**Student Affairs Committee**

**Indiana State University**

**Annual Report to the Senate, 2012-2013**

The 2012-2013 Student Affairs Committee (SAC) has had eight regularly scheduled meetings this year, beginning with the organizational meeting in September and one in each of the succeeding months.

Membership and attendance of the 2012-2013 Committee is listed in the table below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Member** | **Meetings to Attend** | **Meetings Attended** |
| Jim Buffington (Chair) | 8 | 8 |
| Swapan Ghosh | 8 | 7 |
| Cheryl Blevens (Secretary) | 8 | 6 |
| Azizi Arrington-Bey (Assistant Secretary) | 8 | 8 |
| Della Thacker (Vice-Chair) | 8 | 7 |
| John Liu | 8 | 8 |
| Jake Jakaitis (fall only) | 4 | 4 |
| Jeff Hauser (spring only) | 4 | 1 |
| Alma Anderson (Exec Committee Liason) | 8 | 2 |
| **Ex-Officio** | **Meetings to Attend** | **Meetings Attended** |
| Academic Affairs: Josh Powers/Susan Powers | 8 | 5 |
| Student Activities and Organizations: Kimberly Monte | 8 | 3 |
| Residential Life: Josh Powers | 8 | 4 |
| HMSU: Anita Gabbard (left ISU 4/1/2013) | 7 | 0 |
| Athletics: Joel McMullen/Marlon Dechausay | 8 | 2 |
| Registrar: Brian Coldren/Jennifer Lawson | 8 | 8 |
| Admissions: Richard Toomey | 8 | 6 |
| Financial Aid: Richard Toomey | 8 | 6 |
| Student Academic Services: David Wright | 8 | 4 |
| **Student** | **Meetings to Attend** | **Meetings Attended** |
| Brandon Harris | 8 | 2 |
| Rachel Leshinsky | 8 | 3 |
| William Matt Copas | 8 | 2 |
| Jacoby Waldron | 8 | 5 |

**On-going charges for 2013-2014**.

SAC recommends the following charges be carried over to 2013-2014:

***1. Identify a faculty member to serve as representative to SGA Senate meetings.***

***2. Monitor international student enrollment.***

***3. Administer the Faculty Scholarship. Investigate “fast-tracking” of scholarship winners to the Executive Committee.***

***4. Continue to monitor late textbook purchases in 2013-2014.***

***5.* *Continue to monitor current rules governing course evaluation policies and practices at department and college levels and to keep abreast of the Provost’s task force investigating alternative evaluation instruments.***

**SAC addressed the following charges**:

**OnGoing Charges**

***1. Identify a faculty member to serve as rep at SGA meetings.*** Jake Jakaitis served in fall and Jeff Hauser in spring. In addition to serving as a liaison between SGA and SAC, the representative should also encourage the SGA President and Executive to work with the appropriate Standing Committee Chairs to coordinate appointment of student representatives. The faculty representative should also encourage students to participate as student representatives. SAC recommends this as an ongoing charge.

***2. Monitor changes in international student enrollment***. J. Buffington assumed responsibility for this charge. The Office of International Programs and Services has announced enrollments in fall of 2012 were 616. This total compares to the 556 enrolled in fall of 2011. The fall of 2011 enrollment was the highest since fall of 1997, when 558 were enrolled. The fall of 2012 total is the largest since fall 1993’s 646.

The Office of International Programs and Services is in the process of changing its name to the Center for Global Engagement. There is some possibility that the Center will become the Lee Hamilton Center or the Richard Lugar Center.

**SAC Recommendation**: SAC recommends this as an ongoing charge.

***3. Administer the Faculty Scholarship.*** The SAC Scholarship Subcommittee (Swapan Ghosh, Azizi Arrington-Bey, John Liu ) and SAC recommended to the Faculty Senate that Sara Umphries and Morgan Whitehead each receive a scholarship of $624.96. For the past two years, the amount awarded has been considerably less than the $1,250 per recipient awarded by SAC in spring 2011. The amount awarded in spring 2012 was down because SAC had awarded more than the endowment had earned during the twelve months. This year, the amount was less because the Foundation realized considerably less on endowment earnings, not only for this scholarship but across the board. Applications for this scholarship numbered 69, less than the 85 last year, but the second highest total since the scholarships have been awarded. Both recipients attended and were recognized at the April 18th Faculty Senate meeting. This year, for the first time and thanks to a suggestion from Tami Rees, Administrative Assistant for Faculty Senate, ISU Media Relations was contacted about the event. The event was photographed and details about the scholarship and the recipients were shared with Media Relations.

