Minutes  
Student Affairs Council (SAC)  
Conference Call  
November 1, 2007

Members present:  
Mike Lenhardt, BSC  
Paula Berg, MiSU-B  
Mike Hillman, NDUS  
Bob Boyd, UND  
Hal Haynes, DSU  
Ray Gerszewski, MaSU  
Georgia Pullen, NDSCS  
Prakash Mathew, NDSU  
Hugh Long, WSC  
Glen Schmalz, VCSU  
Lisa Eriksmoen for Dick Jenkins, MiSU  
NDSA- Rachel Peterson

Members Not Present:  
Laurel Goulding, LRSC

Others Present:  
Deb Glennen, Director of Disability Support Services, UND.  
Kate Haugen, NDSU

Approval of the agenda

Review and approval of the October 4, 2007 SAC minutes  
Minutes of the October 4, 2007, SAC meeting were approved.

Updates
Chancellors Cabinet- Mike Hillman reported that the Chancellor’s Cabinet met October 31 and discussed the drop/add date recommendations. No changes were recommended. The recommendations will go to the Oversight Committee. They also discussed what defines “arrangement to pay.” General agreement was that three valid reasons exist. Financial Aid is delayed but coming; a company pays the tuition; and military reimbursement has not been received. These are all valid reasons. The group of students in the grey area are those students who we don’t know if they are in class and have not made payments. Discussions about fee pay deadlines being extended past 12 days are taking place. The workgroup is also working on recommendations for the spring 2008 session. One president stated it was inappropriate to include students in the enrollment report who are registered for the classes that had not started by the enrollment census date.

SBHE-There was no report.

NDSA-Rachel Peterson reported on implementing a fall break for next year. They have
drafted a resolution, passed it, and it will be brought to the NDSU office for consideration. Upgrading the system wide student email is an issue. There was also discussion on tuition increasing and lack of scholarships keeping pace. Disability Services will be discussed at the next meeting. Paula Berg, MiSU-B, mentioned that 8-9 years ago there was a fall break at MiSU-B, but it was more for the faculty. The NDSA legislative sub-committee will be meeting to formulate issues.

NASPA-Hal Haynes, DSU, said there are well above 70 members in North Dakota. Two upcoming events—Region Four West Conference November 8-10, 2007, at Little Rock, AR and the National NASPA Conference March 8-12, 2008, in Boston, MA. Reminder to get registered, the earlier the better.

Professional Staff Development- Ray Gerszewski, MaSU, Paula Berg, MiSU-B, and Hal Haynes, DSU, will be meeting on Nov. 5th for a conference call to discuss final plans. Gary Pavela has committed to be a presenter. They will have a draft of final plans for the December meeting. The workshop will be held at UND in the Innovation Center.

Criminal History

The draft policies 511 Student Criminal History Background Checks and 602.3 Job Applicant and Employee Criminal History Background Checks and their respective draft procedures were discussed. Also provided was a set of questions that NDSU and DSU ask as part of their admissions application. Kate Haugen, NDSU, and Hal Haynes, DSU, reported that they had updated versions. Those were emailed to the SAC while we were discussing this topic. Initial questions and discussion centered on the 511 Procedures. Mike Lenhardt asked whether anyone knew if the final Procedures would list the programs under 511, 1 and 2 by campus or by the NDUS. Campuses should have submitted program lists quite some time ago. It was thought perhaps the HR council had those program lists.

