

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COUNCIL
Thursday, February 27, 2014
Conference Call**

MINUTES

The Academic Affairs Council via conference call on Thursday, February 27, 2014 with the following people participating: BHSU, Rod Custer and Curtis Card; DSU, Judy Dittman; NSU, Tom Hawley; SDSMT, Duane Hrcir and Mike Gunn; SDSU, Laurie Nichols and Mary Kay Helling; USD, Kurt Hackemer and Deborah Dodge; BOR, Sam Gingerich, Paul Turman, Katie Boehnke, and Sydney Bartunek, with Pat Shea, Bob Turner Rick Melmer, Daniel Palmer, Barbara Basel, and Jim Shekelton joining for part of the meeting.

1. Agenda– Additions, Changes, and Approval

A. Praxis Cutoff in Math (Curtis Card)

1. Sam noted that the Education Discipline Council is having discussions with the Department of Education regarding that issue. Rather than the paper/pencil format historically used, this is now delivered in an adaptive, online format. Cut scores for this exam are based on a pilot group but these were not built on the body of evidence that was used to establish the cut scores for the paper/pencil version so there are issues coming up. There are complaints specifically in math where students are having difficulties passing the exams. Sam added that there are discussions with the DOE to start looking at these scores more broadly over the state of South Dakota. The information provided by the DOE and on the Praxis test site does confirm that the same material is being covered; just a different format. Sam noted the cutoff scores are approved by the Board of Education based on a recommendation from the DOE so this is an issue where the Deans of Education of each campus need to be in the loop.

2. Minutes

- A. September 2013
- B. October 2013
- C. November 2013

3. Consent Agenda Items

A. Program Modifications

1. Black Hills State University

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

Existing Program-Substantive Program Modifications

- Environmental Physical Science, Composite (BS) – *change in the total credits of supportive course work and change in the total credits required for the program*

2. Northern State University

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

Program Placement on Inactive Status or Termination

- Technology Proficiency Certificates (see list below of certificates) – *request to terminate the program*

List of Technology Proficiency Certificates to be terminated; all require 12 credits:

- Computer Maintenance and Configuration for E-learning
- Database Management Systems for E-learning Environments
- Digital Imaging for E-learning
- E-learning
- E-learning Course Delivery
- E-learning Information Technology Management
- E-learning Multimedia Design and Production
- E-learning Software Applications
- E-learning Web Application Development
- E-learning Website Administration
- E-learning Website Design and Development
- Instructional Design for E-learning
- Object Oriented Programming for E-learning
- Research in the E-learning Age

3. South Dakota School of Mines and Technology

South Dakota School of Mines and Technology submitted the following program modifications requests. These proposals will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April.

Existing Program-Substantive Program Modifications

- Geology and Geological Engineering (MS) – *create accelerated master's program*
- Paleontology, Accelerated (MS) – *create accelerated master's program*
- Paleontology (MS) – *change in total credits of elective course work and change in the total credits required for the program*

4. South Dakota State University

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

Existing Program-Substantive Program Modifications

- Agricultural Education, Communication and Leadership Major (BS) Agricultural Education Specialization – *change in the total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits of supportive course work and change in the total credits of elective course work*
- Agronomy (BS) – *change in the total credits required within the discipline and change in the total credits of elective course work*
- American Indian Studies (BS) – *change in the total credits of supportive course work and change in total credit of elective course work*
- Animation Certificate – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Architectural Studies (BS) – *change in total credits required within the discipline and total credits of supportive course work*
- Art Education (BA) – *change in additional academic requirements*

- Art Education (BS) – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Art History Certificate – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Athletic Training (BS) – *change in graduation requirements*
- Bachelor's to DNP: Family Nurse Practitioner Specialization – *change in the total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits required for the program, and addition of two new courses*
- Bachelor's to DNP: Neonatal Nurse Practitioner Specialization – *change in the total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits required for the program, and addition of two new courses.*
- Biotechnology (BS) – *change in the total credits required within the discipline and change in total credits of elective course work*
- Ceramics Certificate – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Construction Management (BS) – *change in the total credits required within the discipline and change in total credits of supportive course work*
- Dietetics (BS) – *change in graduation requirements*
- Electrical Engineering (BS) – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Electronics Technology (BS) – *change in the total credits required within the discipline and change in total credits of supportive course work*
- Exercise Science (BS) – *change in the total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits of elective course work, and change in additional academic requirements*
- Graphic Design (BA) – *change in total credits of elective course work and change in additional academic requirements*
- Graphic Design (BS) – *change in total credits of elective course work and change in additional academic requirements*
- Graphic Design Certificate – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Health Education (BS) – *change in graduation requirements*
- Human Sciences – Family and Consumer Sciences Education Specialization (MS) – *change in total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits required for the program, change in program coursework, and change in emphases*
- Human Sciences – Family Financial Planning Specialization (MS) – *change in total credits of elective course work and total credits required for the program*
- Landscape Architecture (BS) – *change in total credits required within the discipline and total credits of supportive course work*
- Nursing – Family Nurse Practitioner Specialization (MS) – *change in total credits required within the discipline and total credits required for the program*
- Nursing (BS) – *change in the total credits required within the discipline and change in total credits of elective course work*
- Nursing –RN Upward Mobility – *change in total credits of supportive course work*
- Nutrition and Food Science (BS) – *change in graduation requirements*
- Painting Certificate – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Pharmaceutical Sciences (BS) – *change in CIP code*
- Pharmaceutical Sciences (PhD) – *change in CIP code*
- Post Master to DNP – *change in the total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits required for the program, and addition of two new courses.*
- Post Master to DNP: Family Nurse Practitioner Specialization – *change in the total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits required for the program, and addition of two new courses.*

- Post Master's Family Nurse Practitioner Certificate – *change in the total credits required within the discipline and change in total credits required for the program*
- Printmaking Certificate – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Recreation Administration Minor – *change in the total credits required within the discipline, change in total credits of elective course work and change in total credits required for the program*
- Sculpture Certificate – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Studio Arts (BA) – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Studio Arts (BS) – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Studio Arts Minor – *change in additional academic requirements*
- Theatre – *change in total credits required within the discipline and change in total credits of elective course work*

5. University of South Dakota

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

Existing Program-Substantive Program Modifications

- Administration (MS) – *change in program name, change in existing specialization and remove Plan A option*
- Basic Biomedical Sciences (MS) – *change in total credits required within the discipline, change in total credit supportive course work and addition of Plan B – Non-thesis master's*
- Basic Biomedical Sciences (PhD) – *addition of Cardiovascular Biology specialization*
- Biological Sciences (PhD) – *change in total credits required in discipline, change in total credits of supportive coursework, change in total credits of elective coursework, change in total credits required for program, and change in existing specialization*
- Biology (MA), (MS) – *change in total credits required in discipline, change in total credits of supportive coursework and change total credits of elective coursework*
- Biomedical Engineering (MS) – *addition of accelerated program option*
- Business Administration (MBA) – *addition of business analytics specialization*
- Civic Leadership Studies Minor – *change in total credits required in discipline and change in total of credits of elective coursework*
- Computer Science (MS) – *addition of specialization*
- Contemporary Media and Journalism (BA), (BS) Strategic Communication Specialization – *change in total credit hours of elective coursework and change in existing specialization*
- Management (BBA) – *change in program name*
- Management (BBA) – *change in course requirements*
- Mental Health Counseling Graduate Certificate – *change in CIP code*
- Political Science (MA) – *change in total credits of elective coursework and addition of specialization*
- Political Science (PhD) – *change in total credits required in discipline and change in total credits of elective coursework*
- Psychology-Human Factors Specialization (PhD) – *change in total credits required in discipline, change in total credits of elective coursework and change in existing specialization*
- School of Education Certification; Combined (BA), (BS) with Secondary Education Certificate – *change in total credits of supporting coursework, change in total credits required for the program and change in certification requirements*

- Secondary Education/Spanish Education (BSEd) – *change in total credits required in the discipline, change in total credits of elective coursework and change in total credits required for program*

B. Course Modifications

1. General Education Revisions

Black Hills State University and South Dakota State University submitted proposals that will move forward to the March COPS and April BOR meetings. These changes would be included in revisions to BOR policy 2:7 and 2:26.

