

**File 1**

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013

3:30pm, HMSU 227

**AGENDA**

I. Administrative Reports:

President D. Bradley

Provost R. Williams

II. Chair Report:

Steve Lamb

III. Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes of October 29, 2013 **(File 2)**

IV. Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

V. Motion in Response to Charge to Nominate Faculty for Service in Faculty Awards Committees,  
Darlene Hantzis **(File 3)**

VI. Motion in Response to Charge to Review Process by Which Senate Parliamentarian is Selected,  
Darlene Hantzis **(File 4)**

VII. FAC and SAC Material, Revision in Description of Student Success Council; Darlene Hantzis, Jim  
Buffington, Josh Powers **(File 5a, b, and c)**

VIII. Degree Maps, Susan Powers **(File 6a, b, and c)**

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

November 5, 2013

3:30pm, HMSU 227

**Minutes**

**Present:** S. Lamb, C. MacDonald, R. Guell, A. Anderson, T. Hawkins, B. Kilp, C. Olsen, V. Sheets, K. Yousif

**Ex-Officios Present:** D. Bradley, R. Williams

**Others Present:** D. Hantzis, J. Powers, R. Lotspeich

1) Administrative Reports:

a) D. Bradley:

i) I ask for your continuing patience on the health insurance issue. We are still looking into the insurance rate issue, and we have got to encourage those who most need it to apply for the subsidy. We need the data from it to give us a better picture of what's going on. We are working with those who should be applying, and once we get that data we will make changes if they're supported by it. It may take some time to receive enough.

(1) S. Lamb: I'm pleased that it's still being given consideration.

(2) D. Bradley: I have talked to K. Burgher to get more data.

ii) Also, we have visitors from Morocco with us; please make them feel welcome. We are trying to rekindle the relationship.

iii) We will know a little more about the downtown apartments in a week or so.

iv) We have been looking into our options with the Towers. We have an interested party that may be willing to turn them into upscale apartments. What we know is it's going to cost \$4 million-\$5 million to take down these buildings, so we're exploring our options to allow others to adapt them for other uses. They are university property so we would have to go through a long approval process.

b) R. Williams:

i) Our Graduate Dean search is narrowed down further; we will interview two candidates next week, Dr. Barbour and Dr. Garrison, and we will interview Dr.

Maurer and Dr. Yu the following week. We encourage everyone to get involved and give us your feedback; these are all open campus sessions.

- ii) We have preliminarily approved positions for the Colleges: Arts and Sciences will get 13, Nursing, Health and Human Services will get 5, Education 1, Business 2, and Technology 2. These are regular faculty lines but they do not include planned renewals of instructors. There are 5 more from previously failed searches. Each dean will be provided an FTE budget for instruction. Our focus is on getting the university to 555FTE. We are at 569 this year. Next year we are aiming for 560 and from there to 555. We have put out the personnel formula which is based on the student faculty ratio.

(1) S. Lamb: I hope we do not try to use that measure at the department level but use it at the University and College level only.

- (a) D. Bradley: I am concerned about University, the Provost will worry about the Colleges and the Deans will apply the measure to departments but will do understanding that many departments have multiple programs and that while they may be overstaffed for one program they may have serious needs in another program. The point is to increase transparency in these decisions.

## 2) Chair Report:

### a) S. Lamb

- i) Some Deans are aggressively trying to get down to 15% and others seem to be deciding to take a gamble. What will happen? Will there be a back and forth between the colleges and academic affairs?

(1) R. Williams: I kicked back two today. We have a limited amount of funds for this. If we get it down to 15%, there will be raises averaging around \$1,500 in addition to the 2%.

- ii) I am concerned that to date there are only two faculty nominated in the lowest category of overall performance. It was predictable and predicted by nevertheless it is a problem for the process. We did not do a good job of identifying those whom the university agrees are not meeting expectations. It impacts the students the most, and it affects our reputation. I encourage FAC to re-examine that process.

- iii) There was discussion via email last week regarding the Indiana Commission on Higher Education policy statement on regional campuses. This does not apply to ISU.

## 3) **Motion to Approve the Executive Committee Minutes of October 29, 2013: A. Anderson, C. MacDonald; Vote 9-0-0**

## 4) Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

### i) R. Lotspeich:

- (1) The minutes of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) for 8 and 15 October 2013 suggest that the SEC may have the impression that record keeping in the ISU study abroad programs is deficient. It is not. The Advisory Board for International Studies (IS-AB) has a direct interest in study abroad, so we became concerned

about what was said in these SEC meetings. I undertook an investigation of the issue and found no evidence to support this impression. I spoke with the Director of Academic Programs Abroad to learn about the record keeping procedure. I found it to be well organized and complete. I also spoke with other people connected to study abroad and its records toward finding instances in which those procedures were not followed. No one could identify any specific example. My conclusion is that there are no problems that occur with regularity. The evidence shows neither general nor specific deficiencies in record keeping with respect to ISU students participating in study abroad programs. The IS-AB wanted to clarify this matter for the SEC and for anyone who attended those October meetings in which the matter was discussed.

b) R. Guell:

i) Are you going to ask Business Affairs to extend the deadline for applying for the subsidy?

(1) D. Bradley: We will do everything we can to get those who qualify for the subsidy to apply for it and will accept those applications.

ii) Will you allow people, once they have received that first paycheck in January and they see how badly it's going to affect them, to apply then?

(1) D. Bradley: I will ask D. McKee if there is a legal reason why we can't. If there is no legal reason prohibiting us from making that adjustment and if it is not overly burdensome to staff, I will ask them to accept those applications as well.

c) S. Lamb

i) There is a case where we have a staff member whose premiums will jump \$200.

(1) D. Bradley: The numbers that I have seen show that those who sign the affidavit and went through wellness could see a \$100 increase. The trouble, as R. Guell shows in his analysis, which I mostly agree with, is that if a person is married to someone who also makes a modest income and they have one, but not two children, the family could see a \$100 increase. The key is we need everyone who comes close to apply for the subsidy.

*(a) Secretary's Note: If a \$10/hr earning employee has a \$10/hr earning spouse, and they have one child, if the employee did not sign the affidavit and did not participate in the screenings, their premiums will rise from \$341 to \$542. The President has pledged to continue to find ways to address this issue.*

d) V. Sheets: I understand we are still working on getting our FTE to a certain level, but does the Opportunity Hire program follow with that? Does it still exist?

(1) R. Williams: It does still exist. We are keeping diversity in mind while we are working this out. We have to put it in the context of the FTE budget, though. Every search will be charged with diversifying their pool of candidates. Diversity cannot just be an opportunity hire program but a priority for every search.

e) C. Olsen:

- i) This Open Resource textbook initiative has failed spectacularly in my class. I would like to look into a couple of alternative options, one of them being giving our Laptop Scholarship recipients an alternative textbook account worth the value of the laptop itself, especially since many of them arrive with their own laptops already. We have about 55-60 laptops at this point that students still haven't picked up. Another option I'd like to see us explore is making software keys part of the course fees so that financial aid and scholarships can take more of the burden.
- 5) Motion in Response to Charge to Nominate Faculty for Service in Faculty Awards Committees (Noted below): T. Hawkins, A. Anderson; Vote 9-0-0**
- 6) Motion in Response to Charge to Review Process by Which Senate Parliamentarian is Selected (Noted Below): T. Hawkins, A. Anderson; Vote 9-0-0**
- 7) FAC and SAC Material, Revision in Description of Student Success Council:**
- a) **Motion on to approve FAC Recommendation T. Hawkins, (Noted below) C. Olsen; Vote: 4-4-0**
    - i) S. Lamb: I would like to request unanimous consent to insert "or a designee" into the portion giving college governing body chairs a place on the committee. (Unanimous consent granted)
    - ii) R. Guell: I am still trying to figure out whether the Council is a policy-making body, a policy-recommending body, or a "trains on time" policy implementing body like UAAC used to be.
    - iii) J. Powers: This was birthed as a working group; its spirit was one of working together and answering the question, "How do we use this body to help achieve student success?" It's not a policy-making body, but a policy-recommending one.
    - iv) J. Powers: It's not an implementing body. We do implement programs like the recent Student Success Conference. The body would serve as a mechanism informed by data from all around the campus.
      - (a) D. Hantzis: It's difficult to design any committee without understanding its mission. The goals are to advise and advocate. Faculty have a role and a stake in this; they are producers, not just consumers. It's too big because it has to be too big. It would also have to include other faculty who are charged with stewardship.
  - v) R. Guell to J. Powers: Can you accomplish this with the FAC committee?
    - (1) J. Powers: What we would like to do is work with subcommittees made up of both SSC members and other faculty. We also need to include Residential Life, the Center for Student Success, the Director of New Student Programs, and University College.
      - (a) C. MacDonald: Can you function with the FAC recommendation?
        - (i) J. Powers: It's not preferred.
      - (b) K. Yousif: Is it about the numbers?
      - (c) J. Powers: Yes. It would be 29; that's too many.

