Members Present:
Mike Hillman, NDUS        Hugh Long, WSC
Laurel Goulding, LRSC    Mike Lenhardt, BSC
Ray Gerszewski, MaSU     Hal Haynes, DSU
Paula Berg, MiSU-B       Anne Jorgenson, NDSA
Bob Boyd, UND            Rachel Peterson, NDSA
Glen Schmalz, VCSU

Others Present:
Janna Stoskopf, NDSU for Prakash Mathew
Lisa Eriksmoen, MiSU for Dick Jenkins

Mike Hillman called the meeting to order at 9:37 a.m. There were no changes or additions to the agenda.

Mike Hillman asked if anyone had any changes to the March 6, 2008, draft minutes. It was indicated that there is a typo on the first page. After fixing the error, the minutes were approved by consensus.

Updates:
State Board of Higher Education – The Board’s next meeting is tomorrow (April 3) and there has not been a meeting since Student Affairs Council’s last meeting.

Interim Higher Education Committee - There was a joint meeting of the SBHE and the Interim Committee on March 10. David Longanecker facilitated the discussion. The information pieces are all good and provided good background to the committee for discussion/recommendations. There was discussion on small campuses and how to keep them viable. It was very clear the discussion was not about closing small campuses. The Chair indicated they would not need to have any more joint meetings. The next meeting is April 23 and the likely facilitator is Dennis Jones. Dr. Hillman does not believe that meeting will be in the roundtable format.

The one accountability measure where we fall short is retention and graduation rates (as a system). Dr. Longanecker did mention that success in college is best predicted by preparation in high school for college. He suggested our accountability measures could be performance measures. Dr. Longanecker also spoke about having performance funding as an incentive for retention/graduation. The performance funding process to reconfigure current budgets to focus on whatever the priority is, in this case better student retention and graduation, and if and when institutions achieve that, they are eligible for a bonus in funding at the end of the process. Logically, this does not seem to make sense in an under-funded system. There was also discussion on full faculty workload and what it entails.
**Academic Affairs Council** – The Council met April 1 and had interesting discussions on duplication of programs; especially concerning online programs. Dr. Hillman’s question to the Council was if online programs are anytime, anyplace; how can two identical online programs not be duplication under the roundtable definition? That is, how can they not be trying to serve the same group of students? This lead to a lot of discussion and it was suggested that AAC have a facilitator on this topic at its June retreat. Dr. Hillman had to leave the meeting at 3:30 and was not present for the fall break proposal discussion. Laurel Goulding spoke with Doug Darling, who attended the AAC meeting, and he told her that AAC, on a split vote, voted to support the proposal. Glen Schmalz heard the same. The recommendation was to support a one-day fall break on the second Monday in October.

**Chancellor’s Cabinet** – The cabinet met two weeks ago on March 19. The Boards’ budget request was on the agenda and there was good discussion. The cabinet did recommend the budget request be forwarded to the Board.

**Professional Staff Development** – Bob Boyd continues to work on the logistics for the workshop. He anticipates that by the middle of April they will have a draft of the programs and marketing materials available. Efforts will be made to ensure good group participation. Mike Lenhardt and Glen Schmalz are unsure of their participation in the May SAC meeting that coincides with the Professional Staff Development workshop. Hal Haynes is also unsure of his participation but will send a representative if he cannot attend.

**Student Comments** – Rachel Peterson shared that NDSA met in March in Valley City. They mostly worked on nominations for new board member elections. Legislative goals and methods were discussed along with system-wide email upgrades. Their understanding was that each institution develops this on their own. The also discussed “green” initiatives and they may write an NDSA “Climate Commitment Act” similar to what UND has recently done to support green initiatives.

**Fall Break Proposal** – Sample calendars were distributed with the meeting materials. Dr. Hillman was asked to check if the proposal would allow a one day break without needing to go to the board for a policy change. All the fall calendars were 81 days so we would stay within board policy by having a one-day fall break. Wording of the proposal was discussed; this one-day would be a class holiday and not a state holiday so faculty and other employees would be required to work. Since this does not require a policy change, the Chancellor approves the calendars and it will not go to the board. Any SAC recommendation will move forward to the cabinet for discussion along with AAC and CCF recommendations.

