Academic Affairs Council Minutes  
March 1, 2011  
Conference call

Attendance:  BSC Drake Carter;  DCB Larry Brooks;  DSU Jon Brudvig;  MaSU Keith Stenehjem;  MiSU Selmer Moen;  NDSCS – Harvey Link;  UND – Paul Lebel;  VCSU – Margaret Dahlberg,  WSC Wanda Meyer;  CCF – Eric Bless;  NDSA – Evan Andrist;  LRSC – Doug,  NDSU – Craig Schnell;  Gloria Dohman, Mike Hillman, Aimee Copas

Current Issues

- Hillman introduced Aimee Copas as the new NDUS Academic Affairs Associate
- Executive Oversight Committee - Carter  
  o  Carter reporting – they have not met as of yet.
- NDSA – Andrist  
  o  Met Feb 11-12 in Bismarck.  Resolutions passed in support or opposition to a few bills.  
    ▪  Opposing bill HB1411  
    ▪  Supported HB 1147, 1250, 1465, 2167 – (anti-bullying)  
  o  805.2 – running into issues at UND regarding the types of funds that St. Gov’t falls under.  Wrote a resolution stating that the students would like to be heard with regard to this issue.  Jumped the gun on this a bit as this is not under review yet.
  o  Election of new officers coming up.
- CCF – Bless  
  o  Feb – elections held  
    ▪  Nominations for CCF were passed on – new president Ann Smith, VP Eric Brevick, Secretary Tanya Moody, State Board Rep - John Girard – Take over in August, 2011.
    ▪  Stated that they don’t agree with legislature not maintaining tuition freezes.
    ▪  Trying to get a feel for cultural impacts for our institutions.  How can this be measured?  Looking at focusing at different Chambers of Commerce on how our institutions contribute to communities, etc. as a starting point.

SBHE Board Meeting & Legislative Update - Hillman

I. Board Meeting this morning (SBHE Meeting)
   a. Worked through issues with NDSA
   b. Presentation took place on the Accountability Measures Report.  Board level report was not presented.
      i. Several comments by board members that we put together an excellent report, but policy makers continue to not read this information, then say that they continue to want more information.  There is a need for legislators to read and understand our information.
   c. Policy Maker’s Perceptions on the NDUS –
      i. They think we are a high quality system.  They still believe there is a gap in communication, fiscal mgmt., and student success.
   d. Legislative update
      i. There were several bills that the board didn’t take a stance on originally as they felt most of them would likely die on their own.  However, the board did end up now taking a stance on a few bills as a result on House decision.  Bills that would’ve required the Board to keep the Fighting Sioux, bills that infringed on the Board’s authority (both opposed).
      e. Marsha provided background for completion based funding.  Showed positive and negatives of both sides.  It resulted in a rather good discussion from the board
regarding some of the faults in this system. This was a thoughtful and critical
discussion on performance funding at the Board level.
f. Board President made some opening comments regarding where he couldn’t think
of a time when there was a bigger disconnect between what the legislature thinks
and what is actually happening with NDUS. The legislature apparently doesn’t
perceive the positives in what we’re doing at NDUS.
g. A number of academic requests that came before the board were all supported.
h. Regarding Performance Funding – President Kelly spoke and mentioned a
number of very good reasons why this would be a challenging feat to undertake.
Ultimately he was looking for transparency and simplicity in the process.
Whatever system it is, it must be one which all 11 campuses can support.

II. Resolution on Program Fees
a. Lots of discussion around program fee issue at the system level.
b. There is a performance audit underway – comments made that we should see
what the results are there to see if there is truly an issue.
c. Penalty discussed as to what happens if the policy is not followed.
d. Campus should get a chance to respond if questioned regarding this practice.
e. Action item: Be sure to brief presidents on each respective campus regarding the
council resolution on this matter.

III. Institutional GPA – Feb 24th memo discussion
a. Randall discussed the policy on what this looks like.

IV. Business Meeting
a. Approval of February 1, 2011 minutes will be done at April meeting.
b. Operational Issues
   i. Curricular Requests
      1. Stage I requests –
         i. Lebel moved to recommend all stage I requests; seconded by
            Stenehjem.
         ii. Unanimous vote in support of request

   b. NDSU request PhD – Exercise Science and Nutrition and
      PhD in Counselor Education and Supervision.
      i. Brooks moved to approve both degrees; seconded by Link.
      ii. Discussion around the different programs that are all being
          moved together into their own program. That is the purpose
          of the request.
      iii. Unanimous vote in favor of the motion.

   2. Stage II Requests
      i. Stenehjem moved to approve; seconded by Schnell.
      ii. Lebel led discussion reasoning the change with MLS degree
          (a). Stenehjem asked about reason for name change and need
          for request for new one in item #4
      iii. Unanimous vote in favor of the motion.

