

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL
CONFERENCE CALL
JUNE 1, 2010**

Minutes of the Meeting

The Academic Affairs Council met via conference call on Tuesday, June 1, 2010 with the following persons participating: BHSU, Kristi Pearce; DSU, Cecelia Wittmayer; NSU, Tom Hawley; SDSMT, Duane Hrncir; SDSU, Laurie Nichols & Mary Kay Helling; USD, Chuck Staben & Lynn Rognstad; BOR, Sam Gingerich, Paul Turman, & Jodi Gabriel.

Item 1 Additions to the Agenda

Sam commented that this meeting is an extension of the May meeting and it was called to finish up the agenda. He thanked everyone for rearranging their schedules to accommodate this with little notice.

New Site Request ~ BSN at UC, SF

Laurie commented that a new site request has been submitted to BOR staff to offer the traditional BSN in Sioux Falls as state support. At this time, it would be a small cohort at UC only. Sam added that Board staff are having discussions internally as well as with SDSU since this is a unique situation. SDSU currently has authority to offer the accelerated program at state support at UC. But conversations are underway to decide if approval is required to offer the “traditional” program.

Laurie will circulate the site request for review.

Out of Country Per Diem

Laurie suggested that AAC should talk about the state authorized out of country per diem at a future meeting. She has received some comments and concerns from faculty and staff about per diem authorized regardless of source of funds. Some travel is supported by grant funds and these allow reimbursement at higher rates but the traveler is only reimbursed at the established state funding rates. Sam added that this comes up every year or two for additional discussion. Gary Johnson told him that this comes up in RAC sometimes too. VPAAAs should let Sam know if there are additional complaints.

This will come back to AAC in the fall for formal discussion. The VPAAAs should think about the issue and send additional information to BOR staff for the next AAC meeting.

Item 6.D Institutional Program Review Guidelines

Comments on the draft guidelines should be forwarded to Mary Kay.

Sam suggested that AAC should review these one last time before agreeing to pilot them next fall. He would also want to see each campus's 5-10 year program review cycle.

Are there any schedules in place now for program reviews? Sam responded that the ones on file were out of date and some were set out 7-8 years in advance. DSU uses their own cycle with adjustments for new programs and accreditation cycles. SDSU uses the same process.

Item 6.E Residual ACT Testing

Paul T remarked that AAC is aware of the issues that are surfacing concerning residual ACT testing and how the resulting scores are used in the system. Typically students fall into two categories. One pool of students enroll and they then are encouraged to take the residual ACT exam for scholarship purposes to get additional support. The other category is the set of students who are 21 years or younger and according to admissions requirements they are asked to sit for the ACT so they can be admitted. We ask that they have an ACT score on file.

Paul felt that a lot of admissions persons will look at getting people admitted in a timely manner. Residuals are used to overcome the timeframe of formal testing. He reported that as we have discussed elimination of the residual ACT testing, we have received quite a bit of pushback from the student federation group. They felt it deprived the disadvantaged or needy students.

Paul remarked that in analyzing data, we did not have many students that used the residual ACT scores in the system for this past year. Of the approximately 25,000 undergraduate students enrolled last fall only about 250 had residual ACT scores reported and, of these, 150 students had an official ACT score reported so approximately 100 students used the residual exam to qualify for admissions. When looking at success rate, for the large part of those students who made it farther, the majority were on academic probation. However Paul did not feel we had a good tracking record for students who needed the residual ACT for admissions. Do we need to have a better tracking system?

Why do we want to eliminate the residual ACT scores? Paul raised this issue because we have a group of students who take this for the SDOS and assume it will count for all scholarships. We state that residuals are not allowed for the SDOS, the parents and students still assumed it would. The bottom line was that if we don't even accept this for the scholarship requirements why would we want to use it on campus? Do we need to use this for the purposes of admissions?

Cecelia commented that one concern is that the policies would not be changed. The ACT score would continue to be required and were concerned with trying to get the kids to show

up to a testing site and on the correct date. So if the admissions standards would change, she felt it would eliminate some of the concerns at DSU then.

