Academic Affairs Council Meeting
April 13, 2006

Minutes of the Meeting

The Academic Affairs Council met Thursday, April 13, 2006 in Pierre with the following persons participating: BHSU, Dean Myers; DSU, Cecelia Wittmayer; NSU, Clyde Arnold; SDSMT, Karen Whitehead; SDSU, Carol Peterson and Mary Kay Helling; USD, Royce Engstrom; BOR, Don Cozzetto, Sandee Schamber, Lynda Oldenkamp, Josh Riedy, Mike Merrill, and Jodi Gabriel.

Item 1 Agenda
Carol handed out a grid on labs but there were no additions to the agenda.

Item 2 Minutes
The minutes of March 2006 were approved. Jodi will make a correction in the spelling of Jenks from SDSU.

Item 3.A.1 Sequencing of BIOL, CHEM, PHYS Courses
This was a previous discussion in March. Ranny has confirmed that each course listed for general education on each of the goals are each available for credit. All courses listed count towards general education requirements.

Item 3.A.2 Pre General Education Holds
Deferred to May.

Item 3.A.3 Transfer of Completed IGRs
Don explained that previous AAC made a recommendation to MOCC relating to the transfer of completed IGRs. MOCC has provided concerns to AAC regarding the recommendation.

Don remarked that he understood the workload issue but we want the IGRs as individual requirements, not one group meeting all the IGRs on any campus.
Royce suggested that if the university can waive the IGRs on a transfer student, then the database would work just fine. USD plans to look at the students individually and then just enter a waive of IGRs in the system.

Karen wondered if they could waive other issues in degree audit? It may be useful if the student transfers in and wants to say that through a certain sequence of courses that they can waive certain requirements, it might be useful for the petitions that are received in the VPAAs office.

Carol agreed that if possibly a good speaker wanted to waive the speech 101 requirement and the student had documentation that they are indeed an accomplished speaker, then this is where we would be able to do that.

Don will respond to the MOCC group that AAC will review each student individually and then waive the IGR requirement in degree audit if necessary.

Item 3.C.1 Remedial Reading Proposal and Course
The remedial reading proposal was brought to the March AAC meeting and approved. Clyde has now brought forward the new course request for review. There are policy implications and placement guidelines that will be impacted also.

SDSU is the only institution that has responded and agreed with the proposed changes.

Lynda remarked that the system assessment committee is meeting next week to discuss this too. She suggested that we also send this to MOCC and get their input.

Carol clarified that the concept is the level of reading that we want to bring the student is for every course; it doesn't just apply to one course. How far do we let the students proceed before we make them take the course? Previously, AAC decided on the first academic year is when they would be required to take the course and after that we would place a hold on them. Cecelia reported that Carrie Ahern, DSU's assessment coordinator, concurred with that recommendation.

Karen suggested that if a student comes in lacking reading skills, based on their compass score, is there another approach where we can limit the number of academic credits they can take? Carol felt that we wanted to make the reading course either a pre-requisite or a concurrent course. We do not want to delay the student any more than we have to.

Karen concurred but felt that the student needs to be taking this course concurrently with the courses or it won't help the student. The student needs to take this course right away and we need to be able to restrict their registration in additional courses.
AAC is recommending that the student would take the course concurrently with other courses during the first semester until they successfully complete the course. Special students are exempt from the policy.

Clyde recommended that we approve the new course request for the common LART 041 course today. The course request has nothing to do with policy. We need to have time to review the policy and all the implications and issues with it. We could recommend the course to students based on placement scores, optional for institutions for Fall 2006. He suggested that AAC discuss the policy and guidelines implications more thoroughly.

Cecelia felt that if we accept students with low reading scores, then we have a responsibility to assist them to be successful. After universities have used the course, we may have more data on successfulness to make a better policy recommendation. Clyde suggested we add an item to discuss the data at the October retreat.

AAC recommended using READ 041 for the remedial reading course. This is a new prefix for most of the universities. The common course request was approved and will move forward to Dr. Perry for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May Board meeting.

AAC recommended adding an item to the October retreat to discuss the policies and guidelines changes at that time. Clyde will bring a summary and analysis of issues that the reading committee has already pulled together. He will also get some information from Ranny on the technical issues of the remedial course. Some of the universities may have some experiences of using this course to share in the item.