Black Hills State University (Attachment I)

Institutional Graduation Requirements

- Part II Globalization/Global Issues

Add MUS 240-Music Cultures of the World (3) to the set of approved courses in fulfillment of the Global Issues Requirements.

South Dakota State University (Attachment II)

Institutional Graduation Requirements

- Goal 2: Add ENGL 212 World Literature II (3) to the approved list of courses meeting Goal 2.
- Part II Globalization/Global Issues

Add ADV 476 International and Ethnic Advertising (3), ARTH 320 Modern Art and Architecture Survey (3), ENGL 249 Literature of Diverse Cultures (3), FREN 201 Intermediate French I (3), FREN 202 Intermediate French II (3), GE 231 Technology Society and Ethics (3), GER 201 Intermediate German I (3), GER 202 Intermediate German II (3), GLST 101 Introduction to Global Studies (3), MCOM 413 International Media (3), MUS 130 Music Literature and History I (3), NFS 111 Food, People and Environment (3), SOC 453 Industrial Sociology (3), SPAN 201 Intermediate Spanish I (3), and SPAN 202 Intermediate Spanish II (3) to the set of approved courses in fulfillment of the Global Issues Requirement. Remove ARTH 100 Art Appreciation (3), ARTH 211 History of World Art I (3), ARTH 212 History of World Art II (3), BOT 419/419L Plant Ecology and Lab (4?), CSC 303 Ethical and Security Issues in Computing (3), EES 275 Introductions to Environmental Sciences (3), ENGL 211 World Literature (3), FREN 385 Travel and Study Abroad Francophone (3), GEOG 219 Geography of South Dakota (3), GLST 401 Global Studies II (3), MCOM 417 History of Journalism (3), MFL 396 Field Experience (3), MFL 496 Field Experience (3), NRM 110 Environmental Conservation (3), PSYC 482 Travel Studies (3), SE 330 Human Factors and User Interface (3), SOC 350 Race and Ethnic Relations (3), AGECE 479 Agricultural Policy (3), and PSYC 409 History and Systems of Psychology (3) from the set of approved courses in fulfillment of the Global Issues Requirement.

- Part III Writing Intensive Requirement

Add ABE 411 Design Project III (2), AIS 490 Seminar (3), ENGL/SEED 424 7-12 Language Arts Methods (3), GEOG 382 Geographic Research Methods (3), GEOG 421 Qualitative Research Methods in Geography (3), GS 490 Seminar (3), HNS 490 Seminar (3), ID 498 Undergraduate Research Scholarship (3), MCOM 316 Magazine Writing and Editing (3), SOC 350 Race and Ethnic Relations (3), THEA 364 Literature and History II (3), and THEA 364 Literature and History of the Theatre II (3) to the set of approved courses in fulfillment of the Writing Intensive Requirement. Remove ABE 490 Seminar (3), CHEM

494 Internship (3), ECON 433 Public Finance (3), ENGL 410 Mythology and Literature (3), GER 433 German Civilization (3), HO 494 Senior Project I (3), HSC 490 Seminar (3), ID 322 Interior Design Studio III (3), MSCOM 371/371: Advertising Copy and Layout (3), NFS 490 Seminar (3), OM 469 Project Management (3), PS 383-383L Principles of Crop Improvement and Lab (3), PS 390 Seminar (3), RECR 410 Current Issues in Recreation (3), SE 320 Software Requirement and Formal Specifications (3), AGECE 479 Agricultural Policy (3), and PSYC 409 History and Systems of Psychology (3) from the set of approved courses in fulfillment of the Writing Intensive Requirement.

System General Education Requirements

- Goal 4: Add ART 251 (3) Ceramics I to the approved list of courses meeting Goal 4. **(This was HELD for further clarification.)**
- Goal 5: Add MATH 104 Finite Math (3) to the approved list of courses meeting Goal 5.
- Goal 6: Add MICR 231/231L General Microbiology and Lab (4) to the approved list of courses meeting Goal 6.

2. Black Hills State University

Black Hills State University submitted the following 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

- AIS/ENGL 244 American Indians in Film & Social Media

Revised Course Request: Common

- ECON 403 History of Economic Thought
- ECON 433 Public Finance
- ECON 441 International Trade
- ECON 472 Resource & Environmental Economics
- PHIL 416 Contemporary Philosophy

3. Northern State University

Northern State University submitted the following 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

- EAP 046 Oral Communication

Revised Course Request: Common

- PE 788 Master's Research Problem/Project

4. South Dakota School of Mines and Technology

South Dakota School of Mines and Technology submitted the following 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

- BIOL 446 Molecular Cell Biology
- GEOE 782L Fluvial Processes Lab
- GEOL 771/771L Paleobiology/Lab
- GEOL 772 Terrestrial Paleoecology
- GEOL 773 Quantitative Methods in Paleontology
- GEOL 774 Paleoenvironments
- GEOL 775/775L Phylogentic Systematics/Lab
- ME 210 Statics of Mechanisms

Revised Course Request: Common

- BIOL 343/343L Cell and Molecular Biology/Lab

5. South Dakota State University

South Dakota State University submitted the following 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

- ARCH 471 Building Regulation
- AS 720 Advanced Selection of Domestic Animals
- AST 304/304L Electrical Diagnostics for Farm Machinery and Lab
- CA 621 Financial Theory and Research I
- CA 721 Financial Theory and Research II
- CHEM 105 Foundations of Chemistry
- ECON 713 Monetary Theory and Practice – The American Experience
- HNS 380 Professional Development
- HNS 480 Certification Exam Preparation
- HON 203 Reinvigorating Intellectual Culture
- HSC 733 Environmental Health
- HSC 760 Program Evaluation
- HSC 785 Advanced Epidemiology
- LA 232 Computer Applications in Landscapes Architecture II
- LA 423/423L Construction Documentation and Practicum and Lab
- NURS 234 Patient-Centered Care Concepts I
- NURS 235 Clinical Application I
- NURS 258/258L Nursing Principles and Application I: Assessment and Intervention and Lab
- NURS 272 Professional Nursing Concepts I
- NURS 334 Patient-Centered Care Concepts II

- NURS 335 Clinical Application II
- NURS 344 Patient-Centered Care Concepts III
- NURS 345 Clinical Application III
- NURS 358 Nursing Principals and Applications II Interventions Lab
- NURS 360 Research and Evidence-Based Practice
- NURS 372 Professional Nursing Concepts II
- NURS 434 Patient-Centered Care Concepts IV
- NURS 435 Clinical Application IV
- NURS 444/444L Population-Centered Care and Lab
- NURS 472 Professional Nursing Concepts III
- NURS 875 DNP Practicum
- NURS 880 DNP Project
- PS 326 Precision Ag Data Mapping
- PS 424/524 Wheat Production
- PS 425/525 Soybean Production
- PS 426/526 Corn Production
- SOC 245 Energy, Environment, and Society
- SOC 489 Capstone
- UC 280 Peer Mentoring

Revised Course Request: Common

- BOT 419 Plant Ecology
- ECE 228 Guidance with Young Children
- ECE 228L Guidance with Young Children Lab
- EE 316 Signals and Systems I
- EE 320 Electronics I
- ENGL 379 Technical Communication

Revised Course Request: Unique

- HO 434 Local Food Production
- LA 231 Computer Applications in Landscape Architecture I

6. University of South Dakota

The University of South Dakota submitted the following 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

- AHED 770 Technology in Society
- AHED 780 Advanced Instructional Design
- BADM 523 Foundations of Information Systems
- BADM 723 Data Management and Warehousing
- BADM 724 Data Mining for Managers
- BADM 725 Data Mining for Competitive Advantage

