

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL**  
**February 26, 2013**  
**Conference Call**

**MINUTES**

The Academic Affairs Council met via conference call on Tuesday, February 26, 2013 with the following persons participating: BHSU, Rod Custer and Curtis Card; DSU, Peg O'Brien; NSU, Tom Hawley; SDSMT, Mike Gunn; SDSU, Laurie Nichols and Mary Kay Helling; USD, Chuck Staben, Kurt Hackemer, Laurie Becvar, and Deborah Dodge; BOR, Sam Gingerich, Trudy Zalud, Katie Boehnke, and Sydney Bartunek with Barbara Basel, Daniel Palmer, Paul Turman, Paul Gough, and Monte Kramer joining for part of the meeting.

**1. Agenda- Additions, Changes, and Approval**

- A. Sam noted he would add discussion about the French and German shared majors, the international student fee which currently charged in all terms including summer, and the several meetings coming up this summer including the system conference on academic quality.

**2. Minutes**

- A. November 2012
- B. December 2012
- C. January 2013

The minutes for November 2012 and January 2013 were approved as submitted. Any additional edits or corrections should be sent to Sydney. A summary of the December Retreat will be sent out to the Council as soon as it finalized.

**3. Consent Agenda Items**

- A. Program Modifications
  1. Northern State University

Northern State University has submitted the following program modifications requests. These proposals will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

*Existing Program-Substantive Program Modifications*

- Counseling – Agencies (MSEd) – *change in the distribution of credits, change in total credits required for the program, and change in program name*
- Counseling – School (MSEd) – *change in the distribution of credits and change in total credits required for the program*

Tom clarified that the paperwork may have made these look like two separate programs but the proposal is focusing on is two different specializations. Sam noted that the changes are part of NSU's background work on pursuit to kick up accreditation.

2. South Dakota School of Mines and Technology

South Dakota School of Mines and Technology has submitted a program modification request for a change in the total credits required for the Masters in Civil Engineering program and a change in the program name to Masters in Civil and Environmental Engineering. This proposal will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April

### 3. South Dakota State University

South Dakota State University has submitted the following program modifications requests. These proposals will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

#### *Existing Program-Substantive Program Modifications*

- Biology – *change in total credits required within the discipline and change in existing major*
- Biology – Secondary Education Specialization – *change in total credits required within the discipline and change in existing specialization*
- Graphic Design (BA, BS) – *update of programs required coursework*
- Animation Certificate – *CIP code modification*
- Athletic Training (BS) – *change in distribution of credits*
- Athletic Training (MS) – *change in coursework required for the program and change in the total credits required for the program*
- Aviation Major – *CIP code modification*
- Entrepreneurial Studies (BS) – *change in distribution of credits and change in total credits required for the program*
- General Agriculture (AS) – *update of program name*
- General Agriculture (BS) – *update of program name*
- Global Studies (BA) – *update of programs required coursework*
- Global Studies Minor – *update of programs required coursework*
- Rural Sociology (MS) – *update of program name and codes*
- Rural Sociology – Community Development Specialization (MS) – *update of program name and codes*

#### *Program Placement on Inactive Status/Termination*

- Certificate in Computer Applications

Sam noted there were questions raised about the Entrepreneurial Studies program from both USD and DSU since this program is a common system minor. Sam stated that he is aware that the Entrepreneurial Studies minor was setup with common requirements. He added that when this was completed initially it made sense. Sam noted as this area is going in different directions at each institution, he does not see any issues with institutions starting to shape the minor a little differently as long as there is general recognition that the offering has the same name and is serving the same purpose. There are several programs in the system, such as chemistry, where the requirements do vary subtly from campus to campus so doing this with the Entrepreneurial Studies program is not a problem from his perspective.

Sam noted he would like to hear the institutions thoughts on this. Laurie noted she likes the idea because she believes many of the systems minors go in different directions already based upon the strength of each campus. Laurie also mentioned that SDSU went through a fairly substantive program

modification with their Entrepreneurial Studies major about 2 years ago and the minor was never changed at that time. As a result, now it is really out of sync with our major which is causing some internal issues. Sam asked Tom and Peg about comments made on campus and whether they were made because there was belief this was a common minor or were there concerns being made about the changes themselves. Tom noted that comments were made that this issue was not discussed and there was an understanding the program was system-wide. Tom added that he didn't have any problems with allowing these programs to go in different directions depending on the institutions mission. Peg noted Cecelia would need to comment on this issue.

Sam asked whether institutions would like to have a discussion within the system before the modifications proposed by SDSU to Entrepreneurial Studies minor go forward. Or can this proceed.

Mary Kay noted that from her perspective it seems like the system has already moved in the direction of allowing some differentiations as institutions vary since she found that USD currently has an Entrepreneurial Studies minor for business major and one for non-business majors. Chuck noted that USD does not have any issues with the changes SDSU is proposing. Sam noted there seems to be consensus around that process so that is what will be followed.

#### 4. University of South Dakota

The University of South Dakota has submitted the following program modifications requests. These proposals will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

##### *Existing Program-Substantive Program Modifications*

- Addiction Studies (MA) – *addition of a Co-Occurring specialization*
- Educational Administration, Adult and Higher Education Specialization (EdD) – *change in the distribution of credits*
- French Studies (BA) – *change in the distribution of credits and change in the program name*
- Kinesiology and Sport Science, Sport Management Specialization (MA) – *change in an existing specialization and deletion of 9-credit internship and addition of three 3-credit courses*

Sam stated he would like to flag the proposed change to French Studies for discussion. The proposed modification is to bring the BA in French Studies in line with the other partners in the cooperative program in French. Sam noted that because of direction provided by AAC about a year ago, he knows that the representatives from each campus for the common French program have had a series of meetings with follow-up email communications, although he unaware of how effective that process has been. Sam added that it is his perception that there are still some areas of disconnect with this area.

Laurie stated she compared the curriculum laid out in USD's proposal with SDSU's curriculum and there are only 4 common courses. Sam noted that the real issue is that the requirements are different and, more importantly, the availability of elective options are different. Chuck noted that he believes the representatives for each institution are working on it but it hasn't been very smooth. Tom agreed with Chuck and added that campuses are not happy they have to collaborate but that is the only way they will be able to save those small programs. As an example, this past semester NSU was to offer FREN 350 as part of the collaborative program and there ended being only 2 students from NSU

enrolled and no other students from other institutions participated. Tom noted he concerned whether there is just not very much interest in French or if faculty are simply not working together.