**Item 3.D.1 Proficiency Exam Restrictions**
USD had previously requested to put a stronger hold on the proficiency exam hold. MOCC has provided concerns on the restrictions of the proficiency exam requirements. Mike Merrill reported that the restrictions are designed for registration and not for graduation. Karen suggested we accept the MOCC recommendation of adding the restriction in degree audit.

Lynda remarked that there is a one-year retest window. Then the student could get the extensions and get the alternate certifications, etc. and could extend this out and getting to graduation without passing the proficiency exam. Royce added that the student would need to work very hard in not meeting the requirement but some students do.

AAC concurred with the MOCC group that degree audit will implement the hold on graduation rather than having a restriction in colleague to prevent graduation as AAC previously requested. This will be passed on to the MOCC group.
Item 4.A Program Modifications – BHSU
Don expressed concern over increasing credit requirements in various programs and the need to review the program modification process. He used BHSU’s MSCI Math specialization as an example of what in effect is a program with 10 new courses submitted as a program modification.

AAC had a short discussion on the program modification process. Lynda felt that we need to look at the process to address the standards requirements too. Cecelia agreed that we probably need to look at the level of scrutiny for the program modifications.

Dean explained that BHSU is simply moving some courses around on the Spanish modifications. The Math specialization is in response to the BOE requirement. Lynda felt that we would be seeing more of these given the new route that the BOE has taken. Dean added that Item 10.B.1 parallels this request.

The following program modifications for BHSU will move forward to the COPS and Board meetings in May. The program modification for the MSCI – Math Specialization will come back in May.

- BS – BA Spanish
- BSED Spanish

Item 4.B Program Modification – DSU
Cecelia explained that the modification combines the two existing majors and puts them under one major, then adds two specializations. Carol felt that this would make DSU’s major more like SDSU’s. Cecelia argued that the coursework in this change remains very technical and computer based courses.

The program modification to the BS in Computer Graphics Design and the BS in Multimedia/Web Development for DSU will move forward to the COPS and Board meetings in May. The modification combines the two programs under one major, Digital Arts and Design.

Item 4.C Program Modifications – NSU
Clyde reported that these program modifications are merely a clean up after a major review by NSU in Fall 2005. The demand is not there for the Business Education major and the associate degree in Network Administration, resulting in two inactive status proposals. BHSU also offered the associate degree but their demand is there and this will not affect their program.
The following program modifications for NSU will move forward to the May COPS and Board meetings.

- Administrative Systems
- Community Services
- Computer Science Minor
- Elementary Education
- Finance
- Fitness Management
- International Business
- Management
- Management Information Systems Minor
- Marketing
- MSED Guidance and Counseling

The follow programs will be placed on inactive status and go forward to the May COPS and Board meetings for consideration.

- Business Education (Major)
- Network Administration (Associate Degree)

**Item 4.D Program Modifications – SDSU**

Carol reported that the Art and Graphic Design modifications are merely clean up. The BS in Engineering is to correct a mistake made initially in designation of the program.

The following program modifications for SDSU will move forward to the COPS and Board meetings in May.

- Art
- Graphic Design
- BS in Engineering – Major in Mathematics

**Item 4.E Program Modifications – USD**

Royce explained that the USD modifications are separating the majors because BOR policy does not allow double majors. The degree program will only be available as a second major.

The following program modifications for USD will move forward to the May COPS and Board meetings.

- Bachelor of Musical Arts
Item 5.A Course Modifications - BHSU
The following course modifications for BHSU will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported in the Interim Actions of the Executive Director.

New Course Requests
- ENGL 306 Grammar for the English Teacher
- ENGL 409 Teaching English as a Second Language
- ENGL 509 Teaching English as a Second Language
- GEOG 305 A Physical Approach to Geography
- HIST 240 Introduction to Public History & Cultural Resources
- POLS 465 Contemporary Political Thought (now common with USD)
- SPAN 304 The Structure of Spanish
- THEA 344 Fundamentals of Design
- THEA 450 Senior Capstone Project

Authority to Offer Existing Common Courses
- LING 403 Introduction to Linguistics
- SOC 403 Sociological Theory
- THEA 243 Make-Up

Revised Course Request for Unique Courses
- ED 531 Instructional Design
- THEA 361 Theatre History
- THEA 364 Theatre Literature

Item 5.B Course Modifications – DSU
The following course modifications for DSU will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report at the May Board meeting.