- (d) D. Bradley:
  - (i) My view is that it is a working group like what R. Guell describes the role of UAAC. I would not be supportive of taking those people off.
- (e) C. Olsen:
  - (i) The size seems ridiculously hard to manage. But I'm worried about faculty not taking this seriously, especially if there are a large number of people whose primary function isn't teaching; I'm concerned about a lack of credibility.
  - (ii) D. Bradley: Perhaps there can be subcommittees made up of half on the council and half not.
- (f) R. Guell: Is a reorganizing compromise possible?
- (g) D. Hantzis: FAC took this issue seriously. When a vote is to be taken, faculty voices must be there for student success.
- (h) J. Powers: There are not usually votes.
- (i) B. Kilp: I'm concerned that this will expand so much that we have faculty on all kinds of committees. There are a great number of faculty who have been promised they wouldn't have to serve, but something like this will spawn another set of subcommittees much like Faculty Senate and the University College.
- (j) D. Hantzis: That is why FAC focused on leveraging role of the chairs of the governing bodies.
- (k) T. Hawkins: Can you make it work? And use the committee structure to include others. Can you make that work?
- (l) D. Bradley: Please vote it down, and keep track of our concerns.
- (m) R. Guell: If we vote it down, there will only be one faculty member of the 22.

b) **Motion to endorse the SAC alternative (Noted below) R.Guell-C. Olsen; Vote: 8-0-0**

**Motion to Adjourn 5:15pm**

## Appendicies

### For Dreiser Research Award

NHHS --Tim Demchak - Associate and Dera Mallory- Full  
SCOB -- Jim Buffington – Associate and Jeff Harper- Full  
BCOE -- Catharine Tucker – Associate and Feng-Qi Lai- Full  
CAS -- Aaron Morales- Associate and Shannon Barton-Bellessa– Full  
COT -- Tad Foster- Full and Barbara Eversole- Assistant  
Library -- Cinda May- Associate and Steve Hardin- Associate

### For Caleb Mills Distinguished Teaching Award

Library -- Marsha Miller – Lib.  
A&S -- Rich Kjonaas- Full (winner)  
NHHS -- Jolynn Kuhlman- Full (winner)  
BCOE -- Susan Kiger- Associate  
COT -- James Smallwood- Full (winner)  
SCOB --Tom Harris- Associate

### For Distinguished Service Award

Kathy Bauserman -- COE  
Julie Fine – CNHHS  
Bob Guell – CAS  
Jen Latimer --CAS  
David Malooley –COT  
Cat Patterson – CNHSS

FAC recommends the following revision in the relevant section of the Constitution:

#### **245.3.4 Officers of the University Faculty Senate.**

**245.3.4.1 Composition.** The officers of the University Faculty Senate shall be a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson, a Secretary, and a Parliamentarian. Only elected faculty members may serve as officers.

**245.3.4.2 Term.** The officers shall serve for one (1) year but may be re-elected.

**245.3.4.3 Timing.** The Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and the Secretary of the newly constituted University Faculty Senate shall be elected at the first organizational meeting. The Parliamentarian shall be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate at its first meeting. This nomination shall be presented for confirmation by the members of the Faculty Senate at the first meeting of the Senate each fall.

**245.3.4.4 Presiding Officers.** The University President, or in his/her absence the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall preside at the organizational meeting of the newly constituted University Faculty Senate meeting until the officers are elected.

#### Current Language

#### **245.3.4 Officers of the University Faculty Senate.**

**245.3.4.1 Composition.** The officers of the University Faculty Senate shall be a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson, a Secretary. Only elected faculty members may serve as officers.

**245.3.4.2 Term.** The officers shall serve for one (1) year but may be re-elected.

**245.3.4.3 Timing.** The officers of the newly constituted University Faculty Senate shall be elected at the first organizational meeting in April (Section 245.4.1).

**245.3.4.4 Presiding Officers.** The University President, or in his/her absence the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall preside at this meeting until the officers are elected.



## Current University Handbook Language

270.11 Student Success Council. Recognizing the need for increasing student success is clearly one of the strategic priorities of Indiana State University. Improving student retention, while maintain high standards and challenging classroom environments, will serve both our students and the university well. The Student Success Council is charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing both short and long term strategies to impact student retention/success.

270.11.1 Membership. The Student Success Council will be composed of twenty (20) members. The members of the Assessment Council will be appointed as follows: The Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs; six (6) Associate Deans, one appointed from each College and the Library; one (1) faculty member at-large, appointed by Faculty Senate; one (1) representative from SASC; the Director of New Student Programs; the Assistant Treasurer and University Bursar; two students, one undergraduate and one graduate; the Assistant Vice President for Student Auxiliary Services; one (1) Staff Council representative; the Director of Student Activities and Organizations; the General Education Coordinator; the Director of Financial Aid; the Registrar; and the Director of Marketing.

270.11.2 Chair. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be the Chair of the Council.

### FAC Recommendation

270.11 Student Success Council. Student success is a strategic priority of Indiana State University. Student retention and degree completion, while maintaining high academic standards and challenging classroom environments, serves our ultimate goals. To that end, the mission of the Student Success Council is (1) to focus attention and energy on key issues affecting undergraduate student success by raising and forwarding a thoughtful dialogue, (2) to provide oversight for and evaluation of the university's strategic retention and completion initiatives, (3) to advise and advocate regarding policy and resource allocation in support of student success, and (4) to expect the use of data in concert with a broad, university-wide perspective to inform decision making.

270.11.1 Membership. The Student Success Council will be composed of 22 members. The members will be appointed as follows: The Associate Vice President for Student Success; six (6) Assistant or Associate Deans, one appointed from each College and the Library; two (2) faculty members at-large appointed by Faculty Senate; a representative from the Center for Student Success (formerly the Student Academic Services Center); the Director of New Student Programs; the Associate Vice President and Assistant Treasurer; two undergraduate students appointed by the Student Government Association; the Director of the African American Cultural Center; a representative from the University College; the Chair of the Foundational Studies Council; the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs; the Director of Financial Aid; the Registrar; the Executive Director of Residential Life and Housing; and the Executive Director of Career Services.

270.11.2 Chair. The Associate Vice President for Student Success shall be the Chair of the Council.

### SAC Recommendation

**270.11 Student Success Council.** Student success is a strategic priority of Indiana State University. Student retention and degree completion, while maintaining high academic standards and challenging classroom environments, serves our ultimate goals. To that end, the mission of the Student Success Council is (1) to focus attention and energy on key issues affecting undergraduate student success by raising and forwarding a thoughtful dialogue, (2) to provide oversight for and evaluation of the university's strategic retention and completion initiatives, (3) to advise and advocate regarding policy and resource allocation in support of student success, and (4) to expect the use of data in concert with a broad, university-wide perspective to inform decision making.

**270.11.1 Membership.** The Student Success Council will be composed of 22 members. The members will be appointed as follows: The Associate Vice President for Student Success; six (6) Assistant or Associate Deans, one appointed from each College and the Library; two (2) faculty members at-large appointed by Faculty Senate; a representative from the Center for Student Success (formerly the Student Academic Services Center); the Director of New Student Programs; the Associate Vice President and Assistant Treasurer; two undergraduate students appointed by the Student Government Association; the Director of the African American Cultural Center; a representative from the University College; the Chair of the Foundational Studies Council; the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs; the Director of Financial Aid; the Registrar; the Executive Director of Residential Life and Housing; and the Executive Director of Career Services.

**270.11.2 Chair.** The Associate Vice President for Student Success shall be the Chair of the Council.

## File 3

Motion in reponse to permanent charge to nominate faculty for service on Faculty Awards committees.