Concern was expressed in SAC about the Foundation’s handling of scholarship accounts. One concern was that not all faculty donations directed to the Faculty Scholarship were actually credited to this account. SAC received information allaying those concerns. A second concern was that the Faculty Scholarship was not one of those singled out for a donation at the Foundation website; to donate, contributers must select the “Other” option, and write in the name of the Scholarship. The Foundation responded:

* Our online giving form must meet the needs of hundreds of university initiatives and funds so we are unable to provide more specific designation options on the form.
* In the spring of 2013 the Foundation will be launching a peer-to-peer fundraising platform which will give individual programs, departments, funds, and initiatives their own presence for giving. At this time only a handful of programs are participating in our pilot program.  If the Faculty Scholarship would like to participate please let me know.   Participation would require someone on your end to receive training and manage some administrative tasks.

SAC is in the process of designating the Administrative Assistant to the Faculty Senate to participate as a presence for giving at the Foundation website.

In FY 2011-2012, 27 donors contributed $2,985 to the Scholarship. In FY 2012-2013 (through December 5, 2012) 20 donors had contributed $1,080.

As of December 31, 2012, the market value of the endowed scholarship was $34,915.46. The comparable figure on December 31, 2011 was $32,362.05. By March 31, 2013, the market value had risen to $37,425.07.

SAC has updated its “Scholarship Procedures” document to incorporate changes and institute improvements that became apparent in 2012-2013.

***4. Complete annual report of activities (including 2011-2012) for review by the executive committee.*** The report was submitted on May 15, 2013.

**Charges Left Over from 2011-2012**

***1. Examine the Summer School policy for tuition & fee requirements for students taking courses. Determine whether a single “bracketed fee” structure is feasible in summer as it is in the fall and winter. The committee feels it is in the best interests of the students to offer the bracketed fee structure as a third semester. Students’ having the opportunity to take 6-12 hours is in line with the strategic goals of the university.*** Anderson reported that another Faculty Senate committee was investigating alternative summer term arrangements. Coldren reported that the Board of Trustees approved a new summer undergraduate student fee schedule that will begin with the 2013 Summer I and Summer II terms (see attachment “Coldren email”). **Jakaitis moved suspension of the charge. Anderson seconded. Motion passed 6-0-0**.

***2. Continue to investigate the relationship and balance between fiscal health and academic standards.*** Associate Vice-President J. Powers and Toomey supplied SAC members with a profile of the student community at ISU. **Toomey moved suspension of the charge. Anderson seconded.** **Motion passed 6-0-0**.

***3. Undertake a review of current rules governing course evaluation policies and practices at department and college levels.*** Susan Powers gave an overview of evaluative products under consideration for the SIR replacement. Buffington appointed a subcommittee to work with Powers and report back to SAC in January. Members are: Jeff Hauser (chair), Associate Vice-President Josh Powers, Associate Vice-President Susan Powers, and Kevin Bolinger. The University formed a task force in fall 2012 to recommend the adoption of an appropriate assessment tool, and SAC requested to be updated on the task force’s progress. In February, SAC authorized the Subcommittee to send a pilot survey regarding course evaluations to all in attendance. In March, SAC learned that Provost Maynard had directed Associate Vice President S. Powers to arrange for on-campus visits/demonstrations by course assessment vendors. She was directed to conduct a fact-finding survey among all instructors. In April, SAC recommended that the Faculty Senate hold the charge of undertaking a review of current rules governing evaluation policies and practices at department and college levels for SAC action next year. It is anticipated that any surveys and input from AAUP forums will be taken into consideration as the task force continues its work.

**4. *WP/WF Policy: Should WF grades be retained, and if they are retained, whether they should impact the GPA.***  A subcommittee consisting of Thacker, Jakaitis, Coldren, J. Powers, and Waldron assumed responsibility of this charge The subcommittee met on October 25 to discuss the recommendation from Susan Powers in the Office of the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs regarding WP and WF grades. The received recommendation:

We propose that effective Fall 2013, the WF remain as a grade option and appear on the transcript, but quality points (0.0) are not awarded and therefore not factored into the student GPA for both graduate and undergraduate students.

Our charge was to review the recommendation and approve, modify, or reject it.

After reviewing the withdrawal grade policies of our 19 peer institutions as well as those of Ball State University, Indiana University, IUPUI, and the University of Southern Indiana (See file 1: “WF Grading Peers” Excel document) provided by Associate Vice-President S. Powers and our own practices and procedures regarding student withdrawals, we have developed the following recommendation:

We propose that effective fall 2013, the WF and WP grades be eliminated and that ISU students withdrawing from the university be awarded a grade of W in each of their classes. While the W grades will appear on their transcripts, quality points will not be awarded and therefore not factored into the student GPA for both graduate and undergraduate students.

