currently 31) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5 Business and Law Ranking</th>
<th>Business and Law Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Full-Time MBA (currently 46) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Law (currently 47) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Management Information Systems (currently 3) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statutory/Policy Requirements

A.R.S. 15-1626(B) “General Administrative Powers and Duties of the Board”
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# UA Institutional Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Specific Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strategically recruit prospective high-potential undergraduate students</td>
<td>1.1 U.S. News and World Ranking</td>
<td>UA’s position in the annual U.S. News and World Report National University Rankings (overall and public universities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 High performing students in incoming class</td>
<td>The percentage of UA’s incoming immersion class that graduated in the top 10% of their high school class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Pell student success</td>
<td>Gap between 6-year graduation rate for Pell recipient immersion students and non-Pell immersion students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Demographic diversity of incoming resident students</td>
<td>The degree to which the racial/ethnic profile of UA’s incoming class matches the racial/ethnic profile of Arizona High School graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Diverse Student Success</td>
<td>Gap between the 6-year Graduation Rate of Diverse immersion students and non-Diverse immersion students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tackle Critical Problems at the Edges of Human Endeavor</td>
<td>2.1 Space science research</td>
<td>Total NASA funding per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Health and Medical Research</td>
<td>Total annual medical school research expenditure, as reported on NSF HERD survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Technology transfer</td>
<td>Licenses and options income generated per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Specific Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3    | Raise the profile and prestige of UA’s academic programs | 3.1 Medical School Ranking | The Medical School Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:  
• US News Graduate School/Program Rankings in Medicine: Primary Care and Blue Ridge Institute for Medical Research in Anatomy/Cell Biology, Physiology, Family Medicine, and Schools of Medicine |
|      |             | 3.2 Health Science Ranking | Health Science Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:  
• Pharmacy (currently 20) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Nursing DNP (currently 31) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Audiology (currently 10) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Speech-Language Pathology (currently 6) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Public Health (currently 32) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking |
|      |             | 3.3 Resilient Agriculture, Science, and Engineering Ranking | Resilient Agriculture, Science, and Engineering Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:  
• Plant and Animal Science (currently 15) – US News Worldwide Subject Rankings (US Rank)  
• Environment/Ecology (currently 18) – US News Worldwide Subject Rankings (US Rank)  
• Biological/Ag Engineering (currently 23) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking |
|      |             | 3.4 Space, Optics, and Aerospace Ranking | Space, Optics, and Aerospace Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:  
• Space Sciences (currently 8) – US News Worldwide Subject Rankings (US Rank)  
• Geology (currently 3) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Atomic/Molecular/Optical Physics (currently 10) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Aerospace Engineering (currently 31) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking |
|      |             | 3.5 Business and Law Ranking | Business and Law Ranking is to be calculated as the average of:  
• Full-Time MBA (currently 46) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Law (currently 47) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking  
• Management Information Systems (currently 3) – US News Graduate School/Program Ranking |