

Indiana State University
Faculty Senate
Student Affairs Committee
March 20, 2013
3:30 p.m., Scott School of Business, Room 222

Present: Committee: Azizi Arrington-Bey, Cheryl Blevens, James Buffington, Swapan Ghosh, John Liu, Della Thacker. Students: Jacoby Waldron. Ex-Officios: Brian Coldren, Joel McMullen, Rich Toomey, David Wright. Guests: Marlon Dechausay, Marie Humpolick, Jennifer Lawson, Linda Maule, and Susan Powers.

I. Call to Order

Buffington called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

II. Adoption of the Agenda

Approved as distributed.

III. Approval of minutes (SAC 12/13, #6, 2/27/2013)

Move to approve as amended: IV. Charge 6. Tabled motion should read: "Buffington will get additional information and if feasible, will call for an electronic vote on all six recommendations." **Wright/Arrington-Bey. Motion passed. 5-0-0.**

IV. Charges

1. SGA Senate meetings—J. Hauser

No report.

2. International student enrollment—J. Buffington

No report.

3. Complete annual report of activities—J. Buffington

No report.

4. Faculty Scholarship—Swapan Ghosh

The Foundation has indicated that \$1,249.92 is available for scholarships. The Faculty Scholarship is a two semester scholarship with half of the funds being applied to the Fall semester and the remainder applied to the Spring semester. At a future meeting, the chair may ask the committee to consider adjusting the scholarship timeline. **Move to approve the awarding of two scholarships, each in the amount of \$ 624.96: Arrington-Bey/Ghosh. Motion passed. 6-0-0.** Ghosh reported that the committee received 68 applications. He distributed a report (see attachment one) that listed the final 11 candidates, based on scholarship criteria that included GPA, commitment, academic interest, and plans. **Move to award scholarships to the top two candidates, Sara Umphries and Morgan Whitehead: Liu/Ghosh. Motion passed. 6-0-0.** Buffington will notify the Foundation and all appropriate parties of the winners' names

and will also extend to Umphries and Whitehead, congratulations and an invitation to the April Faculty Senate meeting where the scholarships will be awarded. Ghosh will send appropriate acknowledgement letters to the unsuccessful applicants.

5. Late textbook purchases; Provost/Task Force Recommendations—R. Toomey. SAC's charge was to determine if late availability of student financial aid was a determining factor in students' decisions regarding the purchasing of textbooks. Admissions undertook a fact-finding survey ("Student Book Survey") which addressed textbook purchasing practices among students. Toomey introduced Admissions Counselor Marie Humpolick, who presented a PowerPoint presentation based on results of that survey. Survey results indicated that 67% of the 96 respondents reported not purchasing all of the textbooks required for a class but only 11% reported that the availability of student financial affected their purchase. Students' largest concerns about purchasing textbooks were the potential of not needing to use the textbook in class and the high cost of the textbook itself. 71% reported purchasing all required textbooks and 83% said their purchase source was ISU Barnes & Noble Bookstore. Toomey will provide a copy of Humpolick's presentation to the chair who will share it during his report to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. A summary of the survey will also be included in the minutes of this meeting.

In other business, the recommendations as addressed by SAC at the February 27th meeting, and distributed by the chair in his February 27th email to committee members (see attachment two) was reviewed. **Move to approve that the SAC recommendations as noted in the chair's February 27th email be presented by the chair to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the Faculty Senate: Ghosh/Blevens. Motion passed. 6-0-0.** Toomey will be available to accompany the chair to those meetings.

6. University College—J. Buffington (Referencing PDF titled "Administration Response to University College Task Force Recommendation," a memo to Dr. Virgil Sheets, Faculty Senate, from Provost Maynard, dated January 17, 2013. This memo, which included the University College Task Force recommendations, was forwarded to SAC by the chair in an email dated January 25, 2013.) 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.**

7. Undertake a review of current rules governing course evaluation policies and practices at department and college levels—J. Hauser
Provost Maynard has directed Associate Vice President Powers to arrange for on-campus visits/demonstrations by course assessment vendors. She will conduct a fact-finding survey among all instructors. **Hearing no objections, the chair voiced SAC members' consensual endorsement of Powers' report.**

8. Modification of Transfer Policy—J. McMullen
(See attachment three.) McMullen reviewed the subcommittee's report/recommendation that was distributed to SAC by the chair in an email dated March 19, 2013. **Move to accept the subcommittee's report: Thacker/McMullen. Motion passed. 5-0-0.** McMullen will correct minor grammatical errors and forward the corrected report to the chair who will present it to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the Faculty Senate. McMullen will be available to accompany the chair to those meetings.