October 18, 2013 approved, unanimously

FAC members reviewed membership requirements stipulated in the Handbook, last year's awards committee members (as reported in the program from Faculty Honors Dinner, no term of service listed), record of past awardees, and the list of faculty who indicated a willingness to serve on any awards committee. FAC recommends the following nominees to membership on the 2013-2014 Awards committees. *(Note: FAC observed again this year that the charge to develop a slate of nominees would require less time if we had access to a list of returning committee members each year; while the handbook does not specify term of service, we know that some committees carry a term. Also, FAC recommends that the Executive Committee consider the stipulations that accompany each award with the goal of considering minimizing differences, supporting efficient operations, and establishing terms of service.)*

#### **For Dreiser Research Award**

NHHS --Tim Demchak - Associate and Dera Mallory- Full

SCOB -- Jim Buffington – Associate and Jeff Harper- Full

BCOE -- Catharine Tucker – Associate and Feng-Qi Lai- Full

CAS -- Aaron Morales- Associate and Shannon Barton-Bellessa– Full

COT -- Tad Foster- Full and Barbara Eversole- Assistant

Library -- Cinda May- Associate and Steve Hardin- Associate

#### **For Caleb Mills Distinguished Teaching Award**

Library -- Marsha Miller – Lib.

A&S -- Rich Kjonaas- Full (winner)

NHHS -- Jolynn Kuhlman- Full (winner)

BCOE -- Susan Kiger- Associate

COT -- James Smallwood- Full (winner)

SCOB --Tom Harris- Associate

**For Distinguished Service Award**

Kathy Bauserman -- COE

Julie Fine – CNHHS

Bob Guell – CAS

Jen Latimer --CAS

David Malooley –COT

Cat Patterson – CNHSS

## File 4

Motion in response to charge to review process by which the Senate parliamentarian is selected.

October 18, 2013 approved unanimously

The Faculty Affairs Committee recognizes the contradiction in the position of Parliamentarian as it is described in current constitutional language and practiced by the Senate.

FAC discussed the value of selecting the Senate parliamentarian from among the faculty elected to the Executive Committee. We considered that the Parliamentarian be selected from the members of the Senate who would then be tasked to the EC for that purpose. A majority of members felt that would represent extraordinary service by a Senator. We recommend revisions to the Constitution that describe what we understand to be current practice. In doing so, we acknowledge that the EC member nominated to serve as Parliamentarian at the first meeting of the EC in early August will act in that capacity prior to confirmation by the Senate members at the first Senate meeting in late August.

FAC recommends the following revision in the relevant section of the Constitution:

### **245.3.4 Officers of the University Faculty Senate.**

**245.3.4.1 Composition.** The officers of the University Faculty Senate shall be a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson, a Secretary, and a Parliamentarian. Only elected faculty members may serve as officers.

**245.3.4.2 Term.** The officers shall serve for one (1) year but may be re-elected.

**245.3.4.3 Timing.** The Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and the Secretary of the newly constituted University Faculty Senate shall be elected at the first organizational meeting. The

Parliamentarian shall be nominated by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate at its first meeting. This nomination shall be presented for confirmation by the members of the Faculty Senate at the first meeting of the Senate each fall.

**245.3.4.4 Presiding Officers.** The University President, or in his/her absence the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall preside at the organizational meeting of the newly constituted University Faculty Senate meeting until the officers are elected.

Current Language

**245.3.4 Officers of the University Faculty Senate.**

**245.3.4.1 Composition.** The officers of the University Faculty Senate shall be a Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson, a Secretary. Only elected faculty members may serve as officers.

**245.3.4.2 Term.** The officers shall serve for one (1) year but may be re-elected.

**245.3.4.3 Timing.** The officers of the newly constituted University Faculty Senate shall be elected at the first organizational meeting in April (Section 245.4.1).

**245.3.4.4 Presiding Officers.** The University President, or in his/her absence the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall preside at this meeting until the officers are elected.

**File 5a**

Josh, Darlene, Jim (and Linda if you think it appropriate)

Steve has asked me to invite you to tomorrow's Exec meeting (Darlene, you are there for another topic as well) to discuss your quite divergent points of view regarding the composition of the Student Success Council. We are very interested in hearing your views on the matter and how you (as, perhaps, representing a committee) came to them.

I remain uncertain whether this is to be a policy making body, a policy recommending body, or a policy implementing body. I am also interested in the relative value of having faculty who represent those who teach many first-year students, having faculty who represent their college, or faculty with particular expertise.

Neither Steve nor I are sure what the intention of SSC is to be and as a result cannot easily judge the merits of the divergent recommendations. We are sure our colleagues will appreciate hearing from you.

(HMSU 227 3:30)

Robert Guell

## File 5b

Motion in response to the charge to review proposed revision in description of Student Success Council

Approved unanimously October 14, 2013

### Recommendation

The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed material submitted by the AVP for Student Success and discussed especially the role of the faculty members on the Council with Dr. Dan Clark. FAC members recognize that we offer only advice on this matter. Our discussions identified two concerns about the composition of the committee that we believe may limit the effectiveness of the Council.

The Council membership is very large, regardless of purpose or composition of membership. While we are not certain it is possible to reduce the members, we do recommend changes in the composition. Specifically, we recommend that the proposed list of members:

1. exclude nearly all “duplicate” members (i.e. members from the same unit and/or reporting line);

The proposed membership is broadly and deeply inclusive of university units. While it is desirable to establish a table that includes representatives from each relevant unit, it does not appear necessary to include multiple representatives from any unit. We note that more than one of the proposed members is in a direct reporting line to another member. Given that the Council is expected to raise the level of attention paid to student success across the university, we take it for granted that members will go back to their units and discuss the Council’s deliberations, initiatives, and needs. Further, duplicate members over-represent a unit and a reporting line. We reviewed the University Organizational Chart in an effort to identify “duplicate” representatives; we are not confident we were reviewing a current chart.

2. include a faculty representative from each college (i.e. the elected head of the faculty governance body of each college: Chair of Foundational Studies Council, Chair of CAS Faculty Council, etc.)

The stated goal of “raising and forwarding a thoughtful dialogue” about “key issues affecting undergraduate student success” would predict the presence of more than three faculty members, two of whom serve “at-large” rather than as a consequence of a position (i.e. Chair of the Foundational Studies Council). We argue that including one faculty member representative from each College (except the CGPS) will increase the likelihood that a dialogue will emerge and be sustained within colleges and departments.

The proposed membership includes the chair of the governing council of the University College; FAC recommends that membership should be extended to the chairs of the governing bodies of

the remaining undergraduate colleges, or a designee. We recognize that this recommendation may contradict the first recommendation; if there is a choice to be made between increasing faculty involvement and decreasing the membership of the Council, FAC supports the former.

3. omit a specific number of members in description

### FAC Suggested Revision of Handbook

270.11.1 Membership. The members of the Student Success Council will be appointed as follows: The Associate Vice President for Student Success; one Assistant or Associate Dean (or equivalent) appointed from each College, and the Library, excluding the CGPS; two (2) faculty members at-large appointed by Faculty Senate; the Associate Vice President and Assistant Treasurer; two undergraduate students appointed by the Student Government Association; the Director of the African American Cultural Center; the faculty chair of the governing bodies of each College and the Library, excluding the Graduate Council, the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs; the Director of Financial Aid, the Registrar, and the Executive Director of Career Services.

*Note: Colleges include BCOE, CAS, CNHHS, COT, SCOB, and UC. FAC notes that Dir of Financial Aid reports to VPEM, Dir of Career Services reports to AVPCE, Registrar reports to AVPFA; their presence constitutes representation from those areas. Also, of course, other others may be invited to attend Council meetings--Residential Life, new student initiatives, student success center, student support services report to the chair of the Council and can attend, without voting rights, at his request.*

### Student Success Council Proposed Revisions to Handbook Language (dft 8/31/13)

270.11 Student Success Council. Student success is a strategic priority of Indiana State University. Student retention and degree completion, while maintaining high academic standards and challenging classroom environments, serves our ultimate goals. To that end, the mission of the Student Success Council is (1) to focus attention and energy on key issues affecting undergraduate student success by raising and forwarding a thoughtful dialogue, (2) to provide oversight for and evaluation of the university's strategic retention and completion initiatives, (3) to advise and advocate regarding policy and resource allocation in support of student success, and (4) to expect the use of data in concert with a broad, university-wide perspective to inform decision making.