Sam added as a point of clarification, these programs were established as common programs in 1997 and each institutions was told that they would have to figure out how to make these programs work or they would be eliminated. The issue has been left alone because everyone assumed they were working together until the program productivity review a couple years ago when we required affirmation that institutions were actually working together. That is when it was noted that campuses were not working together. The other issue that is in play is that historically German programs worked together but NSU has recently requested that the common German program go online which in turn would potentially require any institution to grant a German degree completed online. Sam noted he decision to bring a common program online cannot be decided by one institution rather all institutions must agree so that is being discussed on campuses as well.

Laurie noted that at SDSU one of the issues that is difficult for the French/German program is the mode of delivery. Laurie mentioned that may be where discussions should start by stating what is not working within the programs rather than just work together. Sam noted that each faculty has their own preferred delivery modality and if this is not being used for delivery then it will be wrong. Rod asked the Council whether each campuses faculty prefer the web to DDN. SDSU and NSU noted their faculty do not like the DDN technology and would prefer face-to-face but if that's not an option then definitely online.

Sam noted the Council is in agreement that those responsible for the offerings at the separate campuses need to work this out. If not, the existing common program will be terminated with a teach out provided for enrolled students. To reinforce this, Sam suggested the grads by program be reviewed (NSU has graduated 2 in French and 2 in German during the past *five* years, SDSU has graduated 9 in French and 20 in German, and USD has graduated 6 in French and 10 in German).

## B. Course Modifications

### 1. Northern State University

Northern State University has submitted the following new course requests. These proposals will move forward to Dr. Warner for review and will be reported in the Interim Actions report for the April BOR meeting.

#### *New Course Requests*

- CGPS 747 Chemical Abuse and Dependency Counseling
- CGPS 748 Behavioral Addictions Counseling
- CGPS 752 Crisis and Disaster Intervention and Wellness

### 2. South Dakota School of Mines and Technology

South Dakota School of Mines and Technology has submitted the following new course requests. These proposals will move forward to Dr. Warner for review and will be reported in the Interim Actions report for the April BOR meeting.

#### *New Course Requests*

- BIOL 110 Introduction to Applied Biological Sciences
- BIOL 444 DNA Structure and Function
- BIOL 478 Microbial Genetics
- BIOL 480 Bioinformatics
- CSC 426/526 Cybersecurity
- EE 456/556/556L Digital Control Systems
- EE 557 Intelligent Control Systems
- MES 678L Micro X-Ray Computed Tomography

3. South Dakota State University

South Dakota State University has submitted the following new course requests and course modification requests. These proposals will move forward to Dr. Warner for review and will be reported in the Interim Actions report for the April BOR meeting.

*New Course Requests*

- AT 441L/541L Techniques I Lab
- AT 443L/543L Techniques III Lab
- AT 462/562 Interventions I
- EHS 109 First Year Seminar
- HSC 452 Interprofessional Issues in Health Care
- MCOM 786 Conducting Professional Research

*Revised Course Requests: Common Courses*

- EE 637 Organic Electronics
- ENGL 379 Technical Communication

*Revised Course Requests: Unique Courses*

- AT 441/541 Techniques I
- AT 442/542 Techniques II
- AT 464/564 Therapeutic Modalities
- AT 474/574 Rehabilitation of Athletic Injuries

*General Education Revisions*

- ARCH 341 Building History III
- EHS 109 First Year Seminar

*Existing Course – Minor Modification Request*

- Latin American Politics (POLS 347) – *change course number to POLS 447 and change the course description*

4. University of South Dakota

The University of South has submitted the following new course requests and course modification requests. These proposals will move forward to Dr. Warner for review and will be reported in the Interim Actions report for the April BOR meeting.

*New Course Requests*

- BADM 444 Contemporary Ethical Leadership
- CPHD 602 Rotations
- ECON 445/545 International Macroeconomics
- HSAD 750 Healthcare Economics: Industry Studies
- HSC 280/280L Essential of Human Anatomy and Physiology/Lab
- HSC 281 Human Disease
- HSC 370 Computerized Medical Records Regulatory Compliance
- KSS 782 New Media & Technology in Sport
- KSS 786 Strategic Sport Communication
- KSS 787 Current Issues in Sport Management
- PHGY 610 Advances in Pediatric Research
- POLS 446/546 INTS 446 Politics of India and Pakistan
- POLS 456/556 INTS 456 International Political Economy
- POLS 457/557 INTS 457 Globalization and Development
- POLS 458/558 INTS 458 Democracy and Authoritarianism
- SURG 806 Surgery Sub-Internship

*Revised Course Requests: Common Courses*

- PHYS 533 Nuclear and Elementary Particle Physics

*Authority to Offer an Existing Common Course Request*

- EPSY 210 Lifespan Development
- POLS 447 Latin American Politics

**4. New Programs**

A. New Program Requests

1. No report

B. New Certificate Requests

1. No report

C. New Site Requests

1. No report

D. Intent to Plan Requests

1. South Dakota School of Mines and Technology and South Dakota State University

South Dakota School of Mines & Technology and South Dakota State University submitted an intent to plan request for Ph.D. programs in civil engineering. This proposal will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. Please provide any comments or concerns to Paul Gough.

Paul Gough noted in the proposal SDSM&T requests degree authority for a Ph.D. in Civil and Environmental Engineering (CEE) and SDSU requests degree authority for a Ph.D. in Civil Engineering (CE). Paul added these proposals are consistent with the Boards goals of expanding graduate programs and supporting research. Laurie noted that this proposal is part of SDSU's

strategic plan to add a couple more PhD programs that have impact in economic development for the state. Mike added that SDSM&T feel like this proposal is something that will be beneficial for the state, students and system.