   3. Prefix (UND) Medical Lab Science
      i. Schnell moved to approve seconded by Carter.
      ii. Unanimous vote in favor of the motion.
V. Planning/Discussion

a. Additions/Corrections to Draft Agenda – none

b. CIO Update
   i. ConnectND – since last meeting, you now have to use your common identifier to log in.
   ii. Conversion to Microsoft exchange services continues to move along and we are getting to the point where a lot of it will be clean up by the summer.
   iii. Around the 1st of April, ConnectND helpdesk services will be shifted to a provider so there will be a # to call in that will be able to be used 24/7.
   iv. Reminder of people search application available for use: http://peoplesearch.ndus.edu
   v. Kloberdonz – updated that we have purchased and are rolling out “Respondus” lockdown browser. Prevents students from searching the web while they are taking a test online. This type of software has been requested by faculty. In addition plagiarism identification software has also been requested...something like “turnitin” – investigations underway.
   vi. Putlick – Data element dictionaries – message went out with url included and the process of accessing. Message that went out to user-groups will also be sent out to council. Hillman– much of what is in accountability report will come from this data element dictionary in the future. This is an important piece to get correct. There will likely be required data elements down the road for accountability purposes. There needs to be an understanding and consistency in the elements that we use to drive the accountability process.

c. Articulation and Transfer – Lisa unable to join call – moved to April meeting

d. NDUS Procedure – 402.1.2 – Student Placement into College Courses
   i. Dohman – covering page 15-16 in agenda
   ii. Looking at trying to find a relationship between scores between ACT and SAT. When they (SAT) tried to find a relationship – it was not a good relationship. They (SAT) offered to do a study for us – if we submit certain data points, they would tell us what an applicable SAT math score would be for students to be successful. ACT had already done this for us.
   iii. Recommendation if we choose to go another route rather than going through their research services to go through the curriculum study, would be to look at the ACT composite of 21 and use that on the concordance tables to go over to their SAT math scores.
   iv. This would mean we would be placing students into math scores based on the ACT composite math, and/or by the SAT reading/math composite.
   v. This would then be a comparison of the ACT math subtest and the SAT critical reading & math test. ACT score of 22 is generally equivalent to SAT 1030, ACT 21 is generally equivalent to SAT 990.
   vi. Aimee Copas will send out updated policy 402.1.2 as well as updated tables to all members.

e. Policy 605.1 – Academic Freedom and Tenure: Academic Appointments
   i. Hillman – senior staff discussed this policy. Chancellor concluded that signed contracts are a part of the board policy...that is the expectation.

f. Dual Credit Update
   i. When the issues related to dual credit began to surface – they were very much related to fees and what we charge for the service.
   ii. In the discussion – the Chancellor felt that the funding model for dual credit favors k-12. We provide the instruction, but then k-12 is able to funnel that in and put it into the state aid formula – maybe it is time to take a new look at the funding model.
   iii. Right now the charges for dual credit between institutions are not the same across the board.
   iv. Lisa Johnson came up with an identification of discussion topics.
      1. The information that Johnson created will be sent to the AAC.
   v. 4 issues identified
1. Variance in dual credit tuition among NDUS institutions
2. Examination of dual credit funding models (should higher ed. be getting some state aid?)
3. Assurance of academic rigor
4. Faculty credentials and compensation

vi. DPI, Jeff Lynn, Doug Johnson, and Cory Steiner will continue to lead these discussions. Steve Light, Keith Stenjehm, Doug Darling, Harvey Link, 2 faculty representatives, UMary rep, and Rasmussen Rep will also be a part of this discussion. Future possibility of student representative(s).

vii. Comment made regarding banter about age needed to be eligible for dual credit.

1. Parent contacted Hillman regarding their advanced student who is only a freshman, but would like to take part in dual credit.
   a. Conclusion made that state law relates to HS units that can be used for the foundation aid formula. These younger students should likely not be able to be counted toward foundation aid formula. (from a legal perspective)
   b. University system campuses were doing dual credit before the dual credit law passed. The board has delegated those decision making abilities to the campuses.
   c. Can freshmen in HS take college courses? They cannot be fully admitted, but they can be special students and can take classes that have been specifically determined for these students. Hence, they can take college courses and earn college credit on a case by case basis – decision to be made by the university. What the HS does with those college credit classes is up to the High schools.
   d. Carter commented that parent/student understanding of dual credit is different from our definition. Century code states that it applies to sophomores, juniors, and seniors. However, institutions can create special populations of students. The system was willing to admit the student, but the HS (Mandan) has a policy in which they only award dual credit to juniors and seniors.

2. Importance of care of terminology used to refer to classes – be clear on dual credit vs. special college courses.

3. What does each campus call it when campuses allow a student to take a college class early – this needs to be unified. Several use ‘early entry’, some ‘special student’, another ‘special student on probationary status’.

VI. Next meeting – Bismarck April 5th.