- BADM 726 Operational Analytics
- CPHD 620 Foundations of Cardiovascular Sciences
- CPHD 630 Advanced Cardiac Biology
- CPHD 640 Neural Regulations of Cardiovascular Functions
- CPHD 730 Advanced Cardiovascular Pharmacology
- CPHD 740 Protein Quality Control
- DHYG 100 Introduction to the Dental Professions
- LAW 804 Tribal Courts & Tribal Law
- LAW 847 Advanced Legal Writing in Natural Resources Law
- MCOM 101 Media Experience
- MCOM 241 Social Media Marketing
- MCOM 440/540 Event Marketing and Management
- MCOM 462/562 Advanced Digital Imaging
- POLS 708 Theories of the U.S. Congress
- POLS 709 Theories of the American Presidency
- PUBH 710 Epidemiology
- PUBH 720 Public Health Practice
- PUBH 730 Public Health Project
- PUBH 740 Rural Health Policy and Education
- PUBH 750 Social and Behavioral Sciences in Public Health
- SPCM 280 Nonverbal Communication
- SPCM 370 Intergroup Communication

Revised Course Request: Common

- BME 608 Biomedical Engineering
- BME 610 Experimental Design & Data Analysis in Biomedical Engineering
- CHEM 200 Introduction to Research
- CIS 447 Artificial Intelligence
- CIS 484 Database Management Systems
- CIS 491 Independent Study
- CIS 492 Topics
- CIS 494 Internship
- CSC 486/586 Data Mining
- ENGL 583 Advanced Creative Writing
- HIST 464 20th Century Frontier
- MIS 105 Introduction to Computers
- MIS 150 Computer Science I
- MIS 210 Web Authoring
- MIS 250 Computer Science II
- MIS 461 Programming Languages
- MIS 484 Database Management Systems
- MIS 491 Independent Study
- MIS 492 Topics
- MIS 494 Internship

- REL 370 Philosophy of Religion

Authority to Offer an Existing Common Course

- CSC 486/586 Data Mining
- PHYS 733 Experimental Particle Physics
- SOC 402 Social Deviance
- SPCM 340 Oral Interpretation of Literature

4. New Programs

A. New Program Requests

1. Dakota State University

- D.Sc. in Cyber Security

Dakota State University submitted a new program request for a D.Sc. in Cyber Security. The proposal will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. All comments and concerns should be provided to Jay Perry.

2. South Dakota State University

South Dakota State University submitted the following new program requests. These proposals will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. All comments and concerns should be provided to Jay Perry.

- Construction Minor
- Film Studies Minor
- Health Communication Minor
- Events & Facilities Administration Minor
- Engineering for Precision Agriculture Minor
- Precision Agriculture Minor
- Ph.D. in Agricultural, Biosystems and Mechanical Engineering

3. University of South Dakota

- Social Media Marketing Minor

The University of South Dakota submitted a new program request for a Social Media Marketing Minor. The proposal will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. All comments and concerns should be provided to Jay Perry.

4. South Dakota State University & University of South Dakota

- Master in Public Health

South Dakota State University and the University of South Dakota submitted a new program request for a Master in Public Health. The proposal will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. All comments and concerns should be provided to Jay Perry.

5. South Dakota State University & Dakota State University

- Master of Science in Analytics (DSU) & Master of Science in Data Science (SDSU)

South Dakota State University and Dakota State University submitted a new program request for a Master of Science in Analytics (DSU) and a Master of Science in Data Science. The proposal will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. All comments and concerns should be provided to Jay Perry.

B. New Certificate Requests

1. Northern State University – (This request was HELD for further review.)

Northern State University submitted a new certificate request for a German Translation/Entrepreneurship Certificate and it is being held for further review. All comments and concerns should be provided to Sam Gingerich.

2. South Dakota State University

South Dakota State University submitted new certificate requests for an Animal Science Certificate and a Theatre Arts Administration Certificate. These proposals will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. All comments and concerns should be provided to Sam Gingerich.

C. New Site Requests

1. No report

D. Intent to Plan Requests

1. University of South Dakota

- Occupational Therapy Doctorate (OTD)
- Ph.D. in Health Sciences

The University of South Dakota State requests authorization to develop a proposal for an Occupational Therapy Doctorate degree and a Ph.D. in Health Sciences. The proposal will move forward to COPS in March and BOR in April. All comments and concerns should be provided to Sam Gingerich.

5. Policy Revision and Development

A. BOR Policy Revisions

1. Revision to Board Policy 2:10, Limiting Withdrawals

Sam stated that AAC has been discussing a proposed revision to Board Policy 2:10 that would establish a limit on the number of W's a student could have transcribed. As was noted, in recent years several institutions have taken this step to promote student success. The California State University System and postsecondary institutions in Texas have had limits legislated. In other cases, such as the Georgia system, several institutions have established policy limits. During the past couple of years, AAC has discussed this topic a number of times. The Council received a summary of discussions with representatives from these systems. In addition, a policy brief outlining research which shows limiting withdrawals had a positive impact on degree completion was included from Georgia. After discussion, members of the Council were asked to take this back to campus for review. In addition, this was also passed along to SAC and to MOCC for their review. The attached material lays out the recommended change to policy 2:10, establishing a limit of six withdrawals. This draft reflects the common elements found in other policies reviewed. As a note, the limit of six W's is commonly applied in the states referenced above.

Kurt noted USD there were a couple concerns raised by the Continuing Education department and the impact this might have on adult learners and non-traditional students. They are concerned this policy revision would

negatively affect those students more than traditional students. Laurie asked Sam if we could treat this policy as we do with others and allow for a petition or exception for an adult learner that may have a poor past and is trying to turn things around. Sam noted that is the last statement in the proposed policy language stating that the VPAA can waive anything as seen fit. Sam noted this revision would be setting a soft barrier because there are sets of students who accumulate the majority of the W's within the system. These types of students have a high risk of not graduating and are at high risk for significant debt.

Laurie noted a couple common questions at SDSU include: will we look at the date for the last W and will there be an opportunity to look at that date and possibly move it up; and how will be transfer credits work. Sam asked the group if we would look to explore the withdraw date again. Universities should send Sam anything they have regarding that and we will be draft something for the next AAC meeting.

Sam noted that his suggestion would be make this process completely manual – paper form that needs to be signed at any point in the process – either have an advisor or faculty member sign off on each of these. AAC members agreed to move this revision forward to the Board for April review and approval with a Fall 2014 implementation date.

2. Revisions to Board Policy 2:29 – Definitions of Credits and Related Institutional Requirements

Sam stated that as the group is aware this item went to the Board in December as part of the collaborative agreement between SDSU and NSU. There were concerns voiced at Committee A because of the apparent lack of agreement within the system and it was remanded for further consideration. This item is here so that we can better understand the world that we are in. If there are a set of common courses at the foundation of the programs, the operating viewpoint of the Board, students and general public is that completing the requirements is completing the requirements and it doesn't matter too much who is teaching these courses. Sam stated that because South Dakota does have a common catalog of courses and other common requirements (general education/major), there needs to be consideration on how this is going to play out in this world. Discussions need to start in AAC to further clarify how academic policies will play out in our environment. Sam noted that in this item he wanted to point to the fact that most of policies in the system that regulate the certification of student achievement are based on when students had to walk into a classroom and face a faculty in a face-to-face situation in a physical location. Laurie noted that we could start with the policies regarding Minors and get those reviewed and understood and then go from there. Sam noted that we would need to ask what should be the requirements for students to be awarded a degree from a specific campus in that environment. Sam suggested that a rep from every campus should be involved. Mary Kay, Tom and Kurt volunteered to be in the group with Paul to further discuss this item.

Sam will talk with Dr. Warner regarding this and decide if this should go forward to COPS for discussion.

B. Interstate Passport

Sam stated that a few weeks ago, Board staff circulated an announcement from WICHE of a new framework for block transfer of lower division general education. This project, referred to as an Interstate Passport, is based on learning outcomes, not courses and credits. Background can be found in an article from *Inside Higher Ed* at the following link: <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2014/01/09/wiche-transfer-passport-based-proficiency-rather-credits> or on the Passport's website at www.wiche.edu/Passport. The announcement stated that 16 institutions in the four founding states (HI, ND, OR, UT) created the Passport. Other WICHE states can

also apply to participate. There was some modest interest voiced so as a next step, Board staff contacted WICHE staff, soliciting more information about this project.