## **5. Policy Revision and Development**

### **A. BOR Policy Revisions**

#### **1. Revisions to Board Policy 2:10**

Sam stated that this item was discussed at the November 2012 AAC meeting and each Council member was asked to bring the issue back to their institution for discussion. He has received some feedback. Sam noted this proposed change to Board Policy 2:10 would limit the number of withdrawals (W's) a student can be assigned. The goal is to manage the process so that the selected number of students who exhibit poor behavior by registering for 15-18 credits knowing they plan on dropping a course or two, that will be minimized and encourage students to make progress through the curriculum. Daniel did pull some data on this topic that looked at the number to W's that have been assigned overall and at the same point in time, Laurie sent Sam some assessments of W's being assigned by student at SDSU. That data showed principally that 10-15% of students accumulate the W's and those are the students who also struggle to complete their program.

Kurt noted that USD has the concern of transfer students and that this process would need to be completed in an automated version. If it turns out to be a manual process, it would real burden on the Registrars' offices. Sam noted that since several institutions have implemented this change that he is assuming can be automated here as well.

Chuck asked if we have a good sense of whether this will enhance retention and persistent or decrease it as he is still unsure on that. Sam noted that he has had the opportunity to visit with the Provost at Georgia State, who was one of the first institutions to implement this policy and they have direct evidence that it does increase student graduation rates significantly. This process forces freshman and sophomore students to take responsibility for the course they register for.

Sam noted that the data he has seen shows a subset of 10-15% of the students who accumulate the majority of the W's beginning their freshman and sophomore year. That is population this policy targets and for the other 80-90% of the students, this will have absolutely no effect at all. Kurt asked how Sam would envision this playing out for students who start at a Board institution and then either in-system or out-of-system transfer and then come back. Sam noted it is an in-system limit since we cannot hold students responsible to withdrawals from out-of-system institutions. Although, as far as financial aid goes a W is an F and so if a student transfers back with several W's that will affect their financial aid.

Laurie noted she pulled some data in cohort over about 7 years to take to Faculty Senate and the range for SDSU courses for students is 1-20. Most of the previous years have been 1-13, 1-15, 1-19, and 1-20. Laurie added it was interesting to look at the data for SDSU and as Sam noted there are a small percentage of students that are out there with a large number of withdrawals.

Sam noted an issue relating to this was found when looking at math remediation. Occasionally, the system will get data that says is a student drops a course during drop/add to change registration from one math class to another, that change has been counted as a W. Sam noted from his

perspective the system is not looking for data on student activity before the end of the drop/add period but rather what is transcribed.

Kurt asked if we considered adding some specific language regarding students in the system. Sam noted it's possible to look at rolling that into the guidelines.

Laurie mentioned that one comment she receives consistently regarding this proposed policy change is that the system allow W's to go on too late into the semester and maybe we should be looking at shortening the time frame for allowing W's to be made. Sam stated that is an issue that has been discussed over the years and the driver is that everyone says we have to wait until one week after the mid-term grades are distributed. Sam stated if the Council wants as a group we can bring the issue back up.

Tom noted that a comment he has received at NSU is that this seems like a manual tracking system but that has already been addressed. Also a couple of staff members at NSU commented on the categories of withdrawals. Sam noted that issue arises from the idea that within the system apparently do track withdrawals that happen before the end of the add/drop period because we have to track those so we can audit back to a student's billing record. However, those are not withdrawals and should not be transcribed. Sam noted the policy states clearly when a W is a W because there is only one option (which is the W) that is transcribed.

Trudy noted that MOCC has had conversations on these proposed change but will need to have further discussions on automation. Sam noted the Council was in general consensus that the Registrar's should weigh in on this proposed policy change. This item will be brought back to the April AAC meeting with feedback from the MOCC and Registrars.

## **2. Revisions to Board Policy 3:18**

Sam noted that Jim has been working on a series of proposed revisions to Board Policy 3:18 and this process was initiated to assure that the funding decisions made will stand in the event of legal challenges. The Student Federation and SAC have been involved throughout the process and since the item will be moving forward to the Board for consideration, Jim noted that a review by AAC would be helpful. Sam stated that Council members should provide any comments to Jim by Friday, March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013. This item will go forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

### **B. Programs Authorized for Delivery at Centers**

Sam stated each campus provided a three-year history of face-to-face or blended course offerings at each location authorized for delivery at the Centers. Sam noted that each institution seems to be doing what they need to manage the delivery of the curriculum. Regent Jewett voiced his concern at the December Board meeting that campuses are backing away from the responsibility of delivering face-to-face courses at the Centers. Sam noted these reports for the most part help to show that that is not true. This item will go forward to COPS/BOR meetings in May or June.

### **C. Questions Arising During the Integration of Colleague with Pearson's eCollege**

Sam noted that last December, the agreement with Pearson governing the use of MyMathLabs was extended. Two modifications occurred. First, the agreement now offers the MyMathLab/e-text price



to all other courses where a faculty member requires a MyLab/e-text package. Second, it was agreed to enhance the linkage between Pearson's e-College, their platform for the MyLabsPlus delivery, and Colleague to improve the efficiency and capability of the process and to support a direct bill feature.

Sam provided background on the direct bill model implementation. This proposed process aligns with other similar activities where students pay tuition and fees for a given course every term they register. Further, since it is a direct bill model, if access were to be extended beyond a semester, the system would need to establish a set of administrative processes to track enrollment of all students in all sections and to provide access while adjusting bills for the set who continued. In addition, as noted, this agreement does extend beyond MyMathLab and students in other courses will most commonly only use the materials for a single semester. If there's interest in reconsidering this, Pearson will be approached.

Laurie asked whether with the traditionally printed textbooks that have an e-book or MyLab linked to it be included in this contract. Sam noted that they are outside of this and the only thing that is part of this is the courses where faculty members are already requiring e-Text and the associated MyLabs. Laurie asked if Dave was working through the logistical questions that are coming up. Sam stated that his understanding Dave is making sure the integration works first, then they have started having some discussions about the logistics regarding how they are going to flag those faculty members when they submit their text requests to the book stores for those sections that fall under this model.

Chuck noted that presumably the bookstores are not going to like the direct bill model because they will lose revenue they are seeing now. Sam noted that the operational assumption is that the pricing structure will be remarkably the same so that revenue into the institution will be similar. There will still be a markup from Pearson's price of about \$10 that will cover some administrative costs.

