INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

November 12, 2013

3:30pm, HMSU 227

AGENDA

1) Administrative Reports: President Bradley, Provost Williams

2) Chair Report: Steve Lamb

3) Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes of November 5, 2013 **File 2**

4) Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion

5) Degree Maps, Susan Powers **File 3a, 3b, 3c**

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE, 2013-2014

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

November 12, 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: S. Powers

1) Administrative Reports:
   a) D. Bradley:
      i) I received a note from George Pillow that he has been appointed to a board in the state and needs to resign his membership in the Board of Trustees effective immediately, so again we are one short. Randy Minas has said he would like to get names to the Governor fairly quickly to get a decision on a new one. We hope that will work out.
      ii) There will also be dates for the new screening. They have done some research and found a list of those who haven't been screened or signed the tobacco affidavit. There is no update on the data yet for those who have applied for the subsidy; there is still more coming in. Diann pointed out that there are also people who are not choosing to have their insurance premiums taken out pre-tax; their adjusted gross income could thus be increased by several thousand. People could lose out on the subsidy simply by not taking those premiums out pre-tax.
      iii) We have a policy in place that we don't accept transfer credits from nationally accredited universities. Bob Jones was one recent one in particular, because they are not regionally accredited. Those institutions generally get Title IV funds. Also, with the block transfer, for example, if a student gets a D- in History 101 at Purdue and they took 30 hours, we accept that grade. If they get a D- and they only had 29 hours, we don't. It's not morally or politically defensible. It's Commission policy that we do that; they also say we shouldn't accept nationally accredited transfer credits. We cannot and should not be doing those kinds of things, as they give higher-ed a "black

eye." A D- at Purdue should be treated as a D- at ISU. Take the credit, and if it needs repeated, treat it the same as we do here at ISU.

   (1) C. Olsen: It seems like laundering…it's not academically defensible.
   (2) D. Bradley: We have been forced to move away from other similar policies due to attendance and transfer issues from other colleges.
   (3) C. Olsen: At Ball State, they do not accept transfer credits. If you don't have the 30 hours, they don't accept the block.

b) R. Williams:

   i) The first candidate for the Dean of Graduate Studies has been here. We have another coming tomorrow, and two more next week. We had three faculty in our Open Forum today. We know that it's at a hard time to make it, but I want to encourage as many faculty as possible to attend.

   (1) C. MacDonald: There's also a meeting that includes Faculty Senate officers at 10:15 for each candidate. I will send the entire Executive Committee that invitation.

   ii) R. Williams: We also have biennial information in. We have 13 percent who Exceed Expectations, 86 percent who Meet Expectations, and .94 percent who do not meet. The Library still needs to turn in their numbers.

   (1) R. Guell: If you had accepted the first round, what would those numbers have been?
   (2) R. Williams: We don't know, because there are some departments that have to have their numbers redone. Apparently some of them included Lecturers and didn't know they were Instructors, etc. and we have to look over their numbers again.
   (3) R. Guell: When will faculty get their notifications?
   (4) R. Williams: They are due to us on the 13th of November, and letters are to be completed by the 15th so everyone will know next week.
   (5) S. Lamb: I do know that after material went through personnel committees and department offices the individuals were to be notified of both evaluations.
   (6) R. Williams: Some colleges are doing it differently.

2) Chair Report:

a) S. Lamb:

   i) I do think there are a lot of challenges upon us. We have the vote concerning contract faculty participating in the removal of a chair. This can be a critical issue.

   ii) Concerning the outcome of the biennial process, I understand there are more fires being set. The Executive Committee has sent a motion down to FAC asking them to consider revising the process so that if one is found to be failing in the classroom it would be sufficient to receive a classification of not meeting overall expectations. Also, if one failed in any two categories, one would still receive a classification of not meeting expectations. I think that this amendment has a reasonable chance of passing

because faculty understand the damaging effect we can have in the short and the long term in the lives of students if we are found to be horribly deficient in the classroom. The reputation of the university may be severely damaged given poor performance in the classroom.

    (1) D. Bradley: Do we know what the impact would have been?

    (2) R. Guell: We have not seen that but we have asked for it.