New Course Requests (Unique)
- ARTD 185 Introduction to Animation
- ARTD 245 History of Graphics
- ARTD 388 Environmental Design
- CET 721 Web Authoring
- CSC 482 Algorithms and Optimization
- CSC 483 Machine Learning Fundamentals
• CSC 486 Data Mining Methods
• DAD 110 Introduction to Digital Arts and Design
• DAD 215 Team Building/Creative Problem Solving
• MCOM 348 Writing for Networked Environments
• MCOM 358 Principles of Usability Testing
• MCOM 368 Editing for Structured Environments
• SCTC 291 Independent Study
• SCTC 292 Topics
• SCTC 491 Independent Study
• SCTC 492 Topics
• SPCM 225 Symbolic, Strategic Communications
• SPCM 250 Storytelling
• THEA 404 Experimental Theatre Forms
• THEA 405 Performance Art

Authority to Offer an Existing Common Course
• BADM 464 Organizational Behavior

Revised Course Requests – Unique
• HIM 489 Program Sustaining
• RESP 381 Respiratory Care Management
• RESP 489 Program Sustaining
• SEED 303 Secondary/Middle Content Area: Minor

Revised Course Requests – Common
• ART 231 Painting I
• BIOL 103 Biology Survey II
• CIS 384 Decision Support Systems
• CIS 484 Database Management Systems

Revised Course Request – Unique to Common
• BADM 468 International Management

Item 5.C Course Modifications – NSU
The following course modifications for NSU will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May Board meeting. The proposal for BADM 404 Not-for-Profit Marketing will be pulled pending common course discussions with DSU (NFP 370/BADM 370). Clyde will let the BOR office know of that outcome.

New Course Requests
• BADM 403 Marketing Communications
• BADM 450 Business Leadership
• BADM 451 Organizational Development
• BADM 459 Direct Marketing
• BADM 463 Women in Management
• BADM 469 Project Management
• SOC 260 Introduction to Planning and Techniques of Zoning
• SOC 361 Community and Organizational Leadership

Item 5.D Course Modifications – SDSU
The following course modifications for SDSU will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May Board meeting. It was clarified that the revised prerequisite is at SDSU at the section level only for CSC 317.

New Course Requests
• CHEM 346 Biophysical Chemistry
• CHEM 346L Biophysical Chemistry Lab

Revised Course Request – Common
• CSC 317 Computer Organization and Architecture

Item 5.E Duplicate Courses in the Master Course Database
Deferred to May.

Item 5.F Course Modifications – USD
The following course modifications for USD will move forward to the Executive Director for consideration and be reported on the Interim Actions report for the May Board meeting.

New Course Requests
• A&S 301 Job Searching in the 21st Century
• BADM 434/534 Project Management
• ARTH 413/513 Postmodern Art History
• ENGL 001 College Reading & Writing

Authority to Offer a Common Course
• PSYC 244 Environmental Psychology
• PHIL 220 Introduction to Ethics

Course Deletion Requests (common)
• AT 100T Athletic Training Transfer Elective
• AT 300T Athletic Training Transfer Elective
• AT 371 Athletic Training Clinical Exp I
• AT 372 Athletic Training Clinical Exp II
• AT 373 Athletic Training Clinical Exp III
• AT 374 Athletic Training Clinical Exp IV
• AT 400T Athletic Training Transfer Elective
• AT 464 Therapeutic Modalities in AT
• AT 474 Rehab of Athletic Injuries

_Revised Course Request Unique_
• SPAN 438 Latin American Civilization

**Item 6 Reports**
No report.

**Item 7.A System Approach to Teacher Education Program Quality Assurance and BOR Annual Teacher Education Accountability Report**
Lynda reported that the first three pages is the coversheet and has the most information for AAC. It’s giving all the background on the process.

The figures in Attachment I are outdated but you may want to compare those budget figures with the figures in Attach III on page 15. They have tried to use the TQE grant for the teacher education assessment project.