Sam noted he has discussed issues brought up with the Math Discipline Council. The first issue is the length of access. Under the new agreement, courses are being set up to allow students access for thirty days after the last date of the semester. This presents an issue when it comes to manual processes because for courses where students can register for multiple semesters it will become difficult when the billing process begins to know which students already have access and who doesn't. Sam noted its simplest if every student in the course gets direct billed and while it's a change for math, it's in line with how this will work in other courses. Sam stated that is the observation on the issue and the primary target here is administrative simplicity.

Sam stated that the other issue is that there is a small group of faculty who have been assigning incompletes to students in remedial math courses and then allowing them to register for the next course in the sequence. However, faculty members have not been awarding incompletes in line with policy but rather to students close to finishing so they don't have to register again. The anecdotal information Sam has received from the Math Discipline Council is that the Math Chairs wish the faculty would stop doing that. The majority of the students assigned an incomplete in remedial math courses and are allowed to register for college algebra, never actually completed the required coursework to have received the incomplete grade in a reasonable timeframe. Therefore, the student is forced to drop college algebra and reenroll in either MATH 095 or MATH 101.

Sam added he gets confused by the idea that incompletes are important because he knows for a fact that at some campuses if a student enrolled in MATH 095 completes the requirements for the course, the student is allowed to/encouraged to start immediately working on college algebra. Sam noted there has been a few cases where students that start the semester in a remedial course actually end up completing college algebra and they get the course transcribed.

To summarize the feedback that has been received, Sam stated that there are concerns about length of access that AAC should consider but there is general agreement that the incomplete argument is hollow. There will be issues on the administrative side that will need to be discussed and also there is a need to communicate with the students on how this is going to play out, whether each student will receive separate notices when they register or if there should be some broader announcements. Sam mentioned there will be pilots for some math sections in Summer 2013 and implementation will begin in the Fall 2013 semester.

Dave noted that there will be links embedded to D2L that will take students to their courses in Pearson. Moving to the direct bill model should help minimize the number of calls that come in regarding issues with accessing course materials. There is one time obligation to click the "I accept" and then the student has access and the cost will be added to the students bill. Sam added if there are math representatives from the other institutions that aren't already involved that would like to join in the discussion, feel free.

#### **D. Articulation between the Regental Institutions and the Technical Institutes**

Sam noted that discussion with Jeff Holcomb about getting the business group together drove this item. Sam stated he plans on passing this forward to Colleen O'Neil to send to the Technical Institutes (TI's) so we can get this process moving along. The TI's will be asked to fill in the boxes on the matrix with the representative(s) they would like listed for each particular interest.

Mary Kay noted that SDSU has been in contact with the TI's that are interested in Agriculture, Electrical Engineering Technology, and Construction Management and that process is complete so they will not need to be contacted again regarding those interests.

Sam noted his operating assumption is that there will be an announcement within the next couple of weeks regarding the push for our system to accept TI entry- level pre-business courses and from there an organizational meeting will be set to further discuss the issue. Sam noted that business covers about a third of the graduates at the TI's and they are going to suggest their courses are like the system's courses. The position of the system campuses is expected to be what it has been historically that that TI's serve a different population with different career goals so while we appreciate their enthusiasm; we disagree with their assessment of the equivalency of the courses. Sam encouraged the Council to think about the question that follows this discussion which is, are there any alternatives that can be considered.

Sam stated there is issue with WDTI who may or may not be interested in continuing to transcript their courses with "T's" so our system knows they are transferable. Mike noted that SDSM&T is still receiving transcripts from WDTI without the T and currently their institution is not accepting those courses. Until there is a publicly agreed upon reaffirmation of processes agreed to, Sam would caution blanket acceptances of courses. Sam clarified that unless a course has a "T" on it then campuses should not accept these courses. If there are a small number of students that are

transferring general education credits from the TI's, Sam noted he does not have a problem requiring those students to go back to WDTI and request the T on the courses. Sam added he would like to see WDTI transcripts from this Spring semester.

This item will go forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

### **E. Grading Policies and Practices for Co-Requisite Remedial Courses**

Sam noted that AAC has been engaged with two different aspects of the system's grading policies that need to be addressed which include the establishment of the grade SP for MATH 095 and grading policies and practices for co-requisite remedial courses.

Sam stated first of all the recommendation for the establishment of the grade SP came from the Math Discipline Council when MATH 095 was developed. With several campuses in the system moving to a self-paced, competency-based approach to remediation in math, it makes more sense to allow students to enroll for a single course (MATH 095) for multiple semesters until mastery is demonstrated. Sam noted the recommendation was circulated and comments were received from MOCC regarding financial aid. As noted the grade SP can only be assigned in remedial courses because it's an alternate for RS and RU and can only be assigned if the student actually makes progress. There are some attributes that are similar to those of an incomplete. In other words, an instructor can assign an incomplete or an SP and then in the future based on the students actions the instructor can change that into a RS or RU, which is then transcribed. Sam noted this came up in discussion with Sharon Kienow and Julie Pier because this would allow financial aid to track all of this for their purposes. Recently, the Registrars have stepped in to raise a series of concerns primarily dealing with the idea of flagging these courses as MATH 095A, 095B, and 095C (or 095-1, 095-2, 005-3) so there is a clear record on the transcript when they look at how many sections there are because it is really going to be financial aid eligibility that is going to be the driver here.

The Council agreed to move forward with the recommendation. Sam noted that this will be a change to Board Policy 2:10 with adding the SP grade while including the materials on the bottom of page two and top of page three in the item, which indicates the SP grade is parallel with an incomplete grade.

The second topic to discuss is the grading policies and practices for co-requisite remedial courses. Sam asked if the Council if they wanted to establish a system policy on this or would they rather leave this to local discretion. Chuck noted that USD is comfortable either way. Sam asked does there need to be a statement in guidelines that says if there is a remedial course that is a co-requisite of a college-level course, then if the student passes the college-level course a grade of RS must be assigned to the remedial course. If this is left alone there is possibility that a student could fail the remedial course and pass the college course. Tom noted that NSU supports the recommendation to use a single grade to be assigned based on work done in the college-level general education course. The rest of the Council agreed to move the recommendation of a single grade forward. Sam noted this will be incorporated into a proposed change to BOR Policy 2:10.