Rationale:

* Of the 24 institutions surveyed, only 4 continue to use WP/WF grades for withdrawing students, and only 3 of them allows the WF grade to impact the GPA. The Committee notes that eliminating WF/WP grades and the impact of a WF on students' GPA would align us with our peer institutions as well as with the principal public institutions in the State of Indiana.
* If a student withdraws from ISU before the 10th week of the semester [by Monday, October 29, this fall, for example] the student's record is wiped clean; there is no record of the student's ever having attended ISU during the relevant term. However, if the student withdraws one day past the established 10th week deadline, that student currently is assigned a WP or WF in each class and the WF impacts the student's GPA.
* At present, WP/WF grades are not used by ISU for students who withdraw from summer sessions, so eliminating these grades for fall and spring semesters would create consistency. Students who withdraw from summer sessions receive a grade of N or F, and neither grade impacts their GPA. Perhaps we should include a recommendation that students who withdraw during summer sessions also receive a W grade to create consistency.
* A study of the grades assigned to students who withdrew from ISU during the 2010-11 and 2011-12 academic years reveals considerable inconsistency in the assigning of WP or WF grades. Of the 186 students who withdrew during the two- year period, 95 [slightly above 51%] were assigned WP grades in some classes and WF grades in others. While this inconsistency clearly in part results from differing faculty perspectives or policies, it also seems clear that the disparity of grade assignment in these circumstances is impacted by the fact that faculty rarely know the reasons for an individual student's withdrawal.
* While some might support WF grades, believing that students should experience consequences for withdrawing from school, SAC feels that the loss of academic credit and of income expended for tuition and, in many cases, room and board is penalty enough. A W grade on an academic transcript is sufficient to document the student's performance. Adding a WF grade, especially one that impacts a student's GPA, seems less like a penalty and more like vengeance.

Move to forward revised recommendation to Faculty Senate Executive Board: Thacker/Swapan. **Motion passed 6-0-0.** At its November 26 meeting, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee voted 7-1-1 to accept SAC’s recommendation. At the December 12, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting, the recommendation was approved 25-0-2.

**New Charges**

1. ***Explore whether financial aid delays limit student’s ability to purchase books.*** SAC determined to broaden the exploration: Investigate reasons for students purchasing textbooks late, and propose solutions. A subcommittee consisting of Toomey, Blevens, and Copas assumed responsibility for the charge. Toomey recruited the ISU Bookstore manager and the textbook manager as additional resources. Toomey reported on several campus initiatives to work on issues of student financial aid. SAC’s subcommittee offered their cooperation as appropriate. In mid-January, Admissions conducted a student-satisfaction survey on textbook purchases (has the student purchased textbooks, what is the source of their purchase, etc. See file 2: “Textbook Survey” Word file.).

SAC observations on the Survey: The problem of students purchasing their textbooks late (or not at all) is not unique to ISU. If anything, the problem is less severe at ISU than at many other places. However, late purchases at ISU is a significant problem and serves as an impediment to education. The textbook survey indicates that ISU’s original charge, to explore whether financial aid delays limit a student’s ability to purchase books, is only a small part of the problem. Student survey responses about how the problem might be solved shed more light than heat on the issue. To some extent, the solution to the problem is a communication issue, and ISU, spearheaded by the Office of Admissions, has taken steps to resolve the communication problem (see the concluding statements in the “Textbook Survey” document.

SAC recommends that it continue to monitor late textbook purchases in 2013-2014.

1. ***Explore the Proposed Modification to the Undergraduate Course Repeat Policy.*** At its January meeting, SAC began consideration of this new charge, appointing a subcommittee consisting of Thacker, Hauser, Coldren, S. Powers, and Waldron. Current policy is:

Any course may be repeated once for grade point average improvement. Only courses taken at Indiana State University are eligible for course repeat. The better grade earned will become the grade for the course. The lesser grade remains recorded on the transcript, but hours and points of the lesser grade will not be used in index computation. If a “DF”, “DP”, “IN”, “S”, “U” or “WP” grade is received, the course repeat request is void.

The subcommittee surveyed peer institutions (See file 3: “Course Repeat Policy Comparisons” pdf file:). SAC modified the proposal as follows:

A course in which a student has received a grade of C- or lower may be repeated for grade improvement. The highest grade received for the course, taken at Indiana State University, will automatically be included in the computation of the cumulative GPA. The initial grade(s) and the repeat grade(s) will appear on the student’s record. Only courses taken at Indiana State University are eligible for course repeat.