Chuck felt that if we don't require the ACT for admissions, we may be opening up other issues. If we publically say that ACT scores are not required for admissions, won't we disadvantage a group of students who then would not take the ACT and may not now qualify for the SDOS.

Kristi agreed. Sam replied that the ACT is not solely used for admissions. This is not in BOR policy. However the ACT scores are used and the scores are also used for placement. Sam felt that the SDOS or other scholarships will still require an ACT score.

Sam commented that the intent was to change the policy for the ACT for admissions. The policy was changed years ago to allow students who have college credits and other ways to admit the students rather than making them come in and sit for the exam. The COMPASS exam can be used for placement.

Paul commented that if the decision comes down to the student with no ACT score, those that we allow the residual ACT score are not very successful. Why are we allowing those students admissions based on only the residual scores?

Sam commented that this is causing some consternation. The underlying issue is a critical one. Students admitted at the last minute are unsuccessful and we need to look at that. Dr. Warner felt we also needed to look at admissions. We have students that we admit and too many do not survive. We need to do a better job of addressing the deficiencies of students when they are admitted. For instance, many students placed in remedial math come in and are not able to complete the required course. A year or two later, they drop out, end up with years of debt and they do not complete their degree anyway.

Sam added that one factoid is being lost. Fewer than 1% of students enrolled last fall had residual scores, and more than half of those had official ACT scores too. He felt we were blowing this up into a big policy issue and this affects a small number of students that would probably fit into another category of admission requirements.

Sam clarified that institutions will continue to use the residual ACT scores. At the same time, campus staff need to continue to communicate that the residual ACT scores cannot be used to qualify for the Opportunity Scholarship.

Item 6.F D2L Implementation and Update

VPAAAs should talk to their D2L campus representatives to make sure that this upgrade process is being talked about on campus and that strategies are in place to communicate changes to faculty and to students.

Paul commented that the D2L management committee meets every month and walks through different types of technical issues that emerge. They have been talking about the updated version and a couple of issues that will affect faculty using this platform.

We will go to the 9.0 upgrade on July 5. As they are doing the tests, the student should not notice a huge variation in what they see. VPAAAs should make sure that the D2L reps are communicating with the faculty who are using D2L and instructing a course this summer.

DSU and USD did not think there were discussions on campus. Chuck said that this seems to be a few days before finals and as a student that would be tough. Paul commented that this is the cheapest for the system. There is a small number of students and faculty that will be impacted. The committee felt that the fall semester would bring a bigger set of issues if we tried to implement the D2L upgrade at that time.

Paul did not think the changes would be significant. Some have already done their updates and there have been no major changes, only a few different labeling features. Each campus is supposed to be putting together something for faculty and students. The VPAAAs should be in touch with the D2L coordinators.

Paul will need to go forward with the mobile computing surveys and the D2L surveys this fall. Institutions should make sure the reps on campus understand that they need to make sure these are in place.

Paul added that server space is getting limited. Staff will start archiving information on past courses. If there are course information rules where the information must be kept for accreditation purposes, the D2L rep needs to know. The faculty may need to assist.

Paul added that there will be guidelines to follow. Creating a shell for each section is taking up the most room. He was not sure when the shells would be dumped but they are talking about it now. Currently no shells have ever been dumped. The committee may need some tutorials for faculty on how to access the archived files, etc. Staff should be communicating the process to the faculty so they know when shells will be dumped.

There are faculty members who have inquired about statistical packages available within D2L, noting that those provided are not very sophisticated. It's very expensive to do a modification so we will continue to talk to D2L about this.

Item 6.G Student Opinion Surveys

BOR staff will continue to talk to the Executive Director and Regents on this issue.

Item 6.H Pre-general Education Holds

VPAAs will continue to talk to campus personnel to note any issues on the timeline for running the reports and issuing the actual hold. As part of these conversations, staff should be asked to suggest strategies that will force students to complete required remedial work as soon as possible.

Item 6.I Technology Fellows Taskforce

Paul provided a list of people serving on the tech fellows committee. He thought the group was getting close to putting together a set of draft guidelines that will be used as we move forward with this program.

The major issue they are working on is tying together funding from the general fund and federal dollars. In addition, the group is discussing how many hours per week the student can or should work. They had a few students that could not meet their requirement and ended up holding it over into the summer session. We are trying to drive that back down to 10 hours a week.