The floor was opened for discussion of the proposed addition of the one-day holiday to the fall calendar. Dr. Boyd said he understands that his campus is supportive of the proposal. Paula Berg said the faculty at MiSU-B does not support the proposal. The faculty advisor to the board, Thomas Barnhardt, said he felt it was a good idea. Dr. Hillman will suggest that this be added to the CCF agenda for discussion. Hal Haynes said there is concern on his campus about taking another potential weekend out of those available for homecoming. Laurel Goulding said her campus is concerned about how having one less class day improves education. There will be a one-day difference between the fall and spring calendar (spring will have 81 days). Part of the
logic in the NDSA request for consideration of this proposal is that students are getting fatigued by this time and this would be a battery-charging effect and be refreshing to the students. Dr. Boyd is interested in hearing if any campuses opposed this initiative when AAC voted on this. Glen Schmalz said the VCSU president abstained from the vote. Lisa Eriksmoen said from the perspective of their students (they have a high concentration of Canadian students) they would like the day off to be home for the holiday (the second Monday in October is Canadian Thanksgiving). Mike Lenhardt moved that SAC concur with AAC to recommend the one-day holiday. Dr. Boyd seconded. Role call vote – BSC – yes; DSU – no; MiSU – yes; MiSU-B – no; LRSC – no; Anne – no; NDSU – abstain; NDSCS – no representation; UND- yes; Peterson – yes; VCSU – yes; WSC – yes; MaSU – yes; Motion carried 7-4-1.

Common calendar dates / enrollment reporting – The common calendar dates and enrollment reporting dates are reflected in the calendars that were distributed with the meeting materials. Class days will be reflected in gray and the last day to drop and withdraw have been included on the draft calendar. The draft policy that is going for first reading to the board talks about the last day of the 12th week of classes as the last day to withdraw and a registrar suggested that the last day to drop a course or withdraw with a record also be added to the common calendar. Ray Gerszweski asked what happened with the discussion about the last day to drop/add being inconsistent on the spring and fall calendars. Dr. Hillman said the only way to resolve the difference was to say the last day to add/drop with no record was to use the 10th day in the fall term and the 11th day of the spring term. After looking over the proposed calendars, it was determined that the calendars all used the 11th day of each term. The calendars will again be revised. Mr. Greszweski also asked whether this could be implemented for the fall term and Dr. Hillman said it is not policy yet so campuses may implement this for the 2008-09 term if they desire. Paula Berg said MiSU-B is going to use the common calendar dates this fall. She asked when the fall break would become effective if it is passed through the cabinet. Dr. Hillman replied fall of 2009. The suggested policy revisions are on the SBHE agenda for tomorrow.

Dr. Boyd reminded everyone that Sharon Parks will be coming to UND in November and he has requested a one-hour IVN session with her so that she can connect with any campus who would like to take advantage of her visit.

SAC June Retreat – Hugh Long said they are suggesting holding the retreat in New Town in conjunction with the Fort Berthold Community College and Four Bears Casino. The dates are June 10-11. In the past they have started at 1:00 and then had an evening activity. Mr. Long is looking at a full day of opportunity on June 10 (fellowship activities) with a supper that evening. An 8:00 a.m. start on June 11th with conclusion of the retreat after lunch. Housing options are Four Bears and he will distribute information. Mr. Long will get together with Glen Schmalz to discuss finances. Hal Haynes said there was a question about who would be the most appropriate person to contact Fort Berthold. Dr. Hillman felt that Hugh or Hal should contact the college and try to incorporate an informal meeting with Fort Berthold representatives, possibly on the evening of June 10. The planned activities for the council should be education related.

Retention Management – When the accountability measures were implemented there were measures that required campuses to report on student retention and student graduation rates. As a part of implementing these accountability measures we did have some resources to participate
in the Noel Levitz retention/management survey and every incoming student was surveyed. The survey has some validity in identifying at risk students and students who are amenable to intervention. The agreement at the time was that those students who were at high risk and amenable to intervention at institutions would have some kind of follow-up mechanism available to intervene. As we heard, retention may be tied to accountability. Dr. Hillman asked how institutions follow-up on high-risk students who are amenable to intervention and how could the system office be supportive. Could the institutions be doing more if performance funding was tied in?