**Rationale**:

A modification is recommended to the current course repeat policy for the following reasons:

* Supports the 4 year Graduation Guarantee and moves students forward in progress toward degree completion.
* To improve student GPA overall (for those who have course repeats because of insufficient grades)
* Accounts for changes to Financial Aid eligibility. Effective July 1, 2011, due to changes in federal regulations, a student may receive federal financial aid ([Title IV funds](http://www.nova.edu/financialaid/grantsloans/title_iv_return.html)) for a repeated course only once if the course was previously passed and will align better with satisfactory academic progress.Per the April 2010 ACCRAO audit of the Office of Registration, we are not complying with the current Course Repeat policy.
* Allows for faster processing of grades which will allow faster turnaround in standing reports as well as graduation processing (will decrease the large amount of hand processing that must occur with current process)
* The modification is aligned with one of the recommendations regarding course repeat put forward by the Academic Taskforce on Affordability.
* The modification will still allow for Dean’s exception for a course repeat of C or better (such as in the case of programs with higher minimum major class grades for retention, graduation, or prerequisites).

The resulting impact will be to improve retention for these students.

**Senate reaction to proposal**. The Senate tabled the proposal, asking that it be modified for clarification. At the April 18, 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting, the following proposal was adopted on a 20-5-0 vote:

Students may choose to repeat any course for grade improvement. Courses that can be repeated for credit are not included in this policy. Only the highest grade received for the course, taken at Indiana State University, will be included in the computation of the cumulative GPA. The initial grade(s) and the repeat grade(s) will appear on the student’s record. Only courses taken at Indiana State University are eligible for course repeat. An exception can be granted by the Dean of the relevant college on a case by case basis.

1. ***Review the Textbook Study Group Recommendations and the Administration’s response to those recommendations.*** SAC received this charge on January 23, with the sanguinary hope for resolution by March. At the January SAC meeting, Josh Powers summarized this document’s subject by noting that the Administration supported the recommendation to not move forward with establishing a University sponsored textbook rental program, and endorsed recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4. The Provost commended the task force for providing strong guidance to the campus and recommended that the University move as quickly as possible to implement all recommendations.

At its March meeting, SAC considered the following set of recommendations:

***Recommendation #1: Expand Textbook affordability education efforts to faculty & students***

Reducing the overall costs of textbooks and other required course materials can be accomplished with thoughtful, systemic planning and aggressive communication to all constituents. In addition to faculty designated advocates in each college, a more comprehensive communication plan and access to key dates and information, led by the University Bookstore, will further these efforts.

In addition to the recommendation, additional communication and forums focused upon the availability, and costs associated with digital volumes, available both to the individual students through the University Bookstore, but also through digital download through the University Library are recommended.

***Recommendation # 2: Continue to work closely with the ISU Bookstore to continue to expand rental opportunities for our students***

There are no additional recommendations to this topic at this time.

***Recommendation # 3: Refine University policies affecting textbook adoptions and affordability***

Faculty course assignments must be made with regard and consideration to established dates and deadlines. With few exceptions, plans and notification of course assignments to individual faculty should be created to account for these procedural necessities.

In addition to the language outlined in the initial recommendation, specific inclusion of alternative options to book purchasing shall be included when considering textbook adoption. Specific examples include electronic texts, digital downloads, reserved library copies and other modalities.

Also, inclusion of additional members to the Textbook Oversight Committee should include a representative from the Library, a representative of the University College and consultation from University Bookstore.

***Recommendation #4: Improve practices to assess the effectiveness of university processes to improve textbook affordability***

Annual reports and review of metrics should be made to SAC as well as the Textbook Oversight Committee to ensure further review and enhancements to both policies and practices of all groups concerned.

At the February 27 SAC meeting, two more recommendations were added to the above memorandum. There was also a request for more information, as indicated below.

***Recommendation #5:*** ***Remove any exclusivity or preferential contractual obligation with regard to the purchase of textbooks***. (SAC requests a copy of any contract ISU has signed with the Bookstore.)