Mike Lenhardt asked if #3 in the 511 Procedures meant that Pat Seaworth was still developing the specific questions to be asked or if the language in #3 of the 511 Policy suggested that each campus could develop guidelines and specific questions. Kate Haugen stated that NDSU likes their revised questions and guidelines for criminal history and would want to continue to use them. Hal Haynes said that DSU is also comfortable with their questions and guidelines and would like to continue to use theirs. Bob Boyd stated that Pat Seaworth wanted SAC to come up with a specific set of questions for the admissions application that they would be comfortable with. Those then would be reviewed by Pat Seaworth and passed along for the Chancellor to consider. He suggested a small task force meet and draft some questions for review. Prakash Mathew stated he interpreted the drafts to mean each institution has flexibility and that the Chancellor won’t dictate the specific questions. Since there was considerable confusion over the 511 Policy and the 511 Procedure and without Mike Hillman or Pat Seaworth on the call to clarify, Mike Lenhardt moved that the SAC request that 511 Procedure # 3 would reflect similar language as 511 Policy #3. The assumption was this would give each institution the right to ask their own set of unique questions. In motion discussion, Glen Schmalz stated that at the last SAC meeting we had approved a common set of questions to be
asked on the undergraduate application. Paula Berg moved the question. The motion was voted on and the total was 4 yes, 3 no, and 4 abstained. With such an indecisive vote, Hal Haynes moved to table this issue, Glen Schmalz seconded it, and it was tabled by a unanimous vote. Bob Boyd requested that we ask Mike Hillman for more information on these policies and procedures.

We decided Policy and Procedure 602.3 both read as we expected and there was no further discussion.

At this point Prakash Mathew turned over the Chair to Bob Boyd and left the meeting.

Later in the meeting both Mike Hillman and Pat Seaworth joined the call. They were asked if 511 required all institutions to use the same questions. Pat Seaworth said this was discussed at the Chancellor’s Cabinet and the answer is YES. The language of the policy means that the same questions are to be asked, that they are to be uniform questions on the undergraduate application. The Graduate application might be able to be more flexible for unique programs. Mike Hillman reiterated that the expectation is that all campuses will use the same set of questions about criminal history. How the individual campus uses that information is where there is flexibility as long as it is consistent with the policy. The SBHE would need the questions for their January meeting. We need to have final passage in time for printing deadlines.

Discussion then centered on the Job Applications Policy 602.3. The main point at the Cabinet meeting was opposition to fingerprinting for FBI checks for Presidents and Vice Presidents as that would turn them off and possible applicants may not apply.

Disability Services Contingency Fund

Ray Gerszewski reported on the history of the contingency fund and its current status. Because of the length and details of his report, there are two attachments of the history and status attached as part of the minutes. Some key points are that the contingency was a line item in the SBHE budget prior to the 2003-2005 Legislative session. During that session, the Legislature rolled the line item amount into a broader SBHE line item for contingencies. The amount was $125,000.

This past session the Legislature stripped all discretionary funds from the SBHE budget and that left no new money for the disabilities contingencies, according to Laura Glatt. Deb Glennen, a member of the Disabilities Council, stated that many requests for funds have been centered around students that are hearing impaired. Signers and real time captioning are expensive services for colleges to provide. She stated that the SBHE/Legislature need to know that this contingency fund is the fund of last resort. The requests come after the institution’s contingency funds are exhausted.

Laura Glatt suggested that the SAC request a line item for disabilities contingency monies be reinstated in next budget. The proposal should go to the Cabinet in January if possible. Ray Gerszewski moved and Mike Lenhardt seconded to request a specific amount of funds as a line item. Ray Gerszewski said they could update the financial data
they had prepared two years ago. Motion passed unanimously.

**Common Drop/Add dates**

Discussion centered on the horrors of complying with the payment deadline and enrollment reporting. Prakash Mathew stated that their campus does not want to re-experience what they went through in the Fall. There was much agreement with that. Prakash Mathew asked if the campuses can revert to the old guidelines until all is finalized. Mike Hillman said we can’t ignore Board policy. He asked that recommendations be ready for the Dec. 3rd Cabinet meeting to go forward to the Dec. 12th SBHE agenda mailing. Finalizing a common Drop date will be the first step. Then the refund policy will be looked at and the final payment date. After that the enrollment reporting date will be considered for a change. If the policy is changed and the second reading is waived, it may be possible to implement for Spring semester. If not, the Fall 2008 semester would have to be targeted.

Meeting adjourned