Lynda clarified that none of this is expended or in-kind funds from the TQE grant. This is all budgeted TQE funds for the teacher education assessment related activities.

Page 2 identifies the TQE measures that would become part of the accountability report. We want to reduce the workload impact of the new report.

Lynda handed out a permission form for the data exchange with the DOE. It releases the SSN to the DOE so we can get information about their SD certification and employment records. We want to get this in place as soon as we can so we have the data available for the next report.

Lynda and Lesta have already been in communication with the education deans and asked for input from them. They want to finalize this next week however.
Attachment IV is the matrix shows the measures that will be included on the accountability reporting. The implementation timeline is shown on page 3. There is also a tentative agenda topics list for the campus visits in May. Lesta and Lynda are also working with the Education Discipline Council and would like to have the entire project in place for the October board meeting.

Lynda clarified that there is no money other than what is coming through the TQE grant for assessment on the campus. This is to develop a system approach to teacher education program quality assurance and the annual teacher education assessment reporting to the BOR.

Sandee is working with the campuses to prepare their assessment plans. The money for these people is already flowing. The other piece is the assessment that Lynda is working on with Lesta that involves the campus tours.

Lynda said that the money is not going to a particular person but rather to the university and they can distribute how they see fit. The money should be going to the business offices. She thought there is an expectation for the campuses to do the time and effort reporting but Sandee didn’t think so. The money is not for work completed but rather money to support the assessment reporting and process on the campuses.

This item will come back with additional information in May.

**Item 7.B TQE Grant**
Sandee reported that the grant is now winding down so there isn’t much to report. There are 10 people attending the MERLOT conference and we’ve just been approved to present at the conference. We have good representation now. Sandee’s report also shows the progress of the assessment plans.

**Item 8.A.1 BOR 2:24 Enrollment Reporting**
BOR policy 2:24 revisions on enrollment extracts were approved at the March Board meeting. The MOCC group has additional concerns. MOCC talked to RIS and propose that they freeze the extract at the end of July and then another extract at the end of August to capture what has taken place since August 1. It wouldn’t change any info that came from the July 31 extract but would add the additional enrollment from August 1 to date.

We would be capturing more information but a little bit of information would continue to be lost.

AAC agreed with the proposed solution.
Item 8.B Fall HS counselor workshop
AAC members will send Don and Jodi the contact person on each campus and suggest any topics for discussion with the counselors. This information is due Wednesday, April 19.

Item 8.C EDC Proposal – Cooperating Teachers
This item will be referred to BAC for discussion.

Item 8.D Dual Credit Courses – Tuition
Deferred to May.

Item 8.E Instructional Methods Codes
Deferred to May.

Item 8.F Winter Interim
Deferred to May.

Item 8.G Curriculum Forms Revisions
AAC approved the revisions to the curriculum forms. Jodi will post to the web so campuses may begin to use them.

Item 8.H Possible System Minor in Military Science
Deferred to May.

Item 8.I Pandemic Planning
Jim Shekleton joined the meeting for this item.

In January, the Board appointed a committee to review pandemic flu. The committee has met and will be meeting this summer with Lon Kightlinger, Department of Health. We need to
manage our campus plans and develop those in order to present those plans to Kightlinger at the end of June.

Jim provided a list of issues that may be relevant to the academic side of the house and something that the VPAAs should think about and plan for.

Are there ways to set firm guidelines for the institutions at the system level, similar to military call ups? What about scholarship requirements? We need to make an accommodation if we should shut down classes for pandemic reasons. Alternate delivery method for example provided that the student has that resource. This type of information should be included in the plans.

Don said that the University of Maryland plan is a good model. The universities might want to look at this plan and use some of the structure for their own plans. Carol add that we could have a broad policy similar to the military policy and then a type of process at the university level and how they would address the issues that arise during a pandemic episode. The broad policy would be generally written so that the university knows where to go and what they are able to do.

Cecelia suggested that decisions about faculty leave or tuition refund should be a system policy. Jim agreed. A stipulation on the tuition refund will be what the federal guidelines are.

Don suggested that the VPAAs could take this information back to the campus and give it to the people who are working on these plans. We need a key group of individuals identified, some office or some person in which all those issues are addressed. Jim felt that the responsibility ultimately needs to lie at the President’s office or he didn’t think the plan would get done.