270.11.1 Membership. The Student Success Council will be composed of 22 members. The members will be appointed as follows: The Associate Vice President for Student Success; six (6) Assistant or Associate Deans, one appointed from each College and the Library; two (2) faculty members at-large appointed by Faculty Senate; a representative from the Center for Student Success (formerly the Student Academic Services Center); the Director of New Student Programs; the Associate Vice President and Assistant Treasurer; two undergraduate students appointed by the Student Government Association; the Director of the African American



Cultural Center; a representative from the University College; the Chair of the Foundational Studies Council; the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs; the Director of Financial Aid; the Registrar; the Executive Director of Residential Life and Housing; and the Executive Director of Career Services.

270.11.2 Chair. The Associate Vice President for Student Success shall be the Chair of the Council.

#### Current University Handbook Language

270.11 Student Success Council. Recognizing the need for increasing student success is clearly one of the strategic priorities of Indiana State University. Improving student retention, while maintain high standards and challenging classroom environments, will serve both our students and the university well. The Student Success Council is charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing both short and long term strategies to impact student retention/success.

270.11.1 Membership. The Student Success Council will be composed of twenty (20) members. The members of the Assessment Council will be appointed as follows: The Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs; six (6) Associate Deans, one appointed from each College and the Library; one (1) faculty member at-large, appointed by Faculty Senate; one (1) representative from SASC; the Director of New Student Programs; the Assistant Treasurer and University Bursar; two students, one undergraduate and one graduate; the Assistant Vice President for Student Auxiliary Services; one (1) Staff Council representative; the Director of Student Activities and Organizations; the General Education Coordinator; the Director of Financial Aid; the Registrar; and the Director of Marketing.

270.11.2 Chair. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be the Chair of the Council.

**File 5c**

**Report to Faculty Senate Executive Committee on a Proposed Change to  
the Student Success Council**

**University Student Affairs Committee**

**Jim Buffington, Chair**

**March 16, 2011**

**The Charge:** Work with AVP J Powers regarding a change to the Student Success Council as per proposal offered at 8/20/13 Exec Meeting. Note new titles of positions, bodies, and offices. Some are either not current or sufficiently specific in the proposal. **[Priority Charge]**

**Executive Summary:**

Revised Handbook Language for Student Success Council and Membership  
August 30, 2013

The Student Success Council has been an official University Committee since 2009. It was established in July of that year by Board of Trustees action with the explicit charge of “developing and implementing both short and long term strategies to impact student retention/success.” In the years since its establishment, the array of student success initiatives has grown substantially. Following extensive discussions within the Student Success Council this Spring, the Council felt that revised language was needed to better capture its role in working in this arena.

In addition, there have been a number of positional title and role changes since 2009 and the language reflects updates to that. Finally, the Council felt it important to expand faculty participation, namely moving from one to two faculty at-large appointments and adding the Chair of Foundational Studies to the Council.

Submitted by  
Joshua Powers  
Associate Vice President for Student Success  
Chair, Student Success Council

At its September 13, 2013 Meeting, SAC raised a minor concern with the size of the Council but agreed that the new language and the additional seats appeal to logic. The following proposed change to the University Handbook was approved 5-0-0.

**270.11 Student Success Council.** Student success is a strategic priority of Indiana State University. Student retention and degree completion, while maintaining high academic standards and challenging classroom environments, serves our ultimate goals. To that end, the mission of the Student Success Council is (1) to focus attention and energy on key issues affecting undergraduate student success by raising and forwarding a thoughtful dialogue, (2) to provide oversight for and evaluation of the university’s strategic retention and completion initiatives, (3) to advise and advocate regarding policy and resource allocation in support of

student success, and (4) to expect the use of data in concert with a broad, university-wide perspective to inform decision making.

**270.11.1 Membership.** The Student Success Council will be composed of 22 members. The members will be appointed as follows: The Associate Vice President for Student Success; six (6) Assistant or Associate Deans, one appointed from each College and the Library; **two (2) faculty members at-large appointed by Faculty Senate**; a representative from the Center for Student Success (formerly the Student Academic Services Center); the Director of New Student Programs; the Associate Vice President and Assistant Treasurer; two undergraduate students appointed by the Student Government Association; the Director of the African American Cultural Center; a representative from the University College; the **Chair of the Foundational Studies Council**; the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs; the Director of Financial Aid; the Registrar; the Executive Director of Residential Life and Housing; and the Executive Director of Career Services.

**270.11.2 Chair.** The Associate Vice President for Student Success shall be the Chair of the Council.

File 6a

**From:** Robert Guell (as edited by Lamb)  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 03, 2013 2:28 PM  
**To:** Steven Lamb  
**Cc:** Biff Williams; Susan Powers; Chris MacDonald  
**Subject:** Agenda item for Tuesday

Steve,

I have been piecing together a really bad scenario over the last couple of days and have come to the conclusion that Susan Powers is saying things in CAAC and MySam training sessions that need to be heard by Exec . If there is an opening in the next Exec meeting we need to have her asap.

As a for instance, I heard her say at CAAC that courses on graduation plans will not allowed to be full before the end of priority registration. For instance, your Bus 205 CANNOT fill prior to the end of priority registration. (Your ACCT and our Econ 200&201 courses routinely close before priority registration. Freshman courses routinely close in the middle of New Student Orientation.) In a different report, a colleague who got MySam training heard her say that advisors will be “accountable and liable” if they make an advising error and that advisors will have to produce an updated graduation plan for each student for each semester whether or not the advisee see the advisor.

I find Susan rarely misspeaks, so if she is not misspeaking, then there are three things Exec needs to consider with the P&P. First, what faculty member will agree to ever advise when there is legal downside and no consideration of advising in performance evaluations and no compensation. Second, how are resource allocations going to be made to accommodate the open-ended registration commitments required by the graduation guarantee. Third, how is it that Department X (when filling out its graduation plans) supposed to communicate with Department Y about Department X’s need for Department Y’s courses when course schedules, staffing decisions and resource allocations are made months prior to actual registration. History will no longer be good enough.

Robert Guell

Professor of Economics

Indiana State University

**From:** Susan Powers  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 03, 2013 3:14 PM  
**To:** Robert Guell; Steven Lamb  
**Cc:** Biff Williams; Chris MacDonald  
**Subject:** Re: Agenda item for Tuesday

I would be pleased to come talk to Exec anytime about what House Enrolled Act 1348-2013 is requiring all state institutions to do. I just received the final implementation rules for that from the Commission of Higher Education on Tuesday.

In terms of open and closed classes during priority registration, the new implementation rules state that we have to make room in classes that are identified on the degree map for students entering as new, full-time students in Fall 2014. With MySAM, we will be able to provide reports of how many students have a certain class on their plan for a particular semester. With the example of ECON 200, it would make sense to make sure that courses are placed on different majors' plan so that one particular semester is overloaded. So this year, we will need a lot of help from departments and deans' office to coordinate that type of planning. Also determining where we can put choices for students or placeholders to lessen some that impact. But yes, the implementation rules state "Guarantee course availability so that students finish on time" based on the student degree map.

In terms of accountable and liable, I will not disagree that this what someone heard, but that is an out of context statement for what I said. We were having a discussion as to who would be paying the tuition for students when a student misses a class because of advisor error or not updating a plan, etc. I did pose that if an advisor is continually and egregiously making errors that results in additional time to degree for students, then the department has a responsibility to fix that problem. I have talked repeatedly about accountability, but in the context that departments control their P&T documents and given our increased accountability and liability for accurate advising and the requirement for correctly updated degree maps, then I would think that it is important for a department to reassess who it evaluates and awards good advising.

Again, the rules for this legislation JUST came out. Believe it or not, they are radically improved from where they were a month ago, but they will have a huge impact on faculty advising. I was going to ask to be able to come talk to you all, I need to plan a meeting with the chairs to determine how we go about doing this and what informations chairs need, and etc.

# DEGREE MAPS 101

Susan M. Powers

## Creating a Degree Map

**Degree maps provide college students with a clear and direct path to on-time completion.**

### Required Elements

- ✓ Description of specific Program Major **OR** broad Major Interest Area
- ✓ Description of expected employment opportunities **OR** link to relevant career resources
- ✓ Expected on-time graduation date
- ✓ Specific required courses listed by semester
- ✓ List or link to list of possible general education courses and electives
- ✓ Milestone courses and action steps clearly identified by semester
- ✓ Minimum of 30 credits per year (include *15-to-Finish* icon and [15toFinishIndiana.org](http://15toFinishIndiana.org) link)
- ✓ Notice of financial aid credit completion requirements and FAFSA application deadline
- ✓ Dual credit, AP, and remediation included (on customized map only)
- ✓ Streamlined content (no codes, acronyms, superfluous information)

## Using the Degree Map to Guide Student Success

**A clear degree map combined with proactive advising will guide students to on-time completion.** **Step 1:** Give every student a standard degree map at orientation and registration.