The group is proposing that those in charge of the program do a self assessment each year and see what adjustments may be needed to maintain the effectiveness of the program and of the guidelines. It would maybe serve as a subcommittee to this council. The committee is hoping to have the guidelines for review in the next few weeks.

Paul was asked if the group is revisiting in the amount that the tech fellows are being paid. He responded that they are talking about how the funding was done in the past and how it needs to be done to maintain this as a viable program.

Cecelia did not feel the DSU numbers made sense and was not sure that the reassignment was correct. Paul asked everyone to review the table on page 3. Last year's shuffle was only temporary and not a permanent change. Paul reviewed the number of tech fellows that each campus will have next year.

Sam commented that this is all part of the process this year. Legislators heard that this was a poorly managed, ineffective program so the cuts were made. The objective is that in going forward, there are some processes developed so the students will make a contribution to the universities and have valid learning experiences.

Item 6.J HPER Lab Fees

Paul commented that an earlier conversation by the HPER discipline council took place on what lab fees are being assessed. He then did a quick review on where the fees are at and if there is variation among campuses.

Responses were provided for why the fees are there. The question is whether we want to make these fees the same across the system. The applied science CIP code is being used for some of the lab fees. Is the fee appropriate and does this fit under the applied science CIP?

Chuck commented that some of these courses are very expensive to run. He would like to see some way to recoup some of those expenses.

Sam remarked that the intent of policy was to limit lab fees to the basic and applied sciences. A specific set of CIP codes are identified in policy. When the policy was created, PE courses would not have fallen under the rubric. BAC has been talking about looking at the fee structure for the system but he's not sure where Monte is on that with BAC. He felt that AAC could sit down and talk about the fee process with BAC.

Do we need to have a general discussion on fees? Laurie commented that the problem is that then everyone pays the same fee and it may not cover some of the more expensive courses. Sam agreed.

Sam commented that the institutions charging the fees will not be told to stop, but we will need to discuss this so that it is more consistent across the system. If there institutions who have been charging the fee and the course fees are there for the one who isn't charging the student, we do need to find a middle ground.

Campuses who have not been charging a fee previously cannot start to do so now. Paul added that we need to sort this out first. If we go ahead and start charging fees just because someone else does, Paul didn't feel we will get any help from the BOR.

Discussions on appropriate use of assessing fees will continue. Campuses that are not currently charging a fee for some HPER courses cannot begin to do so at this time.

(NOTE: Lynn forwarded a reference to the Board agenda item that established this fee and the limited number of CIP codes that were included (Agenda Item I-1(c), June 24-25, 1997). A copy of this is attached. Board staff have tracked changes to this policy coming forward and while a small subset of CIP codes have been added, there have been no changes that would allow the fee to be charged for every "lab" course. If there is interest, AAC may discuss this further.)

Item 6.K Ready Adult Additional Recommendations

Paul commented that the academic affairs team has been working through issues with the ready adult program including a proposed integrated studies major, hybrid course expansion, general education and remedial courses, academic calendar, and prior learning assessment. He has finished the COPS item and will forward it along to AAC since there is more narrative included in the item.

Any comments on these issues should be sent to Paul right away since the group will be discussing these issues in length next week.

Cecelia commented that the integrated studies major should also be available at the off-campus centers as opposed to being offered only on campus. Paul thought it would be a new site proposal request but felt AAC may want to discuss that too.

Sam will talk to Paul G. He felt all along that this would be offered similar to the general studies degree. If we want to serve ready adults we need to offer this online or at one of the off campus centers. We need to be able to serve the distance students.

Sam will talk to Paul Gough on the system integrative studies proposal. He was assuming this would be offered similar to the associate degree in general studies. If we want to serve ready adults, we need to be able to offer this online or at one of the off-campus centers. We must be able to serve the distance students.

Sam felt it was important to note that this system can make some strides in prior learning assessment. This issue is getting more play nationally and hopefully we can find ways to develop more practices in a quality fashion.