    (3) S. Lamb: To receive a Not Meeting Expectations, you have to have two, so the data is not going to be perfect. I think we can make good progress on this issue if we begin making the necessary modifications. We don't need to beat each other about the head and shoulders.

    iii) There was also concern expressed about the FAC motion that resulted in a split vote last week. The FAC motion to get a larger body on SSC with greater faculty representation did not pass. People will want to understand why. We did pass the SAC version, but as there was not a clear decision among us, there will be confusion at the Senate meeting this week as well. I would like assistance in feeling out the Senate's opinion and bringing it to a successful conclusion on Thursday.

3) Approval of the Executive Committee Minutes of November 5, 2013 A. Anderson, C. MacDonald

4) Fifteen-Minute Open Discussion:

    a) B. Kilp:

        i) We received our departmental Dashboard recently. Our committee had not seen it. It had contradictory numbers across the board and we find it difficult to find it useful. For example, it said our ratio had improved from one year to the next when we know it had not.

        ii) D. Bradley: I would say that unless you understand the definitions it will look different.

        iii) B. Kilp: The definitions are just as difficult as the information. Who can we ask about this?

        iv) C. Olsen: The numbers are wrong with ours too. There are discrepancies throughout.

        v) D. Bradley: The definitions of the tables are different; for example, the one you mentioned is a fifth-day enrollment figure. That's one of the struggles in many ways because we always go to the database for that exact day. The number is going to be different according to the day.

        vi) R. Guell: Susan, if a student ultimately withdraws, and you had done a screenshot on the fifth day, and one of them was actually never there—they filled out paperwork and retroactively withdrew, how does that affect the numbers?

        vii) D. Bradley: The fifth day is frozen.

        viii)   S. Powers: That data stays.

        ix) C. Olsen: That's a high number increase.

x) B. Kilp: We want to know how to count the number of students who completed their degree on campus but withdrew from the department. It's sometimes five percent higher here.

xi) D. Bradley: Talk to Patty McClintock if there are specific numbers you want to see.

xii) B. Kilp: That's the assignment we were given by our Dean, but when they give a definition, it's vague. It's as if someone doesn't want you to have a clear definition. Numbers cannot be higher when people leave, and that's what it shows us in certain years. We typically lose 18-20 percent, which is right along with the rest of the state, but sometimes it actually shows us gaining four percent.

xiii) K. Yousif: Can you pick them up from transfers from another college, another major?

xiv) B. Kilp: Occasionally, unless they include people adding minors, but that's not shown.

xv) D. Bradley: I would say the data is correct given the definitions.

xvi) C. Olsen: We discovered it includes not just those who graduated with a degree but those with a certificate as well; it showed something like 35 graduated in a year when they actually received a certificate.

xvii) C. Olsen: On a related matter—this is about student/faculty ratio as it relates to Dashboard—I didn't know that we decided for sure that all faculty were going to be counted as one. The problem is that is works against certain types of faculty or departments. It counts people on sabbatical as one, etc. Those on external grants are also counted as one. Also, the people hired to replace them are counted against you.

xviii) D. Bradley: The goal is to have a report that can be computer generated, not one that takes from 40 different sources and puts it together.

xix) T. Hawkins: What about the implications?

xx) D. Bradley: This is only used to help inform decisions about hiring.

xxi) C. Olsen: It's like faculty are counted against me…my number is really 12 but is says 16 here, for example.

xxii) D. Bradley: We have to look at the big picture.

xxiii) C. Olsen: I just think it's going to work against departments over time.

xxiv) D. Bradley: For instance, we haven't figured out how to deal with GTA's. SCH's the grad students generate are counted but the bodies of GTA are not counted. Some departments are helped by that and some are not. They generate about ten percent of the total of the SCH's. If we turn it loose then 40 people get to adjust those numbers.

xxv) R. Guell: Should there not be a list of "Provostial" buyouts?

xxvi) D. Bradley: But should it affect decisions for hiring Tenure-Track faculty?

xxvii) S. Lamb: When you have a release time that is semi-permanent that has an effect. I thought you and R. Williams had come to the conclusion that we would rather work with data that was accurate at the department level and raise the goals where needed.

xxviii) D. Bradley: I think we can do that but this semester it's not possible.

xxix)   R. Guell: But the hiring indicator could be a moving average so you can smother out whatever is temporary but there's no way you can count a sabbatical replacement as two people.

xxx)   C. Olsen: I have to send that data every semester to HR.

xxxi)   S. Powers: HR doesn't enter that data.