Suggestion: Have students participate in a “choose your major/interest area” seminar to help guide the creation of the degree map. Note that students must choose a major by 30 credits (4-yr) or 15 (2-yr).

**Step 2:** Student customizes standard degree map in consultation with an academic advisor.

Suggestion: Use predictive analytics or transcript analysis to suggest 2-3 courses for a student in a given elective slot. Use Major Interest Areas to better prescribe courses for undeclared students.

**Step 3:** College integrates the degree map into the registration and advising process every semester.

Suggestion: Set up registration processes so that the student’s map courses are the default selection. Streamline registration (early registration, preferential course selection) if students select map courses.

**Step 4:** College uses the map to provide targeted proactive advising for students that go off of their degree map, fail milestone courses, transfer, change major, or let their GPA fall below 2.0 or SAP.

*Suggestion: Schedule mandatory meeting with advisor for students whenever these issues arise.*

**Step 5:** Guarantee course availability so that students finish on time.

*Suggestion: Use the collective maps as a representation of “customer demand” and schedule courses proactively to meet that demand and remain unaffected by the legislated “free course” guarantee.*



INDIANA COMMISSION  
HIGHER *for* EDUCATION

# Degree Map Guidance for Indiana's Public Colleges and Universities

**Published by the Commission for Higher Education  
Pursuant to HEA 1348-2013**

*October 1, 2013*



## INTRODUCTION

Indiana's economy needs college graduates. By the year 2025, nearly two-thirds of jobs will require a degree or quality workforce credential. Sadly, only one-third of Hoosier adults have reached this level of educational attainment. Indiana has set a Big Goal that 60 percent of Hoosier adults obtain a degree or credential by the year 2025 to meet the needs of the economy and to increase the income and opportunities afforded to Hoosiers. To meet that goal, more high school students must continue their education after graduation and more working adults need to come back to school. But the aspiration is not enough. For every 10 students who enter the doors of an Indiana college, only 5 will graduate. Only half of those who do graduate finish on-time. This low completion rate represents a huge missed opportunity for our state. To meet the Big Goal, Indiana must pursue every option to help students who aspire to a college degree graduate, and do so in shorter time and at a lower cost.

The stakes are high for all students. An additional year of college can cost a Hoosier student nearly \$50,000 in extra tuition, lost wages and related costs. For students whose dreams are supported by state financial aid programs, on-time graduation is even more critical because this aid is limited to four years. And for any student who incurs debt to finance a college degree, failure to graduate represents a worst-case scenario: debt and no degree.

To improve our state's graduation rates, students, colleges and the State must embrace a shared responsibility in higher education. Students must make the commitment to enroll in classes at the *on-time* pace of 15 credits per semester and follow through by completing the courses in which they enroll. The 2013 Indiana General Assembly set this as the standard for financial aid recipients, requiring them to complete 30 credits per calendar year to stay eligible for the standard financial aid award.<sup>1</sup> To reinforce this signal for all students, the Commission has partnered with Indiana's public and private colleges and universities to send the signal to all students through a "15-to-Finish" public awareness campaign that explains the benefit of enrolling in 15 credits each semester and completing milestone courses early.

At the same time, universities must provide students with the tools necessary to graduate on-time and at a lower cost. To meet this challenge, Indiana colleges have cut back program requirements to fit within the limits of 60 credits for an associate degree and 120 for a bachelor's degree. They worked together to create a guaranteed-transfer general education core and will soon have guaranteed transfer of a 2-year degree to 4-year institutions. Many have implemented their own student incentives such as tuition freezes for on-time graduates and graduation bonuses.<sup>2</sup> However, some students continue to report that they do not have a clear path to graduation and that advising, if available, does not always steer them in the right direction.

---

<sup>1</sup>A discounted award is available for financial aid recipients that complete between 24-29 credits per year.

<sup>2</sup>Purdue University froze tuition for the next two academic years at its West Lafayette campus; Indiana University is freezing tuition for upperclassmen who are on track for on-time graduation; Ball State University and Vincennes University offer some type of graduation bonus, and Indiana University-Kokomo offers a reduced tuition rate; Indiana University and the University of Southern Indiana offer reduced summer tuition to help students stay on track for on-time or early graduation.

One strategy that has proven successful in addressing these challenges is the implementation of degree maps – a semester-by-semester list of courses a student must take to graduate on-time. Georgia State University combined degree maps with a new model of proactive advising and increased their graduation rates by more than 20 percentage points over ten years. At Florida State University, the implementation of degree maps increased graduation rates 12 percent and closed the achievement gap of low-income and underrepresented students.<sup>3</sup> Florida also found that degree maps helped the bottom line; they invested roughly \$2 million in the program, while the increased retention rates brought in tuition that was \$8 million above historical averages. Other schools have used degree maps to better plan course offerings and classroom space and used them to plan faculty schedules and sabbaticals.

Recognizing the promise of this practice, Governor Pence and the Commission for Higher Education strongly urged the Indiana General Assembly to pass House Enrolled Act 1348-2013 which established, for the first time, a requirement that public colleges provide degree maps to all new full-time students.<sup>4</sup> It also provides a course-scheduling guarantee to these students; if a course on a student’s degree map for a particular semester is not offered or is full, the institution must provide the course for free in a future semester unless it provides a revised degree map. The Act directs the Indiana Commission for Higher Education to work in consultation with state educational institutions to provide guidance for establishing degree maps, including:

1. Procedures for establishing a degree map, including requirements for adjusting a degree map when a student changes his/her major;
2. Requirements and guidance for colleges to determine when the college must offer a course at no cost to the student; and
3. Any other provisions the Commission determines are necessary.

The purpose of this document is to provide said guidance, in accordance with the Act. This guidance has been developed with input and direction from fifteen university representatives, spanning various functions of administration and with representation from each of the public institutions. The guidance has been developed with an eye toward embracing the work done by colleges and universities prior to the establishment of this new mandate. It will provide some guidance that is required and some guidance that is optional. It will explain what the Commission sees as necessities for any degree map offered by public colleges, and will provide guidance for handling “special circumstances (e.g. transfer, major changes, and students who do not declare majors when they initially enroll). It will also outline how institutions should handle the scheduling and free course provisions. The final important component of the document will outline how technology can and should be used to produce and distribute degree maps.

## **A FEW DEFINITIONS**

A few terms will be used throughout this document and need to be first defined. The guidance that follows will explain which of these are required and which are suggested.

---

<sup>3</sup> Complete College America. *Guided Pathways to Success*.

<sup>4</sup>New refers to first-time full-time students. The Act can be viewed in its entirety at <http://www.in.gov/legislative/bills/2013/HE/HE1348.1.html>.

According to the statute, a **“Degree map”** refers to a student reference developed by a state educational institution under guidelines developed by the commission under IC 21-12-14-1 that provides an academic term by academic term sequence of course options that will allow a full-time student to complete:

(1) a baccalaureate degree within four (4) academic years; or

(2) an associate degree within two (2) academic years;

in the student's intended field of study. The reference must specify the expected date that the student will earn a baccalaureate degree or an associate degree and the academic requirements that a student should complete each academic year to timely earn a degree.

**“Student,”** when used in this document in relation to the degree map, refers to a full-time student that is eligible to receive a degree map.

**“Two- and Four- Years”** in the context of on-time graduation refers to the number of terms that constitutes two or four academic years.

An **“Interest Area”** as used in this document refers to a broad category of majors and is suggested in the guidance. For instance, a Social Sciences Interest Area might encompass majors such as anthropology, psychology, sociology and economics while a STEM Interest Area would cover biology, chemistry, mathematics and engineering, among others. It is suggested that a single institution have 10 or fewer Interest Areas from which incoming freshman would choose. The institution should determine which interest areas are most appropriate given its degree offerings.

A **“Milestone Course”** is one that a student must be able to pass to persist and succeed in a particular major. Students who want to be nurses, for example, should know that they are expected to be proficient in courses like biology in order to be successful. These would be identified by the institutions for each degree program. There may also be milestone “action items” that a student should complete, such as applying for graduation during senior year.

A **“General Education Requirement”** is a requirement that students must complete one course from a particular list, but the student is able to select the course they will take to fulfill the requirement. By contrast, an **“Elective”** is a slot on a degree map that can be satisfied by any course in the course catalog.

