

**SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Full Board**

**AGENDA ITEM: M**

**DATE: June 26, 2009**

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBJECT: Graduate Assistant Self-Support Tuition Rate**

In April, the Board approved the FY10 tuition and fee rates and the self-support tuition structure proposal. The self-support proposal included a number of significant changes:

- All Internet courses taken by on-campus students will be at the self-support rate
- All off-campus courses will be assessed a HEFF component
- The on-campus graduate non-resident rate was reduced
- Standardized self-support rates

The recommendation to move all Internet courses to self-support came from the Tuition Review Committee made up of campus and system office representatives. The recommendations were reviewed by the councils. The item was taken to the Board in January of 2008, August of 2008 and December of 2008. Prior to the actual implementation of the recommendations, no one had raised the issue of graduate assistants taking on-line courses and the impact of the cost change to those students. Since the implementation, there have been complaints from students that prompted a review by AAC and BAC of the graduate assistant rates and on-line courses and programs. Information was collected to ascertain the full impact to graduate assistants. It is clear that we have collaborative programs that do require on-line courses for a number of graduate programs.

Many students were impacted by the self-support tuition structure proposal. Resident student rates were being aligned with the self-support and non-resident rates so the cost to those students went up. A comparison of the undergrad resident, graduate resident and graduate assistant cost increase per credit hour is summarized in the following table.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RECOMMENDED ACTION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Approve a Self-Support Graduate Assistant Rate to be effective with fall 2009 at the rate of \$228.85 per credit hour.



**SOUTH DAKOTA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**Full Board**

**AGENDA ITEM: N**

**DATE: June 26, 2009**

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBJECT: Technology Plans**

The Board approved a \$6.00 technology fee to begin with the summer term. The revenues will be deposited into central accounts for each university. \$4.00 per hour will be dedicated for infrastructure and \$2.00 per hour will be reserved for instructional/curriculum technology integration. The dollars will be returned to the institutions through the normal allocation process as dollars are collected from students.

We have assured students that the technology fee dollars will first be targeted towards building the wireless infrastructure. The campuses have already been given the approval to start expanding the infrastructure component to purchase equipment related to the wireless network.

**Infrastructure Plans**

The institutions were requested to submit a five-year infrastructure budget for review. For the most part the plans provide for the purchase and installation of wireless systems and updates to smart classrooms for FY10. There are also requests to update furnishings in classrooms to accommodate the technology as well as to add wired tables and buy appropriate seating. These expenses are necessary to build the environments desired.

There are minimal requests to add technical support staff to support the expanding infrastructure and these requests are warranted. There will be more requests to use the infrastructure dollars for support staff over the next five years.

At this time it is believed the best approach is to approve the budgets one year at a time rather than making long-term commitments. Any staffing agreed to will obviously be a long-term commitment. One of the budget issues not yet resolved is the measurements that will be used to verify that the dollars generated by the technology fee are not replacing previous technology investments. The Business Affairs Council and Technology Affairs Council will

**(continued)**

\*\*\*\*\*

**RECOMMENDED ACTION OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Require an annual report to the Board on the progress of the technology plans using the measurements identified or as refined, and require annual approval of the technology fee budgets.

need to establish the base technology investment that will be used as the starting point for future comparisons.

We are putting accounting systems into place that will allow us to respond to students that their technology fee investment is spent appropriately now and into the future. A communication has already been shared with the Business Affairs Council and the controllers regarding how we should track technology fee dollars. At a minimum, we plan to track the \$3.00 technology fee previously approved and the additional \$6.00 approved starting in FY10. The direction at this time is for each campus to have a separate technology fund where the current \$3.00 fee should reside and where the \$6.00 will eventually be deposited.