Jim remarked that the Department of Health would be the determination on closing a campus but we need to have a plan to work through the closing of a campus. Dean suggested we also need to think about the EUC and their role in offering of the courses. Jim concurred that we need to keep in mind student access to these courses and delivery methods.

Jim will prepare of list of system issues and guidelines or decisions for the institutions.

Item 8.J Student Petitions
Deferred to May.

Item 8.K Financial Literacy
Don reported that financial/quantitative literacy was raised by the Executive Director for AAC discussion. Royce had previously talked about this in February 2005 during the general education review. USD was collecting data related to adding the course to the general education list. AAC decided at that time not to add a required course.

Royce suggested that he continue analyzing this issue. SDSU and USD may bring forth a common course.

Item 9 Faculty Issues
No report.

Item 10.A.1 New Programs – SDSU Minor in Professional Writing
SDSU is proposing a minor in professional writing. Carol remarked that they understand that this is a generic issue so they anticipate the other universities also adding a minor. Institutions should send any comments or concerns to Paul Gough to be included on the coversheet for the May COPS and Board meetings.

Item 10.A.2 New Programs – NSU B.S. in Sport Marketing and Administration
NSU has submitted a proposal for a B.S. in Sports Marketing and Administration. Clyde explained that the program in Fitness Management is located in the business school. This program moves in another direction. Many of the Fitness Management students will move to this area rather than the business area. Clyde added that the Dept. of Labor statistics and a recent survey predict 10-15, may 20 graduates at some point. There are no other majors like this in the system.

Institutions should send any comments or concerns to Paul Gough to be included on the coversheet for the May COPS and Board meetings.

Deferred to May. This relates to the program modification also deferred to May.

Item 11.A CMS Update
Josh commented that in March AAC voted to endorse WebCT as the preferred course management system. The preference did not address whether a centralized or decentralized model is preferred.

The issues that are coming to light is cost and bandwidth. The actual price for Vista is still not solid. Monte felt that it would take 1.5 million dollars to run this – something that no one has. It’s about $450,000 per year systemwide. So the decision for this is being delayed waiting for money decisions.

AAC has recommended the WebCT product and had asked the BAC group to look at the money situation. They are working on this but they are hung up on the cost and the technical issues as well.

Does this push us back to looking at the other CMS systems? Josh did not think at this time that AAC needed to do that until we get the final costs from Blackboard on the WebCT product.

Josh will bring updates from the BAC group back to AAC in May.

**Item 11.B Quality Assurance Process Revisions**

Josh reported that revisions to the quality assurance process document were reviewed by the EUC committee. Don added that the HLC was very specific with what they expected us to do and what they approved when they were here. The QA process is specifically spelled out and we would have to bring the HLC back for an additional site visit if we want to change it.

Don has updated Dr. Perry on what the HLC is specifying and Dr. Perry will update the Regents. AAC needs to go ahead with the QA process that we think is appropriate.

Josh remarked that we do not have a program approval process right now. Our QA process is orientated towards courses. The QA process that the EUC committee came up with is very streamlined.

Royce agreed that we could just add a section on program review on the end of this document. We have a process for on campus program review and we need to put this in context with the online program review.

Josh will draft the program piece and distribute for review. Josh and Don have a meeting scheduled with Dr. Perry next week and will know more after that meeting. Karen will seek the advice of a statistician regarding sample size of courses to review.
The program piece will state that once the courses have all gone through the EUC quality assurance process, then in essence the program has gone through the quality assurance process. We need to keep this as simple as possible.

**Item 11.C 5-Year Program Plan**

In February campuses were asked to provide input for the 5-year program plan. We talked about the process too on moving those programs forward. Is this a realistic plan? Or is it more of a placeholder? Is it time to look at these and if we’re not going to develop them in the near future, we need to take it off? Or maybe just put a timeline together?

Clyde felt that AAC has all looked at this as a placeholder and we haven’t done a very good job of either collaborating programs or taking it off the list. It needs to be a realistic plan.

Josh felt that members of the committee are tentative about program development and they are not sure how to proceed. There is not really a defined process for program development.

How do you get a list for the approval process and also a list on how to get to the offering of the proposed plan for the program? The committee is not sure when they need to get the approval from AAC, or COPS, or EUC, or whatever.