Sam stated he will reduced these recommendations to a policy language change and bring it back to the April 2013 AAC meeting.

**F. Expanding the Use of Technology in Teaching/Learning Process including the Use/Development of E-resources – Faculty Development**

Sam noted that during the December Retreat, AAC discussed the evolving uses of technologies to support the teaching/learning process. The Council agreed that this should be explored at the system level, especially as we recognize the need to support faculty and staff development efforts. To help the system shape this work, Board staff recommend that a small group be commissioned to design a faculty interest and readiness survey to help shape this process. Part of this would include partnering with Pearson, who has the ability to survey the people that are using their MyLabs products, to get some feedback on their experiences in South Dakota and things that can be done to improve it. Some boarder surveys would be included as well to gage our readiness and also to help start thinking about structuring some efforts going forwards. This will lead to discussions that will get groups of faculty working together system-wide to develop materials that can be used to develop and maintain materials that can be used to support common courses or common parts of the curriculum.

Sam stated the suggestion that is being made is getting together a small group to push this forward. Sam added this is separate from the eText initiative because that initiative is focusing specifically on developing the infrastructure to provide students e-texts as an option. This proposal is really about engaging faculty in a broader discussion about the teaching/learning process and different ways that a range of resources can be developed and provided.

Paul noted that we are starting to see the expansion in all these different areas and E-resources ends up being one of the prime opportunities to begin to expand what we are doing in these markets. Through the Mobile Computing Survey, it shows that faculty have embraced more E-resources and are encouraging students to bring laptops to class and by default is improving students' performance in those courses.

Sam added that it is the belief that this is an area where rapid change is coming and our faculty should be engaged. Since we live and work in a world with a common catalog of courses, with established Centers, and with a significant number of students served remotely, there is danger if individual campuses start to do things differently. Sam believes it is important to be doing these things collectively. The state of South Dakota will be better served if we maintain some connectivity.

Paul noted there are a number of things that the system needs to gage on where faculty on these uses of technology and where we can further grow their usage if we provide the right type of professional development. Sam will follow-up with institutions to get recommendations for representatives of a small group.

**G. Review of Programs not Meeting Productivity Standards**

Sam noted that last year the Board established the requirement that an annual review be done of the graduation rates from all majors. This item is to help kickoff that process this year. There is a summary report attached which includes all graduates by major for the system and any programs that haven't terminated/deactivated or recently implemented will be removed.

Sam noted the institutions can take a look at their individual reports and identify those programs that should be removed because of termination, deactivation, or newly implemented. For all intense

purposes, the report should really look at 10 years after the program was created to begin the count. Sam mentioned as the Council may recall, this process was pretty manual last year and this year it will probably be manual again but the goal is to keep trying to shape this process so when a list of programs is generated the review can happen more quickly.

Sam noted if anyone has thoughts about the process, the way the data is being presented or any ideas on how to streamline this process let him know. This item will go forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

## **H. Implementation of the Common Core State Standards and the Smarter Balanced Assessment System**

Sam noted this item is written out as an updated history of what has been happening with the implementation of the Common Core State Standards and the Smarter Balanced Assessment System. Robert Stein will be joining AAC for the April meeting in Aberdeen. As part of his contract he is required to visit each state twice annually so this will be his second visit in South Dakota.

In addition, a group of representatives met at a College and Career Readiness Partnership (CCRP) convening on February 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> in Phoenix, AZ. This Partnership is helping member states identify what is needed for successful utilization of the CCSS and common assessments of student achievement, both to improve college readiness in PK-12 and to make effective use of these assessments for placement and other decisions in postsecondary education. Once state teams have completed this preliminary scan, the Partnership then helps states develop and implement strategies that will lead to successful implementation. Sam noted that one thing that we need to think about going forward is establishing a more formal structure so people can begin to pay more attention to this because as noted beginning in the Fall of 2015 students who will be registering will have the Smarter Balanced scores that will be part of the information that they bring to campuses. Sam added since the SB assessment will be required for juniors in the 2014-2015 year, it could be the only evidence we have about college readiness. Staff in Admissions, in placement and in math or composition dealing with remediation will all need to know about these items.

Sam asked Tom to share any observations he had since he attended the convening in Phoenix as well. Tom noted he thought it was a very good meeting and we need to continue to have good dialogue between K-12 and higher education because there is certainly is becoming more and more emphasis on a vertical alignment.

Chuck asked how this will affect admissions. Sam noted that everyone will need to recognize and know what the Smarter Balanced scores mean when students start showing up with them. Even if a student has scores that shows them as ready to do college level work on math or in ELA, this does not mean that they are automatically admitted. In other words, we will accept the assurance that they are ready to do college level work in these disciplines but will need to be clear that the test doesn't say they're ready for college. Sam noted this assessment is another data point that campuses can use to place students into entry-level math and ELA courses. He stated there needs to be discussion on the validity of the assessment among other issues but the system takes all evidence available into account in the Admission process.

Sam stated the other place this assessment is playing out is teacher education and teacher education program are well aware of the implementation of common core state standards and other related assessments but the system will need to graduate teachers ready to work in this environment.

Laurie asked Sam about the timeline of the pilots occurring on campuses. Sam noted there is a pilot this spring happening with sets of high schools juniors in the 23 governing states where about 50% of high school juniors are taking the assessment. Since this a computer-based assessment, those scores will be immediately available allowing a few incoming students in Fall 2014 to have scores. Next spring the pilot will involve a larger group of high school juniors so in the Fall of 2015 there will be scores for more students. Since the assessment will be a common requirement in the spring of 2015, by the Fall of 2016 the system will need to know what we are doing with these assessments.

Tom noted that Sam may want to mention that the “failure” rates for these exams are expected to be much higher than the current exams. Sam stated that most of the states’ high stakes No Child Left Behind testing junior year align fairly well with the ACT so there is some idea what the proficient and not proficient ratios are. The new assessments are going to align more closely with the NAPE, which is more of an international measure. Sam noted a couple states, Kentucky and Tennessee, have recently re-aligned their junior year high stakes testing with the NAPE rather than with the ACT or SAT and basically what they have found is the number of students who are proficient or highly proficient has dropped by about 30-40%. There is reason to believe the same thing will happen nationwide. Sam added another measure that is starting to be talked about is a communications campaign to involve political and business leaders so that when these assessments come on line, there will be a commitment to continue.