***Recommendation #6:*** ***Allow students to buy their books from a legitimate vendor of their choosing, and, when possible, bill the cost of textbooks to their university account.***

***Requested Information:*** on p. 9 the Provost’s memo on the Taskforce Recommendations (Recommendation 3: Refine university policies affecting textbook adoptions and affordability, second paragraph) states that “the new policy…ensure that all students enrolled in a course use the same textbook.” On p. 11 of the same document (Handbook language, item 3.b.) “If multiple faculty members teach sections of a course during the adoption period, the department faculty shall choose the textbook(s) for the course, subject to approval by the department chairperson.” SAC is uncertain: does this language mandate that if multiple sections (with multiple instructors) of a course are taught, only one text (or set of texts) will be offered in each of the sections? In other words, if BUS 180 has ten sections in spring 2013, being taught by five different instructors, must all instructors select the same text? Some members of SAC believe that if such is the case, then the policy impinges on academic freedom.

**Move to approve that the SAC recommendations as presented above be presented by the chair to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the Faculty Senate: Ghosh/Blevens. Motion passed. 6-0-0.**

Because another Senate Standing Committee (Faculty Affairs Committee) was also reviewing this report/recommendations, Senate action was not forthcoming until a late April Senate meeting. At this meeting, action on Senate recommendations was postponed until next year.

1. ***Review the University College Task Force Recommendation and the Administration’s response to those recommendations.*** SAC received this charge on January 23. Josh Powers summarized the document, wherein the Provost identified two concerns related to the recommendations, asking that they be addressed: the critical need to resolve the issue related to “Governance” for the college, and his concern that the recommendation on the relationship of the University College Dean, Department Chairpersons, and Academic Deans did not provide sufficient authority to the University College Dean to ensure that courses delivered to first-year students are of the highest quality. He supported the concept that the Department Chairperson, Academic Dean, and University College Dean work together on the issue but should no resolution be reached, that the University College Dean be granted authority.

At its March meeting, Dean Linda Maule addressed SAC concerns regarding granting the University College Dean the authority to determine the quality of first-year offerings should a disagreement arise among the UC Dean, Academic Deans, and Department Chairs. As one individual put it—content is the purview of the college. Dean Maule emphasized that concerns addressed in the memo, specifically a need to resolve the issue related to “governance” for the college and the “relationship of the University College Dean, Department Chairpersons, and Academic Deans,” were expressed by Provost Maynard. CAAC reviewed the issues and recommended what Dean Maule described as “a middle ground approach” wherein all administrators work collaboratively to resolve issues but if a resolution is not forthcoming, the Provost will be the final authority. **Move that SAC endorse this middle ground approach: McMullen/Arrington-Bey. Motion passed. 6-0-0.**

Because two other Senate Standing Committees (FAC and CAAC) were also considering the recommendations, the Faculty Senate postponed action on this issue until the April 30 meeting.

1. ***Modification of Transfer Policy.*** At its February meeting, the University Athletic Committee asked SAC to consider ISU’s transfer policy. John Conant, Dechausay, and McMullen reported that ISU may be losing potential transfer students because ISU’s current transfer policy is more stringent than competitors by excluding grades below C. Dechausay suggested looking at a model similar to Bradley or Eastern Illinois where grades are accepted below C if cumulative GPA is 2.0. Conant reported that the UAC passed a proposal to accept transfer credit for students with an overall GPA of 2.5 including D, D+, and C-. A sub-committee was formed to review the proposal from the UAC and present a proposal at the next meeting to implement for Fall 2013. Sub-committee members: McMullen (chair), Coldren, Dechausay, Thacker, and Waldron.

At its March meeting, SAC considered a survey of peer institutions and the attached recommendation (see file 4: “Transfer Policy Change—Survey” Word file and file 5: “Tranfer Credit Policy Modification Proposal” pdf file). **Move to accept the subcommittee’s report: Thacker/McMullen. Motion passed. 5-0-0.**

SAC’s recommendation was tabled by the Executive Committee at the request of Provost Maynard to learn more about how this might impact the Statewide General Education Transfer Core. Susan Powers informed the Provost and SAC that the statewide leadership team came to a common understanding about work that would considered acceptable in the general education.  An institution could certify that a student had completed a core at the home institution in whatever way they deemed acceptable – dual credit, AP, D- and up if the institution considers that passing, and transfer work from other institutions, because none of the state institutions accept transfer work below a C, including Ivy Tech. With those criteria in place, the transfer institution will accept as block credit the general education transfer core from the home (original) institution, but not the classes.  This is how we handle the AA, AS and AAS block credit regardless of grade, but not the classes themselves if below C. If ISU changes its transfer policy, we may have to change the university policy to a C or better being required in the transfer block, and that would be disastrous to student retention.

It was Susan Powers’ conclusion that if we change nothing we are in compliance with the statewide transfer core policies.  If we adopt the new policy, we are out of compliance with our agreement with the state and will need to do something. No further action was taken on this issue.