Pat Shea and Bob Turner, representatives of this project, joined the call and provided an overview of the project while using the PowerPoint as a reference. Bob noted the Passport initiative is a grassroots initiative and the fundamental question is can there not be a common currency to facilitate student transfers between states; a passport that is based on outcomes rather than courses and credits. The need for this was outlined in the pilot passport project that indicates over 300,000 students from WICHE-states transferred across state lines. Bob added that transfer students are known to take longer to get through degrees or certificates which in turn use more classrooms and more money. The goal of the passport is to eliminate unnecessary replication of courses after a student transfers. There were some constraints in developing the passport and five states participated and a decision was made early on that we should focus on specific academic areas which were chosen out of commonality among the institutions that were participating (noted in slide 7). The passport learning outcomes are not something that each participating institution are required to adopt rather the first step in deciding whether or not an institution wants to participate in the passport is to have the faculty in the relevant academic areas look at the passport learning outcomes to determine whether or not they are acceptable and compatible for the institution department learning outcomes. The learning outcomes lead to a set of proficiency criteria that are acceptable to the passport institution. This proficiency criteria developed by faculty are behaviors or attributes that students display to demonstrate proficiency of each of the learning outcomes at the transfer level. It is not expected that every student display every one of the criteria but these are guidelines. Bob restated that the first step if institutions are interested is to have faculty decide whether or not the passport learning outcomes are acceptable at your campus. The second job if the faculty at the passport institutions is to determine how they apply the transfer level proficiency criteria to their students for each of the learning outcomes. Slide 12 provides an example of a passport course block. The question now is how we determine when a student has gained a passport. The registrars at each institution have become important for the passport because they are called upon to identify students that have completed courses in that institutions passport block. Bob noted there is another component to the passport referred to as trust and tracking. The trust part of it deals with the assessments of student learning and that is uniquely defined by each passport institution. Tracking involves passport verification which is chosen by each passport institution as well. The registrar chooses one or more of the following options: adding a comment on the transcript using a standard format; posting a pseudo course on the transcript; or creating an additional record to accompany a transcript.

Sam stated in South Dakota we have already established policies that require similar actions such as system general education requirements and while different institutions may offer different courses that meet those requirements there is an agreement within the state that if a student complete a course that meets the student learning outcomes of the goals set in policy at one of the institutions then all of the institutions recognize the course as fulfilling the requirement. Sam noted that the passport project is now starting to broaden the network; are there ways that we can establish similar arrangements with universities out-of-state to avoid the process of reviewing courses repeatedly. Sam noted that is why he forwarded on information regarding this project and why he encourages the system universities to consider a project like this. Mary Kay noted that as SDSU has been looking at the information on the website and noticed there is a requirement that institutions have a partner 2-year/technical institution while they become a passport member. Bob noted it would not apply to South Dakota because the institutions here have already engaged in learning outcome in various ways. Pat noted that funding for phase 2 is currently being discussed and the goal is work on developing the essential learning outcomes for the lower divisions gen eds as part of the passport.

Laurie asked Sam if South Dakota decided to move forward with this, what would the steps be. Sam noted we could invite Bob to South Dakota to meet with AAC in-person; however if SDSU would like to move forward without a face-to-face meeting then maybe we can charge ahead. Pat talked through the application process noting that institutions simply need to work with faculty ensure the learning outcomes align as well as the proficiency criteria at a transfer level is equivalent and then on the application list the courses used to fill the learning outcomes and then note the assessments used to ensure a student is at a proficient level.

Kurt noted that given the commonality of all the systems learning outcomes and the fact that this could turn into system passport acceptance, is this topic something we would like to embed in our upcoming general education discussions. Sam noted with this type of project there is no such thing as a pilot institution because not only does the system drive all its courses to similar learning outcomes but the transcript is a common transcript so information is flagged about passport on one transcript is on all transcripts. Sam noted his recommendations are that with the passport project there are some core competencies that will be reflected in any program established and the qualitative/quantitative skills are always going to be part of general education so with that he suggests that AAC moves forward with this recognizing that we need to reconsider when we get to the point of general education. Paul noted that he tends to agree and Kurt's comment does present a broader system issue and we will continue this discussion internally. Sam will follow-up with Pat and Bob within the next couple days as there is a couple options for meeting face-to-face at an upcoming AAC meeting on April 2 in Madison. Sam is in full support for SDSU going forward as the pilot institution for this one because the system needs to be aware of these projects that are going on nationwide.

C. Dual Credit Programming

Sam noted that there are a couple issues identified in this item. Work continues to develop processes and procedures, as well as forms and internal guidelines, for the program. Sam noted we are in a silent mode right now because until the appropriation bill is passed and signed there is no program so we are working with the DOE to get this ready with the anticipation that around April 1st there will be some announcements. Sam added that the goal will be to identify a point person on each campus to work with school counselors/students that want to participant in this program. Since it's a dual credit offering it is the Board's intent to require students to go through a counselor/principle at their home school for recommendation to participant in a university course. These students would be able to register for any online general education course the system offers.

Sam stated that secondly, the program the governor is supporting excludes dual-credit courses we've done historically in South Dakota, where each of you work with local high schools to deliver a course taught in the high schools taught by a high school teacher as part of the high school scheduled day. Sam noted that one item that has been discussed with AAC over the last couple years is that we really do need to establish the recognition that these are not high school courses where we are granting credit for a specific course our system offers. If the high school wants students to receive credit for a course, for example ENGL 210, then they would need to use the university syllabus to teach that course to the high school students.

Sam added that the last paragraph in the item points to why this is becoming critical. The Higher Learning Commission is now targeting dual credit offerings as part of their reaccreditation process. As the linked document states, beginning in September 2014 the criteria for accreditation will now include specific reference to Dual Credit offerings -- <http://www.ncahlc.org/Information-for-Institutions/dual-credit.html>. A review of these standards gets quickly to the foundational point. If post-secondary credit is

awarded, these need to clearly be postsecondary courses with appropriate standards offered by qualified faculty to students meeting admissions criteria (able to do college-level work). If this program appears to wander too far from these best practices, the institution could be at risk. This needs to be recognized. Sam noted that the BOR office understands there are high schools we work with that believe their senior-level courses are the same as our entry-level university courses. When having discussions regarding the differences in dual credit, feel free to use the Board office as reference as needed. Laurie asked if there is communication going out to the high school principals right now and Sam noted the DOE is using their connections to let the high schools know this is in play but there is an agreement that until there is an appropriation, there should be no talk of a program.

D. System-level Review of Curricular Proposals

Sam stated that members of AAC are well aware of the review criteria and processes followed at the system level when new programs or new sites are proposed. However, the Council has not had a discussion these past few years concerning the review of the more common course-level proposals or the proposals to modify existing programs. This item is presented to initiate a discussion and the overview considers five different lenses that are used and highlights the types of questions asked as each perspective is applied.

1. Review of course proposals – system-wide considerations. By far, the first and most important consideration is an assessment of the “common/unique course” issue. Since faculty/departments proposing courses rarely have a broad-based understanding of the system’s course catalog, every proposal is assessed using the system’s Course Inventory Report (catalog data base) as the primary tool (see <http://apps.sdbor.edu/RIS-reporting/CourseInventoryOptions.cfm>). This review does include a consideration of similar courses offered under other prefixes; i.e., what’s proposed as a math course (MATH prefix) at one may be a stats course (STAT prefix) at another. There’s also the issue of level. For example, is a 200-level course being proposed when everybody has something similar/identical at the 400-level. Occasionally there are other issues that pop up with pre-req’s and co-req’s as well as with delivery modality. In sum, the first goal is to maintain coherence in the catalog. This is an issue that’s been raised repeatedly at the system level. We may need to designate a system registrar.
2. Review of course proposals – intra-campus considerations. Many of these issues fall to the level of administrivia. This starts with a read of the full-proposal to make sure the proposal “makes sense”. Staff rarely raise issues here because faculty do have control of courses/course-content within the mission/program array authorized by the Board but if something is on the fringe of common sense, questions will be raised. Most commonly, this is triggered if it appears an adjunct faculty is proposing a (required) course be added to the catalog. If the course is proposed as a required course in an existing major, a check occurs to make sure that a corresponding program modification is in the works. This plays out if a course is added to a proscribed set of electives. The course descriptions are read closely to make sure there are no typos since these are published in the data base. CIP codes are reviewed and verified. If the proposal includes variable credit, staff verify that a reasonable rationale is provided.
3. Review of program modifications – system-wide considerations. In many ways, the considerations here are similar to those used for course reviews. If a campus proposes a modification to a program offered by multiple campuses, a comparison is made between all of these. If the proposed change seems to be an attempt to make distinctions with no difference, this will be questioned. Examples here include significantly increasing

requirements to establish rigor or attempts to develop a special niche that meets no external consideration. For the most part, most of those don't matter academically or for student outcomes. The transcript identifies the major, and the cover letter explains why the candidate for a position is exceptionally well-trained. Nobody but us academics believes an emphasis or specialization means anything. Just as with course proposals, too often these programmatic modifications are driven by the belief that similar majors offered on the separate campuses are inherently different. Unfortunately, this view commonly drives processes that lead to fragmentation of the catalog.