Paula Berg said MiSU-B has tried a variety of things with the survey. They have had some success but she feels they would be more successful if they had a professional academic advisor on campus. Hugh Long asked if they have noticed an increase in the number of students who do not want the survey information released. Ms. Berg said no. Glen Schmalz said students on his campus have found the information to be somewhat intrusive. That perception may be based on the age of the students (OTA). Mike Lenhardt said BSC has experienced the same thing on its campus. He feels that the survey is geared towards the high school student who is first entering college. The OTA incoming freshman are not as cooperative as they feel the survey is intrusive; perhaps Noel Levitz has a different instrument for OTAs? Ms. Berg agrees.

Hal Haynes asked what the retention definition is – freshman to sophomore? Dr. Hillman replied that, yes, that is an accountability measure, along with graduation. He said he found out through a Noel Levitz representative that 58% of students who graduated with a baccalaureate degree last spring indicated that they had attended two or more institutions. Dr. Hillman will share this with Julie Schepp who coordinates these surveys and she may contact Noel Levitz to see if there are other surveys available that would be more appropriate for OTA students. Mr. Schmalz said they have found that approximately 20% of their incoming freshmen expects to transfer before they graduate. This then shows up as a failed retention case against the college. Dr. Boyd added that there is another aspect to this, an institution makes a significant effort to serve high-risk students, by definition of high risk, it means that you are inevitably not likely to be successful. He includes international students, OTAs, provisional students, disabled students, etc. The very best of motives on the part of institutions to serve those students, if not properly taken into context, can be punitive to those institutions. If the retention is not as high as predicted, is money then taken away? Institutions that have a high number of high-risk students are looked at negatively when in fact they are facing larger challenges than the other institutions. We probably need to further define high-risk students.

Dr. Hillman said part of what Dr. Boyd is talking about is one of the major issues that came out of the discussions on retention. The best way to improve retention rates is to screen more students out of admission. With declining demographics and workforce, is that what the state wants? Also, what are students’ intentions? Part of assessing student progress or success is that to be able to be eligible for financial aid they must be degree seeking. Part of the problem is that they are degree seeking, but not from that institution. They are considering changing the question to: Do they expect to attain their degree in 3 or 6 years and at that institution? Many students may be meeting their goals but not the expectations of the accountability measure. In many cases students begin their education at a two-year institution and then transfer to a four-year institution before earning a degree. The two-year institution should not be penalized in regard to retention
when this is the case. It is also common for students to change their major after beginning college. Dr. Hillman asked the council to please give some thought to what the system can do to improve its support for high risk students. Julie Schepp will contact Noel Levitz and she may also be able to get them to offer further assistance and/or advice.

Criminal History Update – There are programs for which criminal history checks are permitted; for which criminal history checks are required; and for which FBI criminal history checks are required. The AAC discussed a number of requests to change the programs that are listed on the system procedures. They will be looking at suggesting that some of the tables be amended or changed. Most of what Dr. Hillman is looking at is requests for removal of programs from the table so that checks would not be required.

Paula Berg is wondering if the two-year schools can remove the common core high school information on the common application and insert the criminal background questions. She is suggesting that the two-year colleges create their own common application. Glen Schmalz said he thinks there is a group called the Functional Users Group and they work with the common application. Ms. Berg’s suggestion is that there should be a common application across the board for all institutions. Mike Lenhardt said BSC has been talking about this for some time and they are going to modify their application to reflect what Ms. Berg is suggesting and will share this application with MiSU-B.

Future meeting dates – We will bring a tentative future meeting dates schedule to the May 19 face-to-face meeting in Grand Forks. Hal Haynes suggested using the Strength Through Sharing Conference as a possibility for the August meeting. The dates are July 31 and August 1 at University of Mary. Troy Meadner at UND may be working with this group and may give us some information. Mr. Haynes feels it would be helpful to gather there and support the good efforts of the people involved. The theme this year is leadership. Dr. Boyd thinks it is a good idea to support this group but the meeting takes place during UND’s summer commencement so he will not be able to attend but would try to send a representative.

Janna Stoskopf from NDSU asked for clarification on providing suggestions on the incoming freshman survey and wondered whom they should send suggestions to – Julie Schepp by the end of the week.

Mike Lenhardt shared that he will be retiring on June 30. Dr. Hillman thanked him for his service and the Council wished him well.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.