xxxii) D. Bradley: If you want to do that I think it's possible but that would be a lot of record-keeping by the Deans. It's not done now.

xxxiii) V. Sheets: I think we're not really making long-term hiring decisions.

xxxiv) D. Bradley: I think Instructors stay as long as Tenure-Track people.

xxxv) V. Sheets: We're not contracting them as long.

xxxvi) D. Bradley: How long would it take you to put in the data?

xxxvii)C. Olsen: About a minute and a half. It would at least record who was on sabbatical.

xxxviii)   D. Bradley: Do we record on Banner when someone is on sabbatical?

xxxix) S. Powers: Yes.

xl) C. Olsen: It's really going to be a disadvantage to teach in learning communities.

xli)D. Bradley: I think that's what a department has to decide is how to allocate their resources. We're not going to be auditing departments. Chairs need to be able to justify the allocations at the micro level but the Provost's Office is not going to ask for that. We have plenty of time before next fall to change those procedures and get things where they need to be.

b) S. Lamb: We have one item that was sent to us on an emergency basis by D. Hantzis. As you recall, we were asked to construct a motion that concerned itself with the definition of marriage at the state level and about 2-3 years ago Executive Committee officers did it on its own, and the Senate was upset. I think most of them supported the position we took but if we're going to sign something that represents the entire faculty, the Senate had that right. We apologized, but were permitted to let the letter remain in existence. When we received the request from administration and asked if we would be concerned with this item, FAC immediately took it up, perhaps in a special session. I was sent this today by FAC and asked to bring it today to put it on the Senate body on Thursday. (Document in its entirety follows minutes.) **Motion to Endorse FAC Motion: V. Sheets, A. Anderson**

i)   S. Lamb: Any concerns?

ii) R. Guell: Only of the President: You sent this to S. Lamb asking if we wanted to comment; is there any concern that comment from the Executive Committee or the Senate does more harm than good?

iii) D. Bradley: There have been some who have come out and say they are supportive. This Freedom Indiana group, that is really Lilly and Cummins, base their recommendation totally on workforce issues, not moral or ethical. We don't think we are going to attract the employees to retain if we do this. If you can, try and make

your statement along similar lines because that's the only thing that's going to have an impact.

    iv) T. Hawkins: I don't think that was necessarily the final language that would be sent, but if you wanted to make a statement about this proposed amendment, that you would like to have the support of the Faculty Senate behind it—not necessarily address all the issues here, but know that Faculty Senate is supporting you.

    v) D. Bradley: I think it's my responsibility to speak for the employees. So if the three groups say it's not in the best interests of Indiana I will be pleased to say, 'this is how my employees feel.'

    vi) S. Lamb: I am sure that the Faculty will end up making a statement we can be proud of, and I am pleased the other groups are going to as well. **Vote: 9-0-0**

5) Degree Maps: Susan Powers

    a) S. Powers:

        i) HEA 1348-2013 is essentially a degree-mapping legislation—the implemented rules they put together. It is how the universities are required to implement the House rule. The big picture is we are required to provide Degree Maps that are updated every semester up to their sixth year. If they take longer than that we are no longer required if we choose not to be. We also have to provide four options if something on their Map is unavailable or closed. The options are: put them in a closed class; make substitutions available; make a new Map on the spot that doesn't require it, or pay for that class next time it is offered. Not all Maps can be reorganized.

        ii) R. Guell: So if this is a major that if very lockstep in nature…

        iii) S. Powers: For those the next time they can take them is a year later.

        iv) R. Guell: Let's just say there are several rungs to graduation, and we are guaranteed access to each rung as needed until graduation: is that correct?

        v) S. Powers: Right, but it's updated every semester.

        vi) R. Guell: But it's irrelevant for those which are lockstep.

        vii) S. Lamb: When you say a Map, you mean per student?

        viii) D. Bradley: Per student, that's dynamic. If a student drops or fails, if they're off the track for a reason that's not our fault.

        ix) S. Powers: They have to be successful in coursework. If they get off the path, through some fault of their own, they get a new Map, but it's off.

        x) R. Guell: What will we do with those who have a defined right to a certain class? Will be open a section?