4. Review of program modifications – intra-campus considerations. Once again, each proposal is given an editorial read to make sure there are no “mistakes” in the proposal that are going to lead to a Board comment. Common issues flagged here tend to be all over the map. The section outlining the curricular change may not be clear. There may be arithmetic mistakes in the hours required. The narrative may not align with the changes noted in the requirements. These editorial issues commonly cover the water front. In addition, there are a set of substantive questions that come into play and these primarily focus on the rationale for the proposed change. Addressing weaknesses identified through assessments, program reviews, accreditation, etc. should be the driver. Alternatively, making changes to insure programs offered align with (referenced) national standards is also good. This is critical if there is a proposed increase in the number of hours required in the major.
5. Overall review. After completing the detailed review described above, staff typically may do a reflective summary view of the full package, especially if there were a significant number of proposals considered. This review typically asks if the proposals submitted reflect a reasoned/controlled curricular process. At the same time, staff consider if the proposals lie within the existing boundaries of the campuses curriculum or if it appear that faculty may be pushing to move into areas that may not be part of the mission/may not make sense. If there are concerns, these are commonly flagged with the Provost/VPAA's office.

Sam asked Council member to read the item over carefully to ensure that all things are appropriate and agreed upon, as well as circulate it on campus and then the item will be reconsidered at the next AAC meeting.

E. Implementation of Starfish and Student Planner

Sam stated that the system has invested in both Starfish and Student Planner as tools to support efforts promoting student success. As these tools are coming online, it is important that we balance common uses against those uses promoted by the cultures of the separate campuses. Clearly, in cases where integrations or modifications are being considered, common use is expected.

Kurt noted that the implementation has gone well for Starfish and with gearing up for Student Planner. There have been relatively few issues on the technical side. The most productive discussions come from figuring out how to use some of the tools and for what purposes. Starfish and Student Planner provide the ability for advisor comments so there have been discussions about how to use that, as well as what should be collected via Starfish versus WebAdvisor specifically with the Colleague/Datatel integration issues there. Laurie noted that SDSU has a Starfish/Early Alert taskforce on campus that met a couple days ago and they provided a report of the progress thus far. SDSU has only been using Starfish for freshman and sophomore up until now so starting in the Fall 2014 SDSU is going to be going live and using Starfish for everything – all courses, all levels. There is concern on workload with staff clearing 4000-5000 alerts

currently and no additional staff has been hired for this. NSU and SDSM&T are echoing what SDSU has said that the amount of Starfish alerts they are receiving noting that the trade off in workload is significant. Kurt noted that USD noticed with being more aggressive with Starfish there was another uptake in first-semester retention; that's the one thing that changed in the last few years and they are unsure if it is directly linked to Starfish or not. Tom added that NSU conducted a survey of faculty in December regarding Starfish and as mentioned workload was the top negative comment but there were several positive comments including it allowed faculty to get students help before they were out the door; aiding helping retain students.

Paul noted that campuses should begin to ask the questions such as, to what extent are certain types of flags more influential in helping to retain students; which flags are important in responding; and when helping with the first-semester retention rates. Implementation people on campuses should be thinking about what should we do away with while we are adding more into the mix.

Judy asked about other institutions have worked with the success plans and if so, what are doing and how are going about it. Kurt noted at USD they are pretty far along with their success plan in Student Planner and there are limitations there that are different especially than what advisors may be expecting. Kurt added USD's advisors until recent training were thinking of these as out-of-the-box comprehensive four-year plans and they are really not. They are restricted to only the courses where there is one option so there is a required that could be satisfied with multiple courses doesn't necessarily make it in. Kurt stated that at USD there haven't had problems with the program necessarily but more about the education on their part on what the exact start point will be for advisors that they will then use to build a more comprehensive plan. Paul stated that as we made the choice we go with Starfish, what we are finding is people on the advising side wanted the connect product to come with it so increased the potential cost for this. They recently got the integration piece to work in Starfish which makes the connection available to advisors. There are several components to the connect feature and it makes it similar to what is offered with the Student Planner side of things. Paul added that before we encourage faculty to use some of the other Starfish tools, we want to make sure they are using the tools that have the most potential for long-term integration.

Sam noted that the other one that is coming online this Spring is Student Planner. Kurt noted that last year USD went through a process where overhauled all degree plans on paper and that left the foundation for building Student Planner. Kurt added that once they are able to show people how the system works the reaction has been disappointment because it doesn't do absolutely everything. The professional advisors at USD are seeing the system as beneficial although it is not everything they want. The registrars have spent a lot of time and attention looking at the background pieces to the system in order to ensure it is going to work efficiently. Tom noted that the Ellucian staff at NSU a couple weeks ago was very helpful for staff on campus get an idea of what we was available and what we are doing. Sam stated that there will be discussion in the next couple weeks to identify common ground between institutions so if there are any problems those can be fixed and everyone can move forward. Curtis stated he was at an advisor meeting this week and their concerns regarding Student Planner were first, that the students see everyone's classes and the issues that causes and secondly there was concern about the transition and whether people are going to choose to use Student Planner or WebAdvisor and they are not sure how to approach that issue. Sam noted that the second concern has to do with the implementation plan on campus and it gets back to what programs are built in Student Planner and what is the catalog dates because that falls into academic issues too. Paul added that the bigger distinction is that the same features that have always been in WebAdvisor are going to continue with the Student Planner product and what goes away eventually is Degree Audit except for a couple verification things that they want. Sam stated

that as this moves forward if there are any thoughts, comments or concerns to feel free to send them to the Board office so we can help you best implement these important tools.

F. StraighterLine – Limited Acceptance of ACE Recommendations (PT)

Paul stated that during the [November 2013](#) AAC meeting, the council discussed a set of recommendations that would have allowed for credit to be awarded for 24 StraighterLine Courses that aligned with system general education requirements. The council deferred action during that meeting noting a number of concerns related to test proctoring and feedback from a number of the various discipline councils in the system. Sam indicated a willingness to meet with a number of the discipline councils, and while engaged with the English discipline council, representatives noted a significant divergence in StraighterLine marketing efforts than what had been depicted when discussion of this particular option began. Specifically, they pointed to a description for “Professor-Led Courses” which indicated that:

Some students thrive in self-paced courses, but others want professors to provide guidance and explanation. That's why many StraighterLine courses offer a professor-led option that includes professor videos, office hours and exam study guides. All of our professors are passionate about teaching and have considerable experience with the topics they teach. View our [Professor Led Courses](#) to discover the educational benefits of a direct connection between student and professors.

Paul noted that the South Dakota Virtual High School had entered into an agreement with StraighterLine at the beginning of the fall semester and a number of students had enrolled in a variety of these courses. Specifically, the following courses have students who have successfully achieved the required score on the end of course exam.

- Accounting I
- Anatomy and Physiology
- Business Statistics
- College Algebra
- English Composition I
- General Calculus I
- Introduction to Nutrition
- Introduction to Psychology
- Medical Terminology

Judy asked Paul if high schools are aware that DIAL is no longer working with StraighterLine or are high school counselors still telling students that this is an option. Paul noted that from his understanding everyone in South Dakota that had been doing this were going through DIAL and while DIAL is continuing to help students who have already paid or enrolled for the service, they are not enrolling anyone new as of the last three weeks.