9. Edited Undergraduate Course Repeat Policy—J. Buffington
(See attachment four.) Point of information: this policy will be presented for vote at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

V. Reports

- A. Chair
No report.

- B. Administrative
No report.

- C. Student
No report.

VI. Open Discussion.

No report.

VII. Adjournment

The next SAC meeting is April 10, 2013, 3:30, Scott College of Business, Room 222.
This meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Cheryl Blevens, secretary
March 20, 2013

ATTACHMENT ONE : FACULTY SENATE SCHOLARSHIP FINALISTS

Name	20%	20%	50%	10%		Sum
	Recomm	Extra-curricul	Essay	GPA & Class	GPA notes	
	Commitment, academic interest and plans					
Jillian Dixon	19	19	46	9.91	3.91	Sophomore 94
Brooklyn Coop	19	19	47	8.76	3.76	Freshman 94
Joshua Quentin	20	16	48	9.66	3.66	Freshman Trar 94
Zachary Niehaus	20	15	48	9.8	3.8	Sophomore 93
Winifred Ndungu	20	16	47	9.63	3.63	Sophomore 93
Melody Anderson	17	17	48	9.94	3.94	Sophomore 92
Nicole Merker	19	14	49	8.94	3.94	Freshman 91
Jonathan Ritch	20	15	48	9.6	3.6	Sophomore 93
Sara Umphries	20	17	49	10	4	Sophomore 96
Morgan Whitehead	16	20	48	9.96	3.96	Sophomore 94
Alina Thomas	16	16	49	8.95	3.95	Freshman 90

ATTACHMENT TWO: RECOMMENDATIONS RE: TEXTBOOK STUDY GROUP

MEMORANDUM

TO: JAMES BUFFINGTON, CHAIR
Student Affairs Committee- Faculty Senate
FROM: RICHARD TOOMEY, EX-OFFICIO
SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING TEXTBOOK STUDY GROUP
DATE: FEBRUARY 27, 2013
CC: CHERYL BLEVENS

As requested by Executive Committee for Indiana State University Faculty Senate, a review and discussion regarding the statement issued January 17, 2013 by Provost Jack Maynard was conducted. The sub-committee was asked to offer insight and recommendations for consideration for handbook language to be considered regarding these recommendations.

Below are the recommendations referenced in the aforementioned document. In addition, comments provided the sub-committee is provided to be considered by the larger SAC committee.

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

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 this 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. Specifically, 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.

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

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

Recommendation #6: Allow students to buy their books from any 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) it is stated 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.

ATTACHMENT THREE: MODIFICATION OF TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY

Report/Recommendation of Subcommittee on Modification of ISU Transfer Credit Policy Presented to Student Affairs Committee March 20, 2013

Dear Student Affairs Committee Members:

At our last SAC meeting, Dr. Buffington appointed me to head a subcommittee's whose task was to formulate and formally propose a transfer credit policy for consideration by the SAC. As you will recall, the original proposal that came before SAC from the University Athletic Committee, states as follows: That ISU revise its policy on the acceptance of transfer credits from other institutions from the current policy that prohibits the acceptance of any transfer credits in which the grade earned was below a C to one that does, but only if the incoming transfer student's cumulative GPA is 2.0 or above.

However, after significant discussion and research by members of the subcommittee ("SC"), especially from the standpoint of the actual implementation of the GPA component of the policy within the Registrar's Office, the SC strongly believes that the proposed policy should be modified. Simply put, the new proposal would create a policy that would allow the transfer of any credit hours in which a passing grade (all grades above "F") was earned at the prior school. **The following language is what the subcommittee now proposes in regards to modifying ISU's current transfer credit policy:**

Proposed Transfer Credit Policy

Course credits earned from regionally accredited colleges and universities will be accepted as transfer credit subject to the following guidelines:

- 1. Only collegiate level courses with non-failing letter grades will transfer for credit. Grade point averages do not transfer.*
- 2. Orientation and study-skills courses will not be accepted as transfer credit.*
- 3. Placement credit earned at previous colleges or universities will not transfer.*
- 4. Even though credit hours are transferable, the transferred hours may not necessarily apply toward a particular degree program. The applicability of credits toward a particular degree or program, as well as the University Foundational Studies Program, can be determined in counsel with the appropriate program or departmental advisor.*
- 5. Students with transfer credit must meet all Indiana State University requirements, including any program specific minimum course grade or GPA requirements.*
- 6. A maximum of 90 credit hours may be transferred from other institutions. (Currently 94, but with 120 hour degree completion model coming into effect, 90 will most likely be the number per Susan Powers)*

A student's overall transfer grade point average will not be recorded on the student's transcript. Consequently, a transfer student will establish a grade point average from Indiana State University based only on courses taken at this University. A transfer student must, however, meet the requirements for continued enrollment which correspond to the sum of the total transfer hours accepted and total hours attempted at this University. Also, all hours attempted at previous colleges or universities will be summed with courses taken at this University in computing graduation honors.