Sam will continue to copy AAC in on the communications that are being sent out to the education, math, English, and Smarter Balanced groups. Sam asked that Council members start passing these along to Deans on campus to raise visibility.

This item will go forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

### **I. Lumina Foundation – Degree Qualifications Profile**

Sam noted this item has been discussed by AAC a few times over the years. Since then this project is evolving into a free standing initiative from the Bologna process in Europe and Lumina Foundation supported “tuning” work which is underway in several states. In some ways this relates to the AAC&U’s LEAP process but what these frameworks point to is the different strategies that can be used to support/promote the different ways of assessing programs offered.

Sam mentioned the system conference is on quality and this framework will be presented as background information for an initiative that the system might want to join. Sam asked whether the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) has been discussed on campuses in any way. Laurie noted that when this first popped up in 2010 SDSU bought several copies of the book and distributed it broadly all over campuses to the departments and colleges. Laurie thought that in program reviews and things of that nature it would be a good source for faculty and staff. Other institutions hadn’t discussed this.

Sam asked whether LEAP had been used locally at institutions. Chuck noted that USD used LEAP in some of their graduation requirement assessment activities but this hasn’t been considered at the

department level. Tom noted that NSU does not have graduation institutional outcomes so as a result there has been discussion with the Deans to use Lumina as a starting point especially regarding the detailed rubric describing the levels of learning that should be achieved at each degree level, although this hasn't took hold on campus.

Sam noted this item is framed to be a discussion at the system conference but one theme he is going to continue to push is the belief that higher education is transitioning from their historical model where quality was assured because there was a group of faculty who designed and delivered a specific set of courses and assessed every student in every course throughout their program of study. In the world we live in now, where 30% of students are transferring in more than 50% of the requirements for the degree and 20-25% of students are transferring in more than one semesters worth of credits, the idea the system can assure quality of all graduates because the courses includes everything we designed into the curriculum, that argument gets to be a little softer. Sam noted that the system needs to start thinking about other ways to start determining the quality of the product and some of these frameworks can be helpful. Sam added that is why this item is here and the system might want to think about using LEAP too because it is a boarder way of looking at what we do and it can move faculty to the discussions of the outcomes rather than the inputs or process.

#### **J. Inactive International Exchange/Partnership Agreements**

Sam noted that each campus submitted a summary with the existing agreements that are inactive and can be terminated. Sam added it is his intent to hold these reports for the June Board meeting and include them in the Annual Report on International Agreement Activities item.

#### **K. Placement into Math Courses**

Sam stated that the system's faculty, Discipline Councils and Assessment Committee as well as the Academic Affairs Council have had several discussions about placement over the years. Mirroring changes occurring nationally, South Dakota is moving from binding placement based on single cut scores to placement systems that use multiple measures.

Sam added that during the March 2011 meeting AAC agreed that the placement process is solely binding for those students in cases where remediation is required. If a student is ready to college level work, institutions have the flexibility to use a student's record as well as any assessments they may require to make that placement. Sam noted that last year, Accuplacer was added as another assessment that can be used for placement in math or in composition. As this assessment is coming online questions are being asked about "scores" that would permit enrollment in math courses above MATH 104. Specifically, statements have been made that the placement guidelines make it appear that any student who meets the minimal standard established for enrollment in an entry level college level math course can enroll for any college level math course. However, as stated in the guidelines, institutions do have leeway here and it is assumed that this is being exercised. Rather than reestablishing binding placement for math courses through calculus, staff recommend that campuses continue to exercise the flexibility allowed.

Sam noted that specifically this item came up because of the pilot project that is running with the high schools and the concerns that students within that course are going to take the Accuplacer again, be told they are ready for college level work, show up on campus and say okay I'm ready for

CALC III. Sam mentioned if institutions are hearing the concerns on campuses this is an affirmation those faculties on your campuses have authority to do what you will.

#### **L. StraighterLine Course Review**

Paul Turman noted that AAC has been included in a series of discussions about the use of course materials from StraighterLine and many of the Council members sat in on the recent StraighterLine conference call. Paul stated there was a pretty decent review of the types of materials that are available and there was some good representation from the system assessment committee, which are the individuals who typically have gone through the processes on campuses to begin to review these types of materials as we've dealt options such as CLEP, AP, and any other type of accrediting board examination products that tend to be out there. Paul noted there was good discussion on the call with the two reps from StraighterLine and a number of questions were raised that related to funding and how our business model continues to function in the way that it currently does knowing that we will begin to see some growth. One thing the representatives noted is that you seldom see StraighterLine taking advantage of students who typically want those face-to-face courses and that often you will see more coverage in the online sections for institutions that a good market in that area.

Paul stated the issue that needs to be discussed with AAC is whether or not there is interest in moving forward in dialogue with StraighterLine and if so, the next step would include beginning a process of exploring and reviewing the courses that are available. ACE has made credit recommendations and the system has taken those recommendations and then aligned those with courses in the different disciplines. Paul noted that StraighterLine has a very robust suite of courses and to do a comprehensive review of all of those courses might take more time than we are interested in doing. Paul suggested starting with a smaller group of courses that would include those that we see our students most likely pursuing.

Chuck said that these courses are fine and the problem is the revenue. USD makes about 4.5 to 5million dollars a year in the online versions of courses that StraighterLine offers and these courses tend to be among USD's higher margin courses especially in the face-to-face world and also in the online world. Chuck noted that USD believes if they were to do a good assessment of the courses, it's most likely they would find the courses are fine. Paul noted he believes this going to become an integral piece of the way higher education is going to look in the near future and if we have gone ten years and been able to keep them completely out of the majority of our courses then at some point we are going to have a business model that isn't going to function very well. Paul added currently the system is working with the DOE on remedial course which generates that same amount for institutions and the goal is to at some point be out of the remedial course business but he doesn't believe it hinders the system from taking more proactive measures to find ways to make sure that students are better prepared when they enter the system. Chuck stated that part of it depends on what steps we're anticipating taking at this time but if we are reviewing these courses to look at course-by-course equivalency at the system level, he believes there could be some serve financial implications to the system as well as individual universities, like USD. Sam noted that these are self-paced competency-based courses and there is none of that encouragement that we even provide for online courses. From his perspective, this is analogous to the review of CLEP.