A **“Resident Student”** who is entitled to receive a degree map refers to an Indiana resident, not a student living on-campus.

## **PROCEDURES FOR GIVING STUDENTS A DEGREE MAP**

To be the most impactful for students, a degree map must be both *relevant* and *prevalent* throughout a student's time on campus. To be relevant, the map needs to be dynamic as student's circumstances change, whether the student changes course of study, changes majors, or transfers to a new school. To be prevalent, it should be a key guidepost for a student's progress through the degree program. As such, it should be discussed with advisors, professors, and other individuals who help guide student choice and be readily available to students when they are making course-scheduling decisions.

## Required Procedures

Degree maps must be offered to all students at public institutions beginning with first-time full-time students first entering in AY 14-15. The Commission wants to allow for as much freedom as possible in how maps are conveyed to students. Institutions may select the template, formatting and mode of delivery that best meets the needs of their students. In terms of requirements, institutions must provide a degree map to students upon entry and update the student's degree map when student circumstances change (see section entitled HANDLING SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES for more). This will be a multi-step process. First, the institution should select an "entry point" to give students a standard degree map, assuming no credit at entry or remedial needs. This could be when the student is admitted to the university, upon matriculation, at orientation, or during registration. Then, during the first semester the student should meet with an academic advisor, at which point a customized degree map will be given. It is the responsibility of students to ensure that the university has been notified of AP and dual credit or received a transfer transcript (if applicable) in a timely manner. With the customized degree map, universities may employ messaging to encourage students to shape their own unique educational experience in consultation with an advisor.

In future semesters, institutions must present the student with their customized degree maps or degree audits at each semester registration or integrate it into the registration process. While various strategies could be employed, the intent is that students have their up-to-date degree map made *readily available* to them during registration without the students having to request or locate it ahead of time. Universities are not required to put a hold on students' records to comply with this procedure, but are instead encouraged to integrate the map data more seamlessly into the registration process.

## Suggested Procedures

The Commission has suggestions for institutions to consider, in addition to the required guidance above. It would be helpful to have students either declare a major or select an Interest Area upon entering the institution to help guide the development of the degree map. The use of Interest Areas is meant to allow students to make a choice about their educational path even if they are not ready to select a major, providing a middle ground between having declared a major and having remained entirely exploratory. A significant portion of the student population changes majors during their academic career. Colorado State University, for example, calculated that on average 37% of incoming new undergraduates change their major at least once and that each change in major increases the time to graduation by about a half a semester.<sup>5</sup> The use of Interest Areas can help students make a broader choice and perhaps avoid selecting a major early without adequate experience or information, which would then lead to a later change in major.

This will work best if students have an opportunity to reflect on their options; it is suggested that the institution provide overviews of Interest Areas at the time of entry and allow students to take an interest inventory or use other exploratory tools to help determine an Interest

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.ir.colostate.edu/pdf/briefs/Major-Changes-and-Persistence-Patterns.pdf>

Area. This would provide students with more direction, and ultimately would serve the interests of the institution in seeing students make wise educational choices. As a practical matter, the use of Interest Areas can inform the creation of a degree map for a student who has yet to declare a major; students will be more likely to take courses that align with their interests, making them more likely to persist and less likely to take courses that will not count toward graduation.

While degree maps are required only for resident students who first enter college in AY 2014-15 or after, we suggest making degree mapping a standard practice for all students, including non-residents and transfer students.

## **ELEMENTS OF THE DEGREE MAP**

### Required Procedures

It is in the area of content that the Commission will be most prescriptive with respect to the degree maps. Institutions should feel free to make additions to the required items, if they feel that these additions will have a positive impact on student success. Many of the required elements focus on the intent of the legislation: providing a clear path for students to graduate on-time and helping state financial aid recipients stay on track to meet credit completion requirements. Others are designed specifically with the goal of a “student-friendly” degree map in mind. Each of the elements listed in this section are required. For more detail on which are required for the standard map, customized map, or both, please see Appendix A.

#### *“On-Time Completion” Elements*

The INTRODUCTION to this document detailed a number of policies and practices designed to signal to students a standard of 30 credits per year for on-time completion. These include the financial aid credit completion requirements, the 15-to-Finish Campaign and the various institutional policies that reward on-time completion. It is important that the degree map reinforce the “30 credit per year” standard (or in some cases, requirement) and incorporate other related messages as well. Each map should have a 15-to-finish icon or banner somewhere on the map. It should also clearly mention that 30 credit hours is the benchmark for full financial aid eligibility. The map must tell students that if they follow the map and find a course unavailable, they may be eligible to take that course free of charge in a future semester (more on the details of this later in the document). Finally, the semester-by-semester list of courses should sum to no fewer than 30 credits by the end of the first year, 60 by the end of the second, and 90 by the end of the third.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> There may be limited exceptions to this requirement. Specifically, a small number of programs comprising courses that are not all 3-credit hours courses may have been designed for 29 credits in the first year (with 31 in a future year) to meet the standard 120 credit hour expectation. In this case, it is permissible to map fewer than 30/60/90 credits *for students not receiving state financial aid*. All students who receive state financial aid must have maps that enable them to meet the 30/60/90 benchmarks tied to their aid eligibility.

### *“Student-Friendly” Elements*

The easiest way to guarantee on-time graduation would be for the degree map to list a *single* course for each particular requirement. That ease, however, must be balanced against the desire and ability of students to shape their own educational experience. Therefore, the map should be a list of *specific courses* for each slot on the map that can only be satisfied by a particular course. For general education requirements, a university may either list 1-3 options on the map itself or link to or attach a list of options provided the link/attachment contains only courses that comply with that particular requirement (as opposed to linking to something more general like a course catalog). Additional suggestions for the link/list are included under “Suggested Procedures.”

To meet the test of relevance, *customized* degree maps should also contain other components which account for a student’s previously earned credits. The customized map, done during first semester, must incorporate a student’s dual credit and/or advanced placement work and show it as completed; students should not feel confused as to whether or not their previous work will count toward their degree. For transfer students, the map must incorporate any transferred coursework accepted by the new institution, as on-time completion will ultimately be based on when the student initially enrolled at the first institution. (There are some exceptions in the case of transfer that allow for a degree map to extend beyond 2 or 4 years. Please see the section entitled HANDLING SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES for more.)

Institutions should ensure student-friendly degree maps through a number of other seemingly minor considerations. Reducing the number of (or, better yet, avoiding entirely) acronyms, superfluous information and codes (other than course names like A101) would go far in providing students with an easy-to-understand, streamlined map. Information should be provided about the major or Interest Area a student has chosen, including the type of work that a student is expected to be prepared for upon graduation, to allow students to consider the program requirements in the context of return on investment. Institutions could employ various strategies, including placing text directly on the map or directing students to a career center website. (The Commission’s reports on Return of Investment could be referenced if the institution wishes.) Milestone courses, as described above and defined by the institution, should also be clearly identified on the map. Finally, pursuant to the new law, the degree map must list the expected graduation date (assuming continuous enrollment).

### Suggested Procedures

Many of the existing degree maps point students to a list of options, or use generic terms such as “mathematics requirement” that imply an array of choices. This approach fails to address a key challenge. Students presented with extensive choices without adequate information about the options may experience paralysis or make poor decisions. A report done by the Commission and Public Agenda found that some students themselves voiced a preference for more specific guidance. While schools have varying degrees of complexity or options in their requirements, there are many cases where students could be overwhelmed and would benefit from additional guidance. Many state institutions have expansive lists of courses spanning many departments that satisfy general

education requirements. A student might be faced with hundreds of courses from which they pick one or two to fulfill such a requirement.

To overcome these challenges and give students more advice through the degree map, it is suggested that institutions list 1-3 suggested courses for each general education requirement or optional course. Two successful strategies have been employed by other institutions to provide these suggestions. Both are data-driven and evidence-based. This is critical; the alternative to using data to develop suggestions is to make university-level policy choices which would create additional competition among the departments and faculty and not necessarily provide the best chance for student success. Note that the suggested courses could be student-facing (on the map) or advisor-facing in an internal system that would enable advisors to more efficiently work with students to develop customized maps.

The first approach to course suggestion is predictive analytics, which employs models that use students' past performance, selected major and other factors to determine courses in which they have the highest probability of success. (Austin Peay University has developed a model that predicts with over 90 percent accuracy whether a student will pass or fail a course.)