        xi) S. Powers: ATTR 210 is a very good example of this. Freshmen in the major have to take this their very first semester. That class was closed in the second week of New Student Orientation. So I couldn't say to a bunch of new freshmen, 'congratulations, you're here for five years.' The class was set below capacity of the room, so we increased it. Then we talked with OIT to help with video feeds for a time. The overcapacity was going to be taken care of within two weeks because of drops. On

the plans we have one program curriculum that has a course on it that they haven't taught in years. We also have courses that aren't offered because the Professor is on sabbatical. They find out that they can't have the course, and it's substituted. If we don't get rid of it, we have to either guarantee it or pay for it.

xii) S. Lamb: It becomes especially problematic if the sabbatical is unplanned.

xiii) S. Powers: You can look at a course now and see if it's on the schedule for the next five terms.

xiv) D. Bradley: Not a person in this room would be happy if their child had to delay graduation.

xv) S. Lamb: But we usually are flexible enough; we make substitutions.

xvi) R. Guell: but I am mostly concerned about the fact that, for example, PSY 101 appears on rung one and is always full by the second week of New Student Orientation, and ECON 200 is always full by the third week of preregistration. The question is, is this our de-facto solution—a lot of video feeds?

xvii) S. Powers: Many put down preferred classes, but with freshmen coming in, their custom Map doesn't start at New Student Orientation. We work with Associate Deans and they adjust the Map to a course for the next semester or the next year. The template is a customized plan. Classes will be customized and moved according to availability.

xviii) R. Guell: So a student who is locked out of a class takes another one. We are essentially kicking students down the road, and what are we going to do for those shut out when their options have run out?

xix) S. Powers: Give them a new customized Map to allow them to finish on time. If they are shut out and it adds another semester…

xx) R. Guell: But the guarantee is that at any point during Priority Registration, if that class closes, you have to do one of four things. We tell them to get on early but if they wait until the last minute they will still have that right. You will have to solve with OIT or with money.

xxi) D. Bradley: If a student gets shut out of a class in the fall, surely we can give them come kind of priority in the spring. We have a software package that does a quantitative measure of seat requirements in the next semester. It hardly worked properly, and when it did, departments would not cooperate.

xxii) S. Powers: It can also predict class needs, but it depends on Maps being updated correctly. Purdue and Purdue Fort Wayne have implemented this also. They are looking at trying to put in restrictions where if you are trying to drag a course to a semester when it's not offered the software won't let you.

xxiii) K. Yousif: Departments should collaborate and sort it out.

xxiv) R. Guell: But we have taken this from the responsibility of students who should be up at midnight if they really want it and taken it onto ourselves. I don't think we're

ready. We're going to need at some point to say that we've exhausted all our alternatives saying 'we need money.' I don't think that it will work as a solution.

xxv)   S. Lamb: Every time a student decides to drop a course then we have the responsibility to update their Degree Map?

xxvi)   S. Powers: Yes, before the next registration.

xxvii)   S. Lamb: So I would suggest a third of my advisees, for one reason or another, start with one schedule and end up with another. Therefore my faculty has to work up a Degree Map for them again. My lord, this is unbelievable.

xxviii) S. Powers: The Map has to be worked up before the Priority Registration. With the new rules with Twenty-First Century Scholars, they will be hurt if they drop since they don't complete 30 credits in an academic year.

xxix)   R. Guell: We are already at 40 percent below 12 hours already.

xxx)   D. Bradley: That will get worse. The folks who are trying to save money and get people through school more quickly are going to enforce things.

xxxi)   R. Guell: It's just bad policy.

xxxii)   D. Bradley: The reality is that the big impact will be on the 20-30 percent who are trying to finish in 4 years. The others who are taking 12 credits a semester won't be served. We don't have to change things for them.

xxxiii) S. Powers: We still have to change the Map for them.

xxxiv)   R. Guell: I hope we have greater dexterity next summer than we have had heretofore.

xxxv)   D. Bradley: Things like overlap with Foundational Studies and major classes and finishing in six semesters are going to help.

xxxvi)   T. Hawkins: Is there a consensus on where advising fits—into research, service, or teaching? This is an enormous obligation; I just want to know what faculty think about this.

xxxvii) S. Lamb: We have good advisors and bad ones. You have the responsibility of creating a Map and there will be all kinds of personal factors at work. I like your comment about serving those who will finish in four years, but updating them semester after semester…

xxxviii)   S. Powers: University College will have the worst part shuffling them all around, but as they go, there will be fewer options.

xxxix)   R. Guell: But with 150 advisees that will take a tremendous amount of time.

xl) S. Powers: Once a student has matriculated we have to provide a Map for the next term.

xli) R. Guell: But you don't know whether a student will show up, but you have to make the Map ahead of time?

xlii)   S. Powers: We have 140 templates…for every degree, every concentration.

xliii)   A. Anderson: What responsibility are we teaching them? These students aren't going to be responsible individuals. We used to be able to expect students to work their way through it, but they won't mature this way.