Item 6.L Inactive Courses

Sam distributed the list of courses not offered for at least three years to AAC a few months ago and a couple institutions have responded. According to AAC guidelines, each VPAA can inactivate a course. This annual report then goes to the BOR each October. We could include these deletions in that curriculum report or we could send them all to the BOR in December as an update to the program productivity review. Sam felt it would be a pretty good sized list of courses.

Item 6.N Dual Credit Update

Sam remarked that when institutions are entering into agreement to offer dual credit courses, they need to make sure they are following the guidelines that we have in place. We may do some spot audits to make sure the guidelines are being followed.

Cecelia commented that DSU was surprised to learn that the teachers in NSU's Rising Scholars program are getting a stipend. NSU is looking at a graduated stipend and will distribute the information.

Sam felt that the stipend was more a symbolic gesture. Cecelia felt the instruction was part of their workload at the high school that they are teaching. Sam responded that we do say

these are university courses so we can more easily establish expectations if a small stipend is offered. Kristi felt that the system will need to be consistent with stipends.

Sam felt that offering professional development opportunities and looking at graduate credit for some of these teachers would be something that we could bring forward to the BOR again for discussion. Laurie suggested that offering a voucher of credit would be better than offering a stipend. Sam will talk to Dr. Warner about this suggestion. It is a way to tie the classroom teacher to your institution.

Sam remarked that Southwest State has yet to achieve NACEP accreditation. We align with MnSCU and Iowa system/state policies now. If Southwest State comes into alignment, then we will honor their credits. Sam did not think they would because they are using it as a recruiting tool for them. The institutions should continue with the current process until you hear from Sam.

At the last BOR meeting, BOR policy was revised to also allow campuses to accept credits offered by those programs accredited by NACEP.

DWU was not offering dual credit courses this year. However, Sam said that credit should be honored for those students who are entering into the public university system and who have DWU credit from a few years ago. But students who have earned their credit this past senior year and are incoming this fall, Sam would like to discuss the situations before credit is given.

Sam will inform AAC right away when he hears if Southwest State aligns with the MnSCU requirements. Institutions should continue with their current process until the update is circulated.

Item 6.O High School Counselors Workshops

Cecelia will contact the DSU admissions director to represent the system at the Mitchell session.

Item 6.P – Institutional Credits – Determination of Academic Status

Sam commented that AAC has seen this issue earlier in the year. In March, MOCC was having discussions on transcript information and were confused on how credits were being identified. The issue of credits in residence fits into this definition for students at the centers.

BOR policy 2:29 defines credits in residence and institutional credits but does not clarify how to apply the credits at the off campus centers. Mary Kay added that the

admissions/records offices agreed to move in this direction. One concern is how to figure out and designate honors for students. Currently staff must figure this manually.

Have any conversations been held on campus regarding UC credits? Cecelia responded that this does not happen very often; operationally the courses count. She has had requests to figure academic honors for some students.

Mary Kay said SDSU had a similar conversation. The student must come forward and ask to see if they have honors designation. However she did not feel that it was equal opportunity.

Sam felt that the first matter is of equity and fairness. If we are going to do this they need to be treated similarly. Second, we cannot do this manually. We have to find out if there is a way to calculate and generate the lists for honors.

Sam will talk to Trudy and Carla to see if they have any ideas to generate a list of honor students so that they do not have to be calculated manually. The system needs to look at this broadly and find a way to address this issue.

AAC concurred that the institutions are not opposed to including general education courses taught at the centers cooperatively as institutional credits.

Item 6.Q CIP Code Updates

Sam commented that a new series of CIPS was approved and a specific set of changes requested by RIS. These are identified on the attachment provided. Some confusion on music courses was clarified.

Do we need to monitor this within the BOR office? For IPEDS reporting in September, the new CIPS must be used. The only changes that are left to do are the institutional requests. The ones that are left are clean up.

Institutions must make their updates for new CIPS by September. The IPEDS reports are done in September. Sam will send an email to Carla to run another list after July 1. The institutions will complete their changes by July 1.

Miscellaneous Items

Review of Academic Calendar

Sam commented that only one academic person volunteered and most of the SAC members agreed to serve on an ad hoc committee. Sam will send the email for volunteers.

July AAC Meeting

Members of the Council should consider if a July meeting is needed.

DRAFT