Laurie noted she is worried about what this could do long-term as the funding model for higher ed is changing rather quickly and online is one of SDSU's main focuses right now. Laurie added she is



worried about giving up revenue and maybe this won't affect many students but it is just very unclear at this time. Sam noted there are hosts of issues like this.

Paul reinforced what the reps from StraighterLine said. Students enrolled on campuses do not pursue this option. Others may. He went on to mention that other topics discussed on the call included what types of financial models StraighterLine is willing to negotiate and work with for particular institutions. Similar to the types of things we do with Pearson, assuming we were able to put in a relatively large deal, there may be an ability to add in components into the system for management. Paul noted the question is do we begin to have those conversations with StraighterLine to see how we can make these opportunities balance themselves out to some extent.

Sam noted this item will go forward to COPS in March and BOR in April for discussion.

### **M. IB Examination Guidelines**

Paul noted there is a request from SDSU to add the Economics into the set of IB Examinations that the system currently recognizes. From the responses received from the institutions, it was noted there are no significant issues with awarding credit for ECON 201: Principles of Microeconomics and ECON 202: Principles of Macroeconomics for students who score 5 or above on the Higher Level exams. Based on the review of the curriculum from the faculty in the business area, they felt these seem to align pretty well. Paul noted that since there are no significant concerns from AAC, the modifications will be made to the IB Guidelines.

Paul mentioned there are a variety of others undergoing revisions. Assuming AAC feel this is the best way to approach these by getting faculty in those disciplines to review each, if there are no concerns, those requests will be moved forward as well.

### **N. Reports: Routine and Ad hoc (DP)**

#### **1. 2012 Mobile Computing Survey Report**

Daniel noted that a few years ago the Board approved a new student technology fee that was implemented to assist campuses in developing new campus infrastructure for technology and for technological integration. As part of the policy it was mandated that a system-wide survey be done every year to monitor the implementation of the initiative. Daniel added this is the third time the survey has been run and will likely be the last year as every year conditions continue to be improving on the campus. The survey will be replaced with an alternative monitoring approach.

Daniel highlighted the key observations within the survey data. First, the rate at which students bring computers to campus appears to be expanding very rapidly over this three year period. In 2010 about 40% of students said they took a computer to class regularly and in just a couple of years that number rose to about 55% of students. Second, students and faculty both tend to rate technology integration and technologic expansion as being a good thing on campuses. Students and faculty are seeing classroom and mobile computing technology being used effectively and also enabling new classroom strategies. Third, tables 8, 9, and 10 give a good indication on where respondents are at on a host of different campus instructional technologies. Daniel noted that one thing the system needs to continue thinking about is that students continue to issue some slightly negative viewpoints with regards to classroom desktops and classroom table top space for laptops and also classroom access to outlets. Those are the two critical issues when students are bringing in laptops and students are not seeing a lot of progress in those areas. Daniel added that overall students and faculty see

classroom technology as something that is important and over 90% of both of those populations suggested that classroom technology is being used at the correct amount right now or should be used more.

Sam noted this item will go forward to COPS/BOR meetings in May or June.

## **2. 2011-2012 Teacher Education Accountability Report**

Daniel noted the *Teacher Education Accountability Report* is completed every year to provide a data-driven snapshot of the five teach education units in the Regental system. A big part of the report is getting updates on accreditation and state approval outcomes. Within the last year (AY 2011-12), none of the campuses went through a unit level or program level review so there is not a lot of information to report. Daniel added that the total number of education graduates went from about 500 to 560, which is a fairly large jump from looking at the past trends. Also, the PRAXIS pass rate begin around 97% which is typically although it dropped a bit because there was new PLT exams that came out in the last year that a couple campuses struggled with a little. They are aware where their weaknesses were and are working on improving them.

Sam noted this item will go forward to COPS/BOR meetings in May or June.

## **3. WICHE Projections of High School Graduates**

Daniel noted that the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) recently updated their comprehensive estimates of national and state-level projections of high school graduates. This item provides a targeted analysis of these projections, focusing mainly on state and regional trends. Daniel stated the message that comes in this report this year, which looks at high graduates through the year of 2027-28, is that the student pipeline is really going to be changing nationally and that we need to be sensitive about what comes up from those changes. Daniel noted Figure 1 on page 3 shows the historical trend line for high school graduates in the United States and over the last decade there has been a very steady increase of high school graduates. This has been the reality we have all been living. These projections are saying that over the next several years there is going to be a decline in the number high school graduates, then it will level for a long period followed by a slight raise with a sharp decline after that. The regional trends mirror the national trends for the most part even though there are some variations. This is likely to lead to more competition nationally for high school grads and an increasing focus on adult students. Daniel added that as shown in Figure 3, WICHE is estimating that by 2027, 48.2% of all high school grads in the country are going to be from a minority group so that is quite a change from 10-20 years ago and even from 2009 when that figure was only about 38%. With the national trends in mind, Figure 4 shows what the projections look like for South Dakota. As it turns out South Dakota is in contrast with national trends and is expected to experience moderate long-term growth in high school graduate production with a rapid increase between years 2018-2028. The last thing Daniel wanted to point is that Figures 7 and 8 shows what this would like from a regional perspective. Iowa and Minnesota are relatively flat over this period and a portion of the students who come to our system from outside of South Dakota are coming from one of those two states.

Sam noted that if you look at the changes, for example the numbers of American Indians graduating from high school in South Dakota, those projections are based on that fact that we will continue to graduate about 40% of the American Indian students that enter high school. This is another issue

buried within this report that he believes the system should be aware of as policy decisions are made and programs are implemented. Sam noted this item will go forward to COPS/BOR meetings in May or June.