The other solution is to rely on transcript analysis of what students in a particular major *tend to take* for each elective. Many departments already convey to their students that there are preferred electives. Whether students tend to make a particular choice because it is strongly advised, because it is the most efficient path forward, or because particular types of students prefer particular types of courses, transcript analysis can provide an evidence-based "best path" for students within a major or departments.

If these strategies are not employed and colleges choose instead to rely on linked lists, we strongly suggest that the list contain the following information to help students make informed choices about which elective to take:

- The link/attachment clearly indicates the pre-requisites that are required for each course so that the student can easily check if the pre-requisites are mapped for a prior semester
- The list enables students to understand which courses fulfill multiple requirements
- The list indicates which courses are part of the core transfer library

## **HANDLING SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES**

### Required Procedures

Institutions may inquire as to how to handle degree maps where there are special circumstances. Those circumstances may include students who do not declare a major or Interest Area when they initially enroll; students who change a major or Interest Area at some point after initial enrollment; students who transfer from one institution to another; and students who are in need of remedial coursework (especially relevant to two-year institutions). One way to handle some of these issues is by *partially completing* the degree map when a student initially enrolls; this is a particularly useful strategy in the case of students who do not select a major or Interest Area.

### *Four-Year Institutions*

Students who have selected a major should have a full map complete with specific courses. Students who have not selected a major should have the first 30 credit hours mapped, based on the general education core, and then receive a full map when they have selected a major at or before the 30-credit mark. If a student has selected an Interest Area, the map should likewise extend only 30 credits until a major is selected, but the courses within those 30 credits should be more customized to the student's academic goals.

### *Two-Year Institutions*

Students who have selected a major should have a full map complete with specific courses. Students who have not selected a major should have the first 15 credit hours mapped, based on the general education core, and then receive a full map when they have selected a major at or before the 15-credit mark. If a student has selected an Interest Area, the map should likewise extend only 15 credits until a major is selected, but the courses within those 15 credits should be more customized to the student's academic goals.

The statute requires institutions to give on-time degree maps to students. However, in certain cases students may have made decisions during their academic path that make it unlikely for them to graduate on-time through no fault of the institution. In such cases, as the institution updates the customized map it is permissible for the map to be an *extended-time* map. Any student meeting the following conditions *must still have a degree map* but the map may extend beyond the two- or four-year time horizons. However, every effort should be made to ensure on-time graduation whenever possible. Even if a student has an extended-time map, that student is still eligible for the "free course guarantee" discussed in the next section for the courses as mapped on their extended-time map. In addition, institutions should work with students who express a desire to graduate on-time despite these circumstances, including academic and financial aid counseling where appropriate, to provide them with a map for on-time completion.

Circumstances that allow an extended-time map to be used include:

- Students who change their majors within the same Interest Area after earning 60 credits
- Student who change their majors into a different Interest Area after earning 30 credits
- Students who fail to obtain entry into a competitive-admission major or school
- Students who are enrolled in Commission-approved programs that exceed 60 or 120 credits
- Students who have declared double-majors or minors that extend their program requirements beyond 60 or 120 credits
- Students who transfer to another institution after earning 60 credit hours
- Students who shift academic focus or pathway as they transfer from a two-year institution to a four-year institution
- Students who are identified as needing more than six credits of developmental or remedial coursework. This coursework includes credit-bearing courses that a student is directed to take to prepare for a particular major that are not part of that major's degree requirements.



- Students who are not meeting Satisfactory Academic Progress or are not in good academic standing with the institution overall
- Students who fail to adhere to the degree map by not completing 30 credits in an academic year due to course withdrawals or incompletes
- Students in the military who have scheduled deployments or other special circumstances, though *every effort should be made* to develop a path to graduation within two or four years' worth of terms, even if the student does not enroll in consecutive terms.

One issue that should *not* be reason for an extended-time map is remediation (except in extreme cases). Remediation has been a persistent problem for universities, secondary schools, the Commission, and most importantly, for students. While remediation creates additional burdens on students in terms of courses to take, new approaches should help alleviate the number of remedial credits students must earn before enrolling in college-level work. Institutions should strive to find ways for students with moderate developmental needs to graduate on-time and to make clear to students the implications of remedial work on their expected graduation date. Therefore, for a student who needs remediation, the customized degree map must include those remedial classes.<sup>7</sup> If the student's remediation needs are six or fewer credit hours, the map should still provide for on-time completion. Summer sessions may be mapped to make this possible. Schools that opt to use a co-requisite approach to remediation should find this to be an easy situation to accommodate.

## **COURSE SCHEDULING AND AVAILABILITY**

### Required Procedures

HEA 1348-2013 contains a provision requiring institutions to provide (at no cost to the student) any course on a student's map for which the student cannot enroll (because it is full, offered only at the same time as another mapped class, or is simply not offered). **Please note that the free course guarantee is written into the law and the Commission has no authority to alter that directive.** The guarantee applies to students that have complied with their degree maps. If a course is not available for a student (whether it is full, offered only at the same time as another mapped class or is simply not offered), the institution faces a choice: either it can provide a new map to the student, or provide the course free of charge to the student in the next available semester. The ideal solution would be to avoid this situation altogether by proactively ensuring that courses listed on degree maps are available to students. This is supported by the legislation which states that schools "shall ensure that courses necessary for the student to comply with the student's degree map are available for the student during the academic term in which the student is required to complete the particular course." In the following section we present suggested procedures with that goal in mind. In the event that the course is not available, the student is entitled to the free course.

---

<sup>7</sup> Note also that the remedial coursework, pursuant to CHE policy, should be completed at the 2-year institutions. This may require coordination between schools for the purpose of degree maps.

To determine that a student is entitled to the “free course guarantee,” the university should verify the following:

- The student has followed his or her degree map in each prior semester, meaning the student completed the prescribed courses or satisfied the prescribed electives in the semester they were mapped.
- The student is unable to register for a course mapped for the current semester because it is not offered, offered only at the same time as another mapped course, or is full. Note that the course is considered full only if *all sections* of the course are full, not just the student’s preferred time slot. If an online version is available to the student, the course is considered available to that student even if he or she prefers a different modality. For general education requirements with multiple options, all sections of eligible options must be full, not just the student’s preferred choice.
- The student attempted to register for the course during the *typical* registration period (sometimes called priority registration). Universities may set policies that exclude *late registrants* from the free course guarantee provided that *late registrant* is clearly defined and the policy is made publicly available on the university’s website.
- The student has not received a revised degree map that maps the unavailable course in a future semester without altering the graduation date.
- The student is within 150 percent of the standard time to complete the degree (two or four years).

Universities should develop a simple and transparent process for students to follow to claim the free course guarantee. Universities should track the free courses given in a particular year by student and course number. The Commission may request that information for policy analysis or to investigate a student complaint.

### Suggested Procedures

The “free course” provision poses some fiscal challenges for institutions, but also provides some incentive for institutions to re-think their current approaches to scheduling and existing course offerings. It provides an opportunity for institutions to think strategically about whether a course should really be included on a map, particularly if it is not regularly offered or experiences low enrollments (which prompt cancellation). Institutions can, and probably should, use the degree maps as a means of thinking more broadly about what courses to offer and when to offer them.

The strongest strategy to ensure course availability would be to automatically enroll students in their map classes (and provide them with instructions for opting out) and base course offerings around the assumption that most students will follow their maps. Note that this approach would require some consent or streamlined registration from these students since registration is a contract between the student and the institution and results in a financial liability for the student. This approach is supported by research<sup>8</sup> showing that establishing a desirable outcome as the

<sup>8</sup> For example, Thaler, Richard H. and Cass R. Sustein, 2008. *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

*default* selection increases the tendency of people to make that choice. In this case, the desirable outcome is that students stick to their maps, creating predictability for the student and the school and increasing on-time graduation rates.

A more moderate strategy would be to more fully integrate the degree map into the registration process through use of defaults. Specifically, when students log in for registration, the courses listed on their degree map could be pre-populated as the suggested selections for the semester. These students could be afforded the ability to change the section of the course or pick a different course, with the latter flagging a warning that the student has deviated from the map, if this occurs. This integration and use of defaults would increase the likelihood that students adhere to their degree maps, again creating predictability for the purpose of course scheduling.