Motion to Adjourn 4:48pm

Motion in response to charge to review Indiana public policy initiative HJR 6 and consider recommending institutional action.

Members of FAC reviewed HJR 6 and related legislation, statements in response from public and private Indiana universities and colleges and from other sectors. We discussed several questions:
1. Is it appropriate and reasonable for public institutions to pronounce a position on public policy initiatives?
2. Is it appropriate and reasonable for the Faculty Senate to offer a statement on behalf of the faculty in matters such as these?
3. What is an appropriate response to the proposed constitutional amendment?

By consensus, members of the committee found that it is appropriate and reasonable that the institution state a position on public policies that clearly impact the work and the character of our institution. We also agreed that the Faculty Senate can offer a viewpoint on behalf of the faculty on such matters, as it does on most matters of primary concern to the faculty. Finally, members agreed that the statement offered by ISU should oppose adoption of HJR 6.

The following motion was approved unanimously:

The Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate recognizes the authority and the responsibility of the elected body of the faculty to offer a statement in response to public policy initiatives that directly and significantly impact our ability to fulfill our mission. Therefore, we recommend that the Executive Committee present to the Senate a statement opposing HJR 6 and that the statement be conveyed to President Bradley as an expression of the position of the ISU Faculty, as determined by the elected representatives of that body. FAC further offers to the Executive Committee the following statement, which reflects the response of members of FAC to the proposed amendment and may serve in the crafting of a statement by the Senate:

The faculty of Indiana State University join colleagues from across Indiana in stating our opposition to the adoption of HJR 6 as an amendment to the Indiana Constitution. The legislation directly violates the primary values of educational institutions that recognize invention and discovery thrive only in environments that privilege inclusiveness and the diversity of ideas and identities it welcomes, protects, and promotes.

We conclude that adoption of this legislation will harm our workplace environment. Individuals will be negatively impacted by the resulting nullification of provisions previously determined by a majority of the faculty and the leadership of the institution to be both right and good. Institutions strive to create and sustain work environments that attract the best and the brightest professionals at every level and that foster their continuing allegiance to the institution. We will very likely fail in our efforts to continue to recruit and retain excellent faculty and staff committed to professional achievement,

student success, and community service if we are unable to provide an environment that respects and supports them and their colleagues.

We have no doubt that our ability to serve the best interests of our students--which is in the best interest of the institution and the State--will be compromised by the impacts of the proposed amendment. Not only will we lose students who choose to earn their degrees elsewhere, but we are certain that undergraduate and graduate students who choose to pursue their education at ISU will seek employment opportunities in places that do not similarly restrict basic human rights and impact the quality of life of their peers, colleagues, and fellow community members.

We reject the effort to intervene in the ability of strong, proven public and private institutions to make decisions in service to the goals, missions, and values that make those institutions effective stewards of human and material state resources.   We reject arguments that suggest the proposed legislation meets a need not met sufficiently by existing legislation.

We urge state legislators to consider the unarguably negative impacts on the ability of our institutions to serve our populations, to further the work of discovery that will shape our shared futures and those of the next generations, and to provide the basic needs and rights due to all members of our democracy.

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.

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 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 *for* HIGHER EDUCATION

www.che.in.gov

COMPLETION   PRODUCTIVITY   QUALITY

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.[1] 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.[2] 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.

---

[1] A discounted award is available for financial aid recipients that complete between 24-29 credits per year.

[2] 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.[3] 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.[4] 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.

---

[3] Complete College America. *Guided Pathways to Success.*

[4] 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.

<u>Required Procedures</u>

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.

<u>Suggested Procedures</u>

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.[5] 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

---

[5] 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.[6]

---

[6] 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.[7] 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.

---

[7] 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[8] showing that establishing a desirable outcome as the

---

[8] 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 **OR** broad Major Interest Area	required	required
Description of expected employment opportunities **OR** 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