### **Professional Development**

Academic Affairs personnel from each campus provided proposals that expand professional development efforts to ensure that faculty begin to modify pedagogical practices that will allow for a greater emphasis on ubiquitous computing in the classroom. These plans vary slightly across each of the campuses but include features such as an increase in FTE for institutional design personnel, faculty mentoring programs, development workshops and exploration sessions, and campus-wide conferences, just to name a few. Consistent across the approaches that campuses plan to undertake is the projected outcome that students will begin to experience a change in the teaching and learning environment as each institution expands the number of faculty and programs involved with each phase of the mobile computing plan. Again, it is recommended that we approve the budgets one year at a time reserving the right to provide system wide goals for future allocation of funds as it evaluates the success of campus infrastructure and professional development activities.

### **Program Measures**

Specifically, the Executive Director recommends that seven data elements be reported to the Board of Regents on an annual basis to justify ongoing allocation of the student technology fees devoted to these efforts. These data elements include:

1. ***System Ubiquitous Computing Questionnaire.*** A survey instrument will be developed and a random sample of faculty and students will be evaluated each semester to determine ongoing perceptions about the mobile computing environment. The instrument will assess the capacity of the wireless infrastructure and the integration of mobile computing-based applications into the curriculum. Data will initially be collected during the Fall 2009 semester and used as the baseline for subsequent data collection every Fall and Spring term.
2. ***National Survey of Student Engagement.*** Every other Spring semester, the Regental system takes part in the NSSE project, with an intent to collect data on first-year students and seniors during the 2010 semester. This instrument currently measures student

technology usage on four items that include: 1) Used an electronic medium (listserve, chat group, internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment; 2) used email to communicate with an instructor; 3) used computers in academic work; and 4) used computing and information technology. Data from the 2008 administration will be used as the baseline for determining growth in these specific technology related areas. Additionally, the Regental system also participates under a consortium agreement that allows for additional system-level questions to be added to the instrument prior to data collection. Common system questions that emphasize ubiquitous computing specifically will be developed and assessed every two years beginning with the 2010 administration.

3. ***Desire2Learn Active Usage.*** System-wide use of D2L began during the Fall 2008 semester, and the course management system allows one to track a range of data elements to determine the extent to which faculty and students are accessing course materials. Data such as the number of active sites, usage during classroom sessions, and feature usage can be obtained for the Spring 2009 semester and used as a baseline for determining growth that would occur as mobile computing environments are developed.
4. ***Software Usage Reports.*** A number of campuses have requested that they be allowed to use professional development funds to purchase software that can be used to enhance student learning in wireless environments. Discipline specific software cannot be purchased using these funds. However, campuses will be allowed to use these funds to purchase software only in situations where it has broad general education application. Campuses will be asked to provide data on discipline, course, and student use prior to expending dollars.
5. ***Discipline Lab Reallocation.*** As the wireless environment grows it is realistic to assume that fewer discipline specific computer labs will be necessary. Existing lab allocations are currently available, and campuses will be asked to provide an annual update depicting the reduction in computer labs during each expansion phase, as well as anticipated reallocation of technology fee savings that result.
6. ***Expansion of Smart Classroom Technology*** – The institutions have a baseline number of smart classrooms that should be maintained. The infrastructure investment will allow the institutions to expand smart technology classrooms and expand availability to faculty. The inventory of smart classrooms will be monitored for progress.

7. **Technology Investments** –The fee dollars represent a significant expansion of dollars to support technology. The campuses will be expected to grow their investment in technology using a base plus approach. The average technology budget considering all funds sources as measured over the last 3 to five years will be used as the baseline to measure technology investments against moving forward.

The FY10 infrastructure budgets along with the professional development budgets can be found in Attachment I. In some cases the Board office will need to work with the institutions to approve the balance of the expenses for FY10. Where the institutional expenses exceed available revenue, the expenses may be reimbursed in future years or the dollars represent campus investments from other technology funds.