Another suggestion that has been successfully employed by some of our universities is to offer a “rain check” or priority registration for the next semester. We suggest this as an additional student benefit (supplementing, not replacing the free course). This is particularly important for students near the end of their academic sequence, for whom a free course in a future semester may still extend graduation time and add cost to the degree even if the course itself is free.

## **WHAT TECHNOLOGY IS REQUIRED?**

In this area, the Commission wants to allow for the most flexibility for schools and their vendors to promote innovative approaches to dealing with the technological challenges. After conducting a survey of public institutions, many already have programs in place to handle most of the requirements of a degree map. Specifically, schools have degree audit programs which currently function in many ways like degree maps: they list specific courses or course options, are organized by semester, and sometimes reflect dual credit and advanced placement coursework.

Universities are responsible for making decisions of what technology to use to produce a degree map. Presumably, existing degree audit software and related, interactive planning software, is a logical place for institutions to start, but certainly are not the only available platform that a university could select. Universities should begin working with their information technology offices to generate a sample degree map. Sample degree maps must be sent to the Commission by April 2014 for verification that the maps conform to this guidance.

As degree maps become an established fact, and as we gain more experience with their functionality, the institutions and the Commission need to consider ways in which the technology platforms underlying the degree maps can evolve in more coordinated and integrated ways in the future, so that a more seamless experience for students can be achieved. This will make it easier for high school students to explore potential majors at different institutions and to understand how dual credit courses will apply to different programs. It will also allow college students to consider transfer opportunities, ease the transition from one institution to another after they have actually transferred, and remain on their degree map.

## **CONCLUSION**

New full-time undergraduate students attending public institutions must be presented with degree maps beginning in the 2014-2015 academic year. This guidance should provide institutions with a path forward to developing and refining degree maps to meet the specifications of HEA 1348-2013 and existing Commission policy.

## APPENDIX A

Requirement	Standard Map	Customized Map
Description of specific Program Major <b>OR</b> broad Major Interest Area	required	required
Description of expected employment opportunities <b>OR</b> link to relevant career	required	required
Expected on-time graduation date	not required	required
Specific required courses listed by semester	required	required
List or link to list of possible general education courses and electives	required	required
Milestone courses and action steps clearly identified by semester	required	required
Minimum of 30 credits per year*	required	required
Incorporate 15-to-Finish message	required	not required
Notice of financial aid credit completion requirements and FAFSA application	required	required
Dual credit, AP, and remediation included	not required	required
Streamlined content (no codes, acronyms, superfluous information)	required	required

\*with limited exceptions

### Procedures For Reviews of Long Programs

To be completed for each concentration in each major program.

71 or Fewer Hours	Able to be Completed in 8 Semesters	Able to be Completed in 7 Semesters	Able to be Completed in 6 Semesters	Procedure
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Yes	Yes	Yes	No	2
Yes	Yes	No	No	3
No	Yes	Yes	Yes	4
No	Yes	Yes	No	5
No	Yes	No	No	6

Procedure	Work Done by	Sent to	Includes
1	Chairperson	Dean <sup>1</sup>	Package 1
2	Chairperson	Dean <sup>1</sup>	Package 2
3	Chairperson & Department	Dean & AA <sup>2</sup>	Package 3
4	Chairperson & Department	Dean & AA <sup>2</sup>	Package 4
5	Chairperson & Department	Dean & AA <sup>2</sup>	Package 5
6	Chairperson & Department	Dean & AA <sup>2</sup>	Package 6

1. The report is sent to your College where it will be reviewed by the Dean's Office. The results will be communicated to CAAC
2. The report is sent to your College where it will be reviewed by the Dean's Office. It will then be forwarded to Academic Affairs and reviewed by CAAC.

**Actions requested by Departments**

Package	Elements
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A signed letter/email from the department chairperson to the Dean affirming the credit hours required for the major/concentration are under 72.</li> <li>2) A 6/7 Semester Sequence Plan showing that a student can complete the major in six semesters.</li> </ol>
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A signed letter/email from the department chairperson to the Dean affirming the credit hours required for the major/concentration are under 72. The letter should include a paragraph explaining what courses/requirements/prerequisites make it impossible to complete in six semesters. The letter should include a paragraph detailing the timing of the next accreditation (if any) or internal program review.</li> <li>2) A 6/7 Semester Sequence Plan showing that a student can complete the major in seven semesters.</li> </ol>
3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A signed letter/email from the department chairperson to the Dean affirming the credit hours required for the major/concentration are under 72. The letter should include a paragraph explaining what courses/requirements/ prerequisites make it impossible to complete in six semesters. The letter should include a statement indicating to CAAC whether the program department will seek an exception from the 7 semesters rule or whether the program department will seek to revise their program to meet the rule.</li> </ol>
4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A signed letter/email from the department chairperson to the Dean noting the credit hours required for the major/concentration are over 71. The letter should include a statement indicating to CAAC whether the program department will seek an exception from the 71 hour rule or whether the program department will seek to revise their program to meet the rule.</li> <li>2) A 6/7 Semester Sequence Plan showing that a student can complete the major in six semesters.</li> </ol>
5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A signed letter/email from the department chairperson to the Dean noting the credit hours required for the major/concentration are over 71. The letter should include a statement indicating to CAAC whether the program department will seek an exception from the 71 hour rule or whether the program department will seek to revise their program to meet the rule. The letter should include a paragraph explaining what courses/requirements/prerequisites make it impossible to complete in six semesters. The letter should include a paragraph detailing the timing of the next accreditation (if any) or internal program review.</li> <li>2) A 6/7 Semester Sequence Plan showing that a student can complete the major in seven semesters.</li> </ol>
6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A signed letter/email from the department chairperson to the Dean noting the credit hours required for the major/concentration are over 71. The letter should include a statement indicating to CAAC whether the program department will seek an exception from the 71 hour rule or whether the program department will seek to revise their program to meet the rule. The letter should include a paragraph explaining what courses/requirements/ prerequisites make it impossible to complete in six semesters. The letter should include a statement indicating to CAAC whether the program department will seek an exception from the 7 semesters rule or whether the program department will seek to revise their program to meet the rule.</li> </ol>

**Notes:**

1. Directed Foundational Studies courses in the major are counted in the total program hours. It cannot be assumed that students will have completed a specific FS course before declaring the major or before transferring to ISU . For example, the following is a set of courses that might be taken by a student with an undeclared major in the first year. While certain requirements are met for the FS program, the courses taken might not satisfy any requirements for the major. All required courses must be in the 6/7-Semester Sequence.

First Semester

- a. Eng 101
- b. Math 035
- c. FS History
- d. FS Science
- e. Univ 101 or FS H&W (If one semester. If two Univ 101)

Second Semester

- f. Eng 105
- g. Comm 101
- h. FS SBS
- i. FS Literary Studies
- j. FS H&W

2. Required courses that are not offered at least once a year should be notated with an asterisk in the 6/7 Semester Sequence Plan.
3. Programs that contain required concentrations must be evaluated for every concentration.
4. Responses to this document (as specified by the "Actions" table above) are requested by Nov. 15.

Requests for exceptions are due to CAAC by Feb. 1, 2014.

Program modifications should be submitted to Academic Affairs by April 1, 2014.

Both exceptions and program modifications will be reviewed by CAAC.



**Elements of an Exception** should include one or more of the following:

- 1) A program of study and 6/7 Semester Sequence Plan from at least 3 Indiana public universities\* with the program that demonstrates that it is a rarity for a similarly target program to be able to meet the 7-semester rule if that program of study were in place at ISU.
- 2) A program of study from all Indiana public universities\* with the program that demonstrates that it is a rarity for a similarly target program to be able to meet the 71- hour rule.
- 3) Accreditation documents that indicate that all knowledge bases in the major are essential to accreditation of the program.
- 4) Documents from employers or advisory boards that indicate that all knowledge bases in the major are essential to the student's employability.
- 5) Programs that consist of multiple concentrations may argue that a concentration be excepted if the major allows the possibility of switching to another concentration that can be completed within the 71 credit hour/6-7 semester limits.
- 6) If the above elements do not make a compelling case, you may consider including an explanation of the efficiency with which learning goals and/or student learning outcomes are accomplished. An examination and justification of the prerequisites associated with each course is expected. The department may choose the method of presentation found best suited to its explanation. Curricular mapping or other methods may be useful.

\*Search order preference: IU, PU, IUPUI, USI, regional affiliates of IU/PU, Trine) If the program does not exist for at least 2 other public institutions in Indiana, an institution in a border state with similar program may substitute.