G. IT Certificate Recruitment (PT)

Paul stated that during their [April 2013 meeting](#) the Board of Regents approved the creation of an IT Consultant Academy certificate program at USD, along with a contract with the Governor’s Office of Economic Development for delivery of the coursework. The IT Consultant Academy includes a 12 credit

hour, undergraduate certificate and GOED funds the student tuition, fees, and instructional expenses. The tuition arrangement for this program is in keeping with *BOR Policy 2:13, Third Party Requests for Academic Credit*. Specifically, the academy includes three components including:

1. 12 credit hours¹ with a scholarship for full tuition and fees;
2. 3 month paid internship with Eagle Creek Software Services;
3. Job interview with Eagle Creek

While there has been some interest in the program, Eagle Creek and a number of other IT related companies have indicated a desire to grow the number of candidates who have the ability to successfully complete the required training for working with their growing list of clients. To facilitate recruitment efforts a number of options have been explored. In August 2013 the Board of Regents central office arranged a DDN meeting with representatives from all six campuses to discuss how job and career opportunities with IT Companies could be communicated with recent graduates and students graduating with in the next year. During this meeting the IT Certificate program was discussed along with opportunities for companies more effectively recruit South Dakota graduates.

One of the options explored was working to recruit former graduates who might be underemployed in South Dakota based on the data that the Board of Regents matches with the South Dakota Department of Labor and Regulation. Daniel Palmer utilized a methodology for evaluating underemployment on USD graduates. “Underemployed” workers are those falling below the income threshold we use for our income analyses (i.e., federal minimum wage times 35 hours per week, annualized). Specifically, data from their FY2011 cohort were provided to allow for direct marketing efforts. A second option explored during this meeting was an effort to work with a number of other Regental institutions in the co-delivery of the courses for the certificate so that GOED could better leverage students from beyond USD. The day following the meeting, Chuck Staben emailed representatives from AAC to inquire about potential options for expanding this program across the system (see Attachment I). To date, little momentum has been made in this particular direction.

As these discussions were unfolding Paul Turman developed a set of proposals for discussion with GOED to assist with the expansion of student participation from across the Regental system (see Attachment II). Four specific opportunities were explored including: 1) providing the IT Certificate program as a viable opportunity for students enrolled in the General Studies program; 2) direct recruitment of students participating in the Technology Fellow program throughout the Regental system; 3) the creation of a Workforce Scholarship program funded through GOED; and 4) the formation of a Summer Institute that would allow students to complete all four required courses within a 10-12 week period. In an effort to continue to grow the number of viable candidates for the IT Certificate program, GOED is now working with USD to deliver the certificate to any interested students during Summer 2014, and in early January they began recruitment efforts through a variety of economic development offices throughout the state (see Attachment III for recruitment information). Following a meeting between GOED, Eagle Creek representatives, and USD on Tuesday February 18, a model for the summer academy was developed to provide two options for student to select from based on their previous exposure to computer science coursework (see Attachment IV).

¹ The IT Certificate includes a prerequisite of CSC 150 and CSC 250 (or an equivalent), along with CSC 492: Software Engineering for IT Consulting; CSC 492: Advanced Software Engineering for IT Consulting; BADM 492: Database Management Systems; and BADM 492: Project Management for Business Consulting.

Paul added that for the state to be viable in helping to meet the workforce needs of companies like Eagle Creek and the IT industry in general recruitment efforts will need to increase. Additionally, opportunities for engaging other institutions in the delivery of coursework available through the IT Certificate program must be explored to better capture students from institutions around the Regental system.

Kurt noted that when having conversations with Eagle Creek and Mel from GOED one of the concerns that they had when they were looking at the need for people industry wide is that if we have a pool of people that need to get through Computer Science 150 and 250 that, that may not give us a large enough pool. The pool they are looking for doesn't necessarily need that full range of skills; however they are looking for people with a higher level of computer science skills but are equally interested in talking to a larger group of people that has a understanding of those skills but leans more towards project management. Through discussion they asked what if there was a course that took the essential things that the industry needs and packaged it together for a more concentrated format that would meet the specific needs. Kurt stated that from there they looked at Computer Science 123, whose course description would allow for something like this and there would be no need to go through a new course approval process. Eagle Creek and GOED agreed that this option would expand the overall pool in such a way that it would meet a variety of needs. Paul asked the Council members what is your interest in being involved in the delivery or including some of your students into this academy as it is designed now. Laurie noted that SDSU will help anyway they can; there has been discussion about inviting staff up to speak at a computer science classes, as well as connecting them with SDSU's career center or putting them in the union for a couple of days. Paul asked Kurt how tuition sharing would work if other institutions are interested in getting more of their students involved. Kurt stated that USD's priority is making this to work in terms of economic development for the state. Kurt added USD would be happy to help coordinate and organize this process and in regards to the summer academy, they could use some instruction help. BHSU, DSU and NSU noted they would be willing to have a discussion about this topic and being involved.

Paul noted he will follow-up with Council members and ask that each institution identify representatives from campus and at the same time we should include representatives from the University Center.

H. Routine Reports (DP)

1. 2012-2013 Teacher Education Accountability Report

Daniel stated that given their social, cultural, and economic importance, teacher education units are held to a high standard of accountability. South Dakota's schools of education face pressures from state and federal governments, independent accrediting agencies, and the public at large to demonstrate their effectiveness in preparing highly qualified P-12 teachers. Accordingly, the annual *Teacher Education Accountability Report* provides a data-driven snapshot of the five teacher education units in the Regental system with respect to an array of performance measures. Attachment I (*Executive Summary*) reviews the key observations from this year's analysis, while Attachment II (*Full Report*) presents a detailed examination of relevant indicators. Daniel added that SDSU and USD underwent their unit and program reviews during the last year and both did very well in those reviews.

2. In-State Placement of Regental Teacher Placement Report

Daniel noted that this report summarizes the results of an analysis of in-state teacher placement conducted in partnership with the South Dakota Department of Education. The analysis provides a series of tables, figures, and maps that highlight trends in in-state teacher placement. Daniel added that this report includes a fairly narrow definition of what it means to be placed in that it is only looking at only

South Dakota school districts. Figure one shows 4900 graduates over the 10-year period that are being tracked; however, it is important to remember that this is cohort-based analysis so each of the cohorts have had a different amount of time in the job market. Students graduating in FY02 have been in the market for about 10 years, whereas students graduated from FY12 have only been in the market for a year or two. Table 1 shows that 51% of all graduates over the last 10 years have been placed in an in-state school district. Students that came from in-state have a much higher in-state placement percentage than out-of-state students. Table 2 shows a quick summary of the discipline or preparation areas for those who were placed at a high rate. Figure 3 includes the placement after the first year of graduation and Figure 4 displays the attrition of graduates placed in the first year.

Sam would invite AAC members to visit the South Dakota Board of Nursing website because they do a couple reports on the preparation of and placement of nurses in South Dakota. We have been reviewing that in the Board office and there has discussion of about doing something similar for teacher preparation. It is important to start demonstrating for the state how the systems teacher education programs are meeting the needs of the state much like the programs for nursing have been doing for a decade or so.

I. Redesign of Education Leadership Programs

Rick stated that the BUSH Foundation has recognized that the system needs to prepare teachers more effectively but also they are interested in strengthening principle preparation programs and have provided funds to the Board of Regents and the Department of Education to carry out these goals. Rick noted that this working group has elected to work toward a revised program that would be built from a system-wide common core of courses that then allows students to pursue options that allow students to explore the expertise of the separate programs. At this point, a set of working groups have been established. One of these is focusing on curricular design, one on admissions standards and a third is considering how the revised program should integrate theory with practice by aligning field experiences with the classroom. In addition, the group has identified a set of institutions that have undergone similar process and conference calls were held with a set of these. In addition, teams have visited a couple of exemplary programs to develop a more nuanced understanding of the characteristics of these programs.