Technology Plan - Infrastructure & Support

Proposed FY10 Budgets  
Jun-09

	BHSU	DSU	NSU	SDSM&T	SDSU	USD
Credit Hours	63,968	34,250	50,000	49,800	260,000	161,000
Fee Rate	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	\$4.00
Revenue	\$255,872	\$137,000	\$200,000	\$199,200	\$1,040,000	\$644,000
<b>Total System Revenue</b>						<b>\$2,476,072</b>

Expenses	BHSU		DSU		NSU		SDSM&T		SDSU		USD	
	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going
<b>A. Infrastructure</b>												
Wireless Access Points & Switches	217,976	25,000	129,800	0	93,864	0	75,000	0	1,194,600	160,000	0	0
Wireless Enterprise	0	0	0	0	80,761	12,960	0	0	0	0	13,000	910
Wireless Security	0	0	0	0	14,019	0	0	0	40,000	0	0	8,400
Storage	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28,020	7,005
Bandwidth @ \$60 per Mb	0	4,000	0	7,200	0	0	18,000	0	0	36,000	15,000	27,600
Laptop Software	0	0	0	0	3,395	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	8,400
Battery Charging Stations	0	0	0	0	1,800	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-Total Infrastructure</b>	217,976	29,000	129,800	7,200	193,839	12,960	93,000	0	1,234,600	196,000	106,020	52,315
<b>B. Classroom Investments</b>												
Classroom Infrastructure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97,500	0	142,205	34,198
Classroom Equipment	0	0	0	0	9,050	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,573
Classroom Instructional Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	159,000	134,500	0
Classroom Furniture	0	0	0	0	37,440	0	0	0	0	0	71,860	0
Wiring tables and Chairs	0	0	0	0	16,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-Total Classroom Investments</b>	0	0	0	0	62,490	0	0	0	97,500	159,000	348,565	50,771
<b>C. Technical Support</b>												
IT Support Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	57,200	0	0	0	0	0	0
IT Support Personnel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84,375
IT Support Personnel OE	0	0	0	0	0	3,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,000
Other	0	8,588	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Sub-Total Technical Support</b>	0	8,588	0	0	0	60,200	0	0	0	0	0	86,375
<b>TOTAL</b>	217,976	37,588	129,800	7,200	256,329	73,160	93,000	0	1,332,100	355,000	454,585	189,461
<b>Total One-Time and Base for Year One</b>	255,564		137,000		329,489		93,000		1,687,100			644,046

Technology Plan - Instructional Design and Development

Proposed FY10 Budgets

Jun-09

Revenue	BHSU		DSU		NSU		SDSM&T		SDSU		USD	
	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going
Credit Hours		63,988		34,250		50,000		49,800		260,000		161,000
Fee Rate		\$2.00		\$2.00		\$2.00		\$2.00		\$2.00		\$2.00
Revenue		\$127,936		\$68,500		\$100,000		\$99,600		\$520,000		\$322,000
<b>Total 5 Year Revenue</b>												<b>\$1,238,036.00</b>
Expenses	BHSU		DSU		NSU		SDSM&T		SDSU		USD	
	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going	One-Time	On-Going
<b>A. Instructional Design and Development</b>												
Instructional Design Staff	1.5 FTE	95,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1.0 FTE	0	0	40,000	0	63,000	0	0	0	65,330	0	0
	2.0 FTE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112,597
Instructional Design Staff OE		4,500	0	600	0	5,000	0	0	10,500	0	0	5,500
Curriculum Development		0	10,000	2,500	0	16,000	36,000	0	0	72,065	0	6,360
Faculty Development		0	0	7,400	0	16,000	12,000	0	0	262,400	15,000	133,350
Assessment, materials, books		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63,883	0	0
Consultant		0	0	0	0	0	50,000	0	0	0	0	0
Instructional Design Support		0	0	8,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Instructional Design and Development</b>		127,936	10,000	58,500	0	100,000	98,000	0	10,500	463,678	15,000	257,807
<b>Total By Year of 5 Year plan/phase-in</b>				68,500		100,000	98,000			474,178		272,807
<b>Total 5 Year Expenses</b>												<b>1,141,421</b>