O. Issues from HR (BB)

**1. Implementation of the Affordable Care Act**

Barbara noted that this item asks for AAC's guidance in defining a reasonable method for determining faculty employment status going forward. Tom noted through discussion with Susan Bostian (HR Director), NSU has decided to limit the number of course that adjuncts can teach to no more than 6 teaching credits per semester (or less than 30 hours per week). Sam noted if an institution uses credit hours to establish limits, there are issues that need to be addressed, For example, how will faculty who are handling student teachers be dealt with. There are two models that are being discussed that include the credit hour model and the FTE model and both have faults and both help in ways. Sam recommended that in the future as faculty/staff are hired that the assignment and work expectations be explicitly written down. Sam noted saying "no more than" is fine but asked how this strategy is going to be administered. For example, if faculty teach online courses, they may be able to prove they are working over 30 hours per week by showing the emails that they send. If there is no statement that notes those hours are outside of the expectations/limits then the institution will be liable for health insurance.

Jim noted it seems framing an appointment in terms of a percent of an FTE would make more sense. This would be consistent with our unit definition when it states the bargaining unit is comprised of all full-time and regular part-time faculty members. These employees, regular part-time faculty members, are defined as being 50% or more of the standard load for one term. What the system determines to be a half-time or three-quarters appointment may be a better measure and easier to administer in the long term than trying to narrow it down to the number of credit hours for courses since there is such a variety in what faculty members are expected to do.

Sam noted that equivalency of credit hours in time really only works directly for about half of the instruction that is offered because there are labs, activity courses, studio courses, internships, research, etc. that need to be accounted for. Sam added it begins with being very clear when the offer is being made to the potential employee. Sam stated that the system needs to be compliant by January 1, 2014 so that means when contracts are awarded this Fall 2013, institutions needs to be aware of this.

Jim noted that we need to keep in mind when we are trying to describe expectations that we hire faculty with an eye towards certain outcomes as we expect them to teach a certain number of courses or to conduct research and we 'grade' them based on how well they achieve the outcomes but we do not try to regulate how faculty organize their days and working hours to achieve those outcomes. Approaching contract language from that perspective, Jim stated he believes it's useful to try to frame things by objective so campuses are not slipping into the lexicon of works and days.

Sam stated that in addition to Barbara's work on this item within the state, Jim is engaged in the conversations that are happening nationally. Jim noted that the conversations to date have been interesting as there are two views which include the standard measurement for faculty efforts is the 3 hours of work per credit hour taught and, therefore, so long as an individual is teaching 9 credit hours or less, the person should be okay. There are a cluster of institutions heading that direction

and some of them are being very determined and dismissive of any other views. Jim added the problem is that these tend to be teaching institutions rather than research institutions, they tend to be traditional liberal arts institutions rather than community or technical institutions. These institutions ignore the complexity of our industry simply because the lowest common denominator may turn out to be the community college denominator when you look at the number of faculty employed, it is almost 50/50. Jim noted he believes the system needs to be careful in defining a credit hour as a measure and we should know more by next month as far as where the industry consensus is going to fall.

Jim stated that buried within this item is the issue on whether or not we continue as we do currently to make the determination of benefit eligibility term by term so that someone that is offered a three-quarters time load for the Fall term will get benefits during that term or whether we try to encourage Barbara to look at a larger look-back period since this Act requires a one-year window.

Sam noted this item will come back to April 2013 AAC for further discussion where we will add the topic of where students in general fall into all of this.

## **2. Changes for Faculty Contract/Cover Letters**

Barbara noted that at the May 2012 COPS meeting it was requested that the HR Directors explore an alternative method of providing the Oklahoma Salary Survey market comparison information to faculty members for their discipline and rank. While the CIP Code is part of the contract, the Oklahoma salary data is currently included in the cover letter in order to comply with the Interim Terms and Conditions. Barbara stated there was some concern for all campuses that this is not very uplifting for many employees so the HR Directors were asked to look at other solutions to put this information somewhere else besides the cover letter. The Human Resource Directors are in the process of working with RIS to develop a secure website that individual faculty members would be able to access the average Oklahoma salary specific to their discipline. The purposed solution would require faculty to log on to the Board of Regents' Onboarding website. Barbara noted she would like to receive the Council's opinion on the proposed option, as well as, discuss communication strategies that will support this modified approach. There are three attachments for AAC's viewing which include a copy of the current cover letter, a copy of the contract, and an example of what the information would look like on the website.

Sam noted that this information cannot be made in a public accessible website because it's published by Oklahoma and it's a protected resource. Peg asked why we couldn't put the Oklahoma Salary Survey market comparison information in the contract. Barbara noted that putting it in the contract is an option but she is looking for direction and advice from the Council on regards to what the institutions faculty would prefer the most. Peg stated since putting it in the letter is not an option and it takes so many steps to get to the information on the website then she doesn't see any issues with putting it in the contract. Chuck added he would be in favor of adding the information to the contract versus online.

Laurie asked what prompted the President to bring this issue up. Barbara noted that in years prior when the system had salary policy it was an issue. However, this last year was the first year when faculty had a change in the salary and there were letters sent out. Some presidents reported that this issue has reached a tipping point where frustration was so high that a solution needed to be made to get the information out of the cover letter. Laurie asked Chuck if he was receiving complaints about

this. Chuck noted there were several very visible cases on campus and such that two prominent people left the university. Mike added that SDSM&T had a lot of those similar problems on campus with faculty especially with some of technical aspects that are not comparable to Oklahoma.

Barbara noted that she could include a line in the contract that states this information. Chuck stated he believes this would an improvement to having it right in the cover letter and if it is on a website faculty may think that the information is being hidden away. BHSU, DSU, SDSM&T, SDSU, and USD all agree to recommend putting the information on the contract. NSU would like to see the information on the website. These recommendations will move forward for discussion at the March COPS meeting.

**P. New Prefix Request – SDSU**

South Dakota State University submitted a request for authorization to create a new prefix and department: COM Construction and Operations Management. The proposal was approved for use.

**Q. Cooperative Agreements**

1. SDSU

South Dakota State University (SDSU) submitted a request to establish a cooperative agreement with Southeast Community College (SCC) that will be considered by the Board at the April 2013 meeting.

2. DSU, NSU, SDSU, & USD

Dakota State University (DSU), Northern State University (NSU), South Dakota State University (SDSU), and the University of South Dakota (USD) submitted a request to establish a cooperative agreement with Kilian Community College (KCC) that will be considered by the Board at the April 2013 meeting.

3. USD

The University of South Dakota submitted a request to establish a cooperative agreement with Lake Area Technical Institute (LATI) that will be considered by the Board at the April 2013 meeting.