Rick walked through the white paper that was forwarded to the Council. There was a listening tour in October 2012 where staff from the Board office, representatives from FHI 360 and Jim Parry from the TIE office traveling around the state and met with practicing principles. They received feedback such as that the programs are good but could be better. Many participants noted that the programs could provide more practical application of theory rather than just the theory. In addition, it was stressed that there could be more evidence that students are receiving the information they need to be effective leaders. At that time Rick started working with the Board office and worked with Jim to meet with all the system universities except SDSM&T. There is an organization that BUSH sponsors named FHI360 who provided a couple of consultants and they helped to identify 8 programs in the United States that were determined to be successful for preparing principles in leadership programs. Rick noted he conducted the initial interviews with the universities and narrowed it down to 3 programs that include: the Danforth Leadership Project in Washington, University of Northern Iowa and University of Denver. There were teams of staff that made site visits to UNI and the University of Denver, as well as full review via the phone regarding the Leadership Program at Washington and these reports will be compiled into an item for the Board in April. Rick noted the working group believe they are about a year away from launching a program that would be begin in the Summer of 2015 and would be a cohort-based program that USD, SDSU, and NSU could participate in and would be a 2 year program making the start date Summer 2015 and end date Spring 2017. Rick added that there are a few consistencies over the most successful

program and those include: selecting high-quality students; cohort-based models; and some level of face-to-face involvement.

Sam added that the Ed Leadership programs offered in South Dakota are mostly all online and these have become the default masters degrees for students in education programs that need a master's degree and have no desire in becoming for instance, a principle. The second disconnect is that our online programs are being taken by students all around the country and it is likely that the requirements to be prepared to be a principle in downtown Phoenix are different for students than those in Sioux Falls.

Sam noted that if AAC members haven't had conversations with people involved in this project on their campus, feel free to do so. This item will go to COPS and a summative presentation to the BOR in April.

J. Issues from Human Resources

Barbara noted there has been discussions regarding the definition for a part-time student (especially in the summer) and would like to take this time to look what is noted in policy and strengthen that for consistency across the system. Sam stated that since we offer in a range of options, (4, 6, 8 week terms) there were concerns that we were not defining what it meant to be a full-time or part-time student during any one of those. There are clearing established limits on how many hours a student could take during any one of those sessions and those were being interpreted as definition of full-time student for a period of time which led to the confusion around payroll. Laurie would like to take the 9-hour minimum for graduate students back to their Graduate Deans for further discussion as it is going to cause some concern on campus. Barbara asked that Laurie send in the feedback and it will be included in the item as it moves forward. Kurt and Mike noted they will have discussions regarding the graduate hour minimum as well on their campuses. Sam mentioned that financial aid should be included too. Laurie stated that SDSU will coordinate these discussions.

Barbara noted that the second part of this item involves employment of non-resident. A campus contacted the Board office to determine if there had been changes to the long-standing recommendation that the system/campuses not provide support for any individuals seeking permanent residency. The Board office affirmed that campuses do need to provide required documentation for those non-resident employees seeking continuation of or change in status. However, all costs are the responsibility of the employee since it is the individual who benefits. Sam noted there was a campus that wanted to sponsor an employee and the Board did not approve the request and he wanted to make sure AAC agreed with the decision. There were no comments so the answer will remain as a no.

K. Implementing a Credit by Exam Option for College Algebra – Policies and Guidelines

Sam noted that Dr. Rich Avery, Professor of mathematics at DSU, has developed and will be piloting a competency-based College Algebra course that will be offered in South Dakota. Since the process builds upon a "credit by exam" model, students pursuing this option will be charged this established fee. The materials included with this item provide background. As outlined, students need to work with a high school teacher if they elect to pursue this option. An outline of topics is provided. Students are required to pass (score 80% or higher) four unit exams and a final summative exam. If this is accomplished, the student can have this course transcribed if they enroll at a system campus. The grade would be assigned as "EX." This has been reviewed by the Math Discipline Council and they are in support. As a note, this process aligns with StraighterLine and other similar options. If this develops as a successful option for a certain cohort of students, other disciplines should be challenged to develop options.

L. Proctoring Services and Fees

Sam noted that this item is here for AAC's consideration. The Academic Affairs Council discussed proctoring services and related fees in 2010-2011 (see the following link: http://www.sdbor.edu/services/academics/AAC/documents/11-10AAC_6.G_proctoring_services.pdf and subsequent agendas and minutes). After reviewing this item, the Council agreed that even though common services are provided on the campuses and centers, the decision to charge a fee should be left at the campus level. This issue has once again been raised by students to staff on a campus. Specifically in this case students participating in a cooperative program who are required to complete an online course offered only by the partner institution are being charged a proctoring fee on their home campus. While it is assumed this issue could and should be resolved locally, the issue of proctoring fees is being revisited to make sure everyone is aware of the range of practices in place.

M. Academic Code of Conduct – Implementation of Board Policy 3:4

Sam stated that in December, the system's Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Councils once again spent time discussing implementation of Board Policy 3:4. After the meeting there were some follow up communications by e-mail. As was discussed during the meeting in December, institutions may wish to consider training academic officers to qualify them to serve as hearing officers in cases where students appeal an alleged violation of the institution's academic code of conduct. Curtis asked the question when a student from a home location is taking a course from another location or offered by another location, if there is academic dishonesty then which institution would be responsible for processing it. Sam noted that the institution teaching the course would be responsible.

Tom asked if anyone had been following the complaint system for veterans and if there were any comments regarding it. Tom added that there was some new guidance released stating that if a veteran has a complaint, there has to be someone on campus that the veteran can go to resolve the issue and if not, the veterans can take it to the VA and the VA can suspend any operations. Sam noted that it would be best practice for all students because if students do not know where to go for a complaint there are most likely issues with other students than veterans such as distance education students, etc. Sam said he would suggest all institutions have a clearly identified area on each website to direct students for complaints.

N. Professional Staff Evaluations

Sam noted that in the past few weeks, Board staff members have had discussions with campus reps about questions arising as this year's cycle of faculty evaluations kicked off. It was decided to have a general discussion with the Council to see if there are particular areas that need attention as we move forward.

Sam stated that given the level of these concerns, please put these in a folder on your campus and we will do that same in system office and then in a year or two when we have negotiations and we will bring those out again and address them.

O. Terminal Degree Spreadsheet Update – BHSU and SDSU

Sam noted that Black Hills State University and South Dakota State University submitted revisions to the terminal degree spreadsheet. AAC approved the revisions and these will move forward for COPS and BOR approval.

P. IB Examination Guidelines (PT)

International Baccalaureate credit falls within [Board of Regents Policy 2:5 Transfer of Credit](#) which specifies that “Credit for college level courses granted through nationally recognized examinations such as CLEP, AP, DANTEs, etc., will be evaluated and accepted for transfer if equivalent to Regental courses and the scores are consistent with Regental policies.” Consistent with this policy, SDSU received a request for a number of International Baccalaureate transcripts that have Mathematical Studies Standard Level and Mathematics both Standard Level and Higher Level. Preliminary review of equivalencies associated with these three courses at other institutions have demonstrated that students’ scores at 4 or 5 warrant credit in a series of corresponding courses. To facilitate the review of the equivalencies with existing courses, representatives from the System Assessment Committee were asked to work with institutional faculty/departments that manage this curriculum area and have them review the materials obtained from the IB program. Individual responses from the various campuses have been received; noting no concern with accepting these courses. Based on these recommendations, the systems IB Guidelines have been modified to reflect the addition of the equivalent math courses in our system.

Paul noted that the IB Examination Guidelines are a routine report and this item will move forward for COPS and BOR approval.

Q. Minimally Used Course Prefixes

RIS staff members continue to review the system catalog to facilitate the implementation of Student Planner. As part of this process, Trudy Zalud has identified a set of active prefixes that are used with few courses. A summary list of the prefixes is attached as is a spreadsheet which identifies the full set of courses used for each. The campuses are asked to review these and to consider recommending that use be discontinued.