Karen thought that previously the table was a planning document. Royce agreed that the table was a planning document and was not really concerned if it was not exact. This should have flexibility.

Josh commented that some campuses take this plan far more serious than others. At the end of the day, it is the VPAA that must decide what program and who should develop the program. Karen felt that the purpose of this document in part is so that we all know what each other is working on so that we can come forward and collaborate if necessary. Is it working for us?

Royce commented that AAC should view this document as a guide but not carved in stone. He doesn’t want to see the door slammed on other universities just because one university has marked it as proposed on the list.

Karen felt that everyone who is planning to develop a distance delivered program should be able to go to this document and see if anyone else has the program or is planning for program and then work with that university to see how far the university is on the planning stages.

Josh will add a column or another code to the legend for status of program and talk to the EUC committee. AAC would like the EUC committee members to review the list each year and discuss the status of the programs and potential planning for additional programs with the VPAA. Josh will also review the way the plan is formatted and try to make it more readable and clearer.
Item 11.D Fall 2005 Distance Education Enrollment Report
Information only. Any questions should be sent to Josh.

Item 11.E EUC Online EUC Course Registration
Josh reported that this was added for approval for the EUC to continue to work on the course registration mechanism. There is an analysis provided by Suzanne. Josh reported that he would like AAC’s approval to continue researching in finding a replacement for HPCnet.

There are four policy issues related to EUC course registration.

*Automated admission:*
The campuses are asking to temporarily admit students as special status in order to expedite course registration. In order to have this automated admission, we need web advisor. Some off campus student information is included and shows that students are not registering for more than just a couple courses. Each campus has their own off campus registration for distance education students and none are automated.

SDSU did not object to the automated admission but rather all students be designated the special student status.

Cecelia felt that if we automatically admitted students as a special student, it is opened to anyone, including high school students who cannot handle a college course. Josh clarified that this admission would be for students who ask for the special student status. The EUC committee is still discussing this issue.

*Change withdrawal process:*
EUC wants to allow students with special student status to drop or withdraw from correspondence, internet, and video courses without going through the system or university processes, if the student is taking one course.

Mary Kay remarked that they only need to go through the withdrawal process after they are well into the course. If there is only one course and the student wants to drop the course, they go through the withdraw process only if it’s after the withdraw/drop date. If they withdraw within the drop/add period, there is no penalty.

*Priority registration for self support courses:*
Some of the campuses are waiting for on-campus students to register, and then registering the off campus students. They are waiting until the last of the priority registration period and then the classes are filled.
The problem is that students are being handled differently on each campus depending on when they are registering via distance through the EUC.

**Uniform special student application:**
The EUC committee proposes to develop a uniform undergraduate and graduation application for special student application.

Josh will continue work with RIS to explore the abilities of WebAdvisor.

**Graduation with Honors**
Dean commented that we have a policy in place to complete the last 64 credits at that university in order to graduate with honors. Why is it 64 hours when it’s only 32 from the university in order to graduate from that university?

Karen thought that AAC looked at what we currently had and we probably settled on half of the credits earned at that institution. Are there exceptions? Carol responded that she has had a few exceptions over the years.

**Library Resources**
Don reported that there may be new money for library resources. The Executive Director has indicated that he will entertain a proposal for library updating. There is $482,000 left from the O&M funding and he would direct that toward strategic library initiatives at a system level for support. Royce will be putting in a formal proposal for Dr. Perry and the BOR to consider.

Royce added that the Executive Director would like a proposal based on three parameters at the system level.
- science and engineering initiatives relating to the 2010 initiative/epscor/new PhD programs
- non duplicative
- system purchase with system access

Royce added that this is a fast timeline. We won’t identify the specific purchases but more a process on how we are going to spend the money.

How do the librarians get involved? Karen felt that if it has to be tied to initiative/epscor/new PhD programs, then those people should be involved too.

Royce suggested that he draft a proposal for how we are going to spend the money, and agree among AAC. After Dr. Perry approves, then we give it to the librarians, epscor, PhD people,
etc. He suggested that the proposal would include the three parameters set by Dr. Perry and maybe some procedural issues.

Royce will draft the proposal and circulate to AAC for comments.