R. Institutional Accreditation – NSU

Northern State University has been informed by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) that the institution’s initiation and expansion of distance education up to 100% of total degree programs is approved. In addition, the National Association of School of Art and Design (NASAD) Commission on Accreditation voted to grant Membership to Northern State University.

S. Addition to the Small Lab/Class Sections List

The University of South Dakota submitted a request to add DHYG 333L: Radiography Practicum Clinical Laboratory to the list of courses exempt from the 7/10 policy. Justification for this request is included in the attached letter in the item. AAC approved the request and it DHYG 333L will be added to the list.

T. USD Department Name Change

The University of South Dakota has submitted a request seeking authorization to rename the Department of Languages, Linguistics and Philosophy to the Department of Department of Languages and Linguistics. The philosophy program is being moved to the Department of History to take better advantage of the synergies that exist between these programs. AAC approved the request and it will move forward to COPS and BOR for approval.

U. New Prefix Request – SDSU & USD

South Dakota State University submitted a request for authorization to use the EXPL prefix. The proposal was approved and the summary list in the AAC Guidelines will be changed to reflect this.

The University of South Dakota submitted a request for authorization to use the EXPL prefix. The proposal was approved and the summary list in the AAC Guidelines will be changed to reflect this.

V. Cooperative Agreements

1. Black Hills State University

Black Hills State University has submitted a cooperative agreement with Aalen University (Aalen, Germany) to be considered by the Board in April, 2014.

2. South Dakota School of Mines & Technology

South Dakota School of Mines & Technology (SDSM&T) has submitted the following cooperative agreements that will be considered by the Board at the April 2014 meeting.

- Technische Universität, Bergakademie, Freiberg, Saxony, Germany
- Universidad Centroamericana “José Simeón Cañas”, El Salvador

3. South Dakota State University

South Dakota State University (SDSU) has submitted the following cooperative agreements that will be considered by the Board at the April 2014 meeting.

- Sungkyunkwan (2) & International Agreements, (Seoul, Korea) (These are providing an update to already approved agreements)
- Ecole De'Ingenieurs de Purpan, (Toulouse, France) (Provide a note that states what is being paid by students participating under each agreement)

W. Request to Seek Accreditation – SDSU

South Dakota State University requests approval to seek accreditation from the American Society of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (ASBMB) for the BS in Biochemistry. This is a new accrediting effort developed by the Society. Accreditation standards were recently released and a set of institutions have been invited to apply.

Achieving this accreditation will demonstrate that the program offered by SDSU meets the professional standards, rigor and quality of other similar programs nationwide. In addition, this request supports the institutions commitment to pursue accreditation for all programs where this is possible.

X. Implementation of an Intensive ESL Program at SDSU

Laurie noted that South Dakota State University is seeking Board approval to implement an Intensive ESL Program that is designed to prepare students who speak a first language other than English for admittance into a nationally accredited higher education institution in the United States. Laurie added that SDSU has about 550 international students and it is the goal to approach 800-100 students in the

international students' population. In the efforts to revamp the international students program at SDSU, Kathleen Fairfax was hired and it became clear that the campus needed an ESL program because they do bring in graduate students who while they have had TOEFL, their English skills are still marginal. SDSU would like to provide more support to those students through an ESL program as well as help to meet the population range. An ESL Director has been hired and he put together this item proposal to bring up this ESL program that includes 3 levels of beginner, intermediate and advance. Laurie added there will be a flat fee for this program.

Kurt asked that when fees are set for program like this, is the system going to have to worry about uniformity of fee in the future. Sam noted that from his understanding this is a fee for service so SDSU is providing a service and costing it out. If campuses end up in similar places then it could become an issue. The strategy that SDSU is using for the next generation for ESL programs is different than that use by the other institutions that are using more of a credit hour model. If institutions start adapting similar models then we may need to coordinating fees. SDSU is opting towards the full-campus experience. Kurt noted that USD is thinking about moving to a non-credit program similar to the SDSU one. Sam stated his recommendation for campuses would be to recognize fees charged by others but talk about differentiations and make clear the reasons for why the fees are different.

Sam noted there is one other part that is not clear to him. With a couple of institutions (BHSU and NSU) they have gone through their reviews for the ability to issue F1 VISAs and one question that comes up is whether the ESL program offered is licensed by the State. The response thus far has been a letter from the Board office states the programs had been approved by the Board of Regents. Sam asked that campuses have those discussions on campus and then those answers to the questions will determine if the item goes to Committee A as a consent or informational item.

Laurie noted that with the fee for service there is room to have it included only the program or there is the option to roll many more things into to give a full campus experience. Currently SDSU is leaning toward the full campus experience option. Laurie added if campuses are looking at fee for service and uniformity we would need to pay attention to it and spell out every part of the fee.

Y. Articulation Agreements – SDSU

South Dakota State University requested approval for the following set of articulation agreements:

- Students completing the AAS in Mechanical Drafting, Design & Engineering Technology at Alexandria Technical & Community College can apply credit toward the BS in Operations Management at SDSU;
- Students completing the AAS in Mechatronics at Alexandria Technical & Community College can apply credit toward the BS in Operations Management at SDSU;
- Students completing the AS in Agriculture at Ridgewater College can apply credit toward the BS in Agricultural Science at SDSU;
- Students completing the AS in Agricultural Science and Technology at Ridgewater College can apply credit toward the BS in Agricultural Education, Communication, and Leadership – Education Specialization at SDSU;

- Students completing the AAS in Agri-Business or Farm Operation and Management or GPS/GIS Technology for Agriculture at Ridgewater College can apply credit toward the BS in Agricultural Business at SDSU; and
- Students completing the AAS in Dairy Management at Ridgewater College can apply credit toward the BS in Dairy Production at SDSU.

AAC approved the proposed agreements and these will move forward for COPS and BOR approval.

Z. Affordable Care Act

Sam noted that AAC has been discussing this item for over a year now and if you are following this nationally, you will have noticed that the IRS recently did provide some guidelines regarding adjunct faculty and student workers. Sam added that with that guidance, we are at a point now where we can provide some recommendations and those recommendations will be working on moving into guidelines that will be followed within the system solely for the purpose to make sure the system is not in violation of the Affordable Care Act. The recommended application of the guidelines for the system is included below.

Recommended application of the guidelines for Regental Institutions

- 1. Adjunct/Part-time faculty and teaching assistants:** The recommendation is to adopt the method that is reasonable for this purpose would credit an adjunct faculty member of an institution of higher education with **(a)** 2 1/4 hours of service (representing a combination of teaching or classroom time and time performing related tasks such as class preparation and grading of examinations or papers) per week for each hour of teaching or classroom time (in other words, in addition to crediting an hour of service for each hour teaching in the classroom, this method would credit an additional 1 1/4 hours for activities such as class preparation and grading) and, separately, **(b)** an hour of service per week for each additional hour outside of the classroom the faculty member spends performing duties he or she is required to perform (such as required office hours or required attendance at faculty meetings).
- 2. Students & interns:** The recommendation is to adopt the guideline that service performed by students in positions subsidized through the federal work study program or a substantially similar program of a State or political subdivision, internships and externships thereof **do not count as hours of service for section 4980H purposes**. The exemption is limited to these programs, however, and “[a]ll other hours of service for which a student employee ... is paid ... are required to be counted as hours of service for section 4980H purposes.”
- 3. Residential life staff or other student workers with “on-call” schedules:** The recommendation for employees who have on-call hours use a reasonable method for crediting hours of service for which the employee is schedule to work and scheduled for any on-call hours, for which the employee is required to remain on-call on the employer’s premises, or for which the employee’s activities while remaining on-call are subject to substantial restrictions that prevent the employee from using the time effectively for the employee’s own purposes.”
- 4. Graduate Research Assistants, post-doctoral workers and/or other technical research staff:** The rule does not specifically address exemption of graduate research assistants, post-doctoral and/or other technical research staff; as a result institutions will have to manage carefully working hours expectations of these roles to determine whether or not the assistantships qualify as full-time in accordance with the ACA.

There have been various concerns addressed and discussed regarding each group noted above. AAC members should forward all questions and concerns to the Board office and we will work to answer those questions for the benefit of the university.