Findings & Conclusions of Sub-Committee:

- ISU, in many of its recent institutional policy changes (+/- grading scale, increased parking infractions, lowering academic dismissal benchmarks, just to name a few) will always point out that the new policy conforms to what our peer institutions are doing. As the research and documentation that Marlon presented to the SAC indicates, ISU is in the clear minority on this issue. Most of our peer institutions accept grades above an F for transfer credit, with differing variation of how it is actually

done. The SC actually looked at two sets of “peer” institutions for comparison. The first set included those included in Marlon’s initial report and include those schools that ISU’s Admissions Office (Sarah Wurtz) confirmed as our “peers.” In other words, the four year schools that ISU competing against to attract and gain the enrollment of prospective students. Sarah was aware of the “peer institution list” which Brian Coldren brought to the SC’s attention, and that is attached and mentioned hereafter. However, for purposes of admissions, the attached list is not relevant to the discussion of what schools are our “peers” when it comes to admission/enrollment.

As Sarah pointed out, Admissions’ focus is upon prospective students within a 400 mile radius of campus and within the State of Indiana. Thus, to her office, the schools Marlon listed were much more relevant when it comes to a discussion of what ISU policies should be in relation to attracting and enticing the enrollment of prospective students than the schools that are contained in the list attached and prepared by ISU’s Office of Institutional Research. What Idaho State, for instance, does, one way or the other, is irrelevant. They are not a peer for purposes of this issue. ISU is not competing against Idaho State for the same students. The SC feels that ISU needs policies that do not inhibit the Lakeland College student from choosing ISU when debating whether to attend Eastern Illinois and Indiana State. It is the SC’s belief that the peer institutions on Marlon’s list are more relevant and should be the focus for comparison.

2. ISU is considered a school for “first generation” students. Students who are enrolling at a four year school for the first time. As such, we are very likely to be a primary choice for many students who are attending junior colleges, especially schools like Ivy Tech (with whom ISU has developed a very strong relationship with to encourage their students to transfer to ISU) and Vincennes, not to mention the large number of other junior colleges within 180 miles of Terre Haute. Without hard evidence to support the theory, it is believed that many students who attend junior college are most likely “first generation” students as well and went to junior college for a variety of reasons such as, economic, academic and otherwise. We should be attracting those students, not creating barriers to their transfer to ISU.

3. From President Bradley’s first day in office, he has stressed the importance of increasing our enrollment, graduation rates, affordability and retention.

a. **Enrollment:** It is logical to assume that a transfer policy that would allow grades below a C to transfer in as credit would have a direct impact upon a potential transfer student’s decision as to whether to transfer to ISU or another school. If a potential student has 4 classes (12 hours) in which he/she earned a C- at their prior school, and none of those credits transfer to ISU, they are losing a whole semester’s worth of work. However, if they are also considering Eastern Illinois, for instance, all of those credits could potentially transfer, thus it is safe to assume that this fact would weigh heavily upon the student’s decision.

b. **Graduation:** If the same student in (a) above actually chooses to come to ISU despite losing 12 hours of credit, it is safe to assume that the probability of that student not graduating because they will have to go to school longer due to the loss of credits upon transfer increases, which then increases the chance that other things can happen that would force them to leave school before graduation (illness, marriage, life events, injury, etc.).

c. **Affordability:** Obviously, the more hours a transfer student loses upon transfer, the more they are going to have to enroll in and pay for at ISU. Therefore, a transfer student’s potential costs to obtain their degree will increase.

d. **Retention:** Works hand in hand with (b) above. Same arguments apply. The longer someone is required to stay in school, the more likely it is that things will happen in a students’ lives will that may force them out of school.

4. A transfer student from Harvard who earns a D+ in Astrophysics 201 (3 hrs) loses that passing grade upon transfer to ISU; but an ISU student who earns a D+ in the same or similar class is allowed to use that class to obtain their degree at ISU. Therefore, we are saying that a D+ from ISU is better than a D+ from Harvard? The same applies to transfers from junior colleges. If the grade a student earned at that school was used to award the student an associate's degree or was acceptable as credit at that school, there is no reason why ISU should discount it or refuse it as credit. The practice of what appears to be "academic elitism" has no place at ISU.

5. For those classes/credit hours that ISU does accept as transfer credit currently, ISU does not transfer in a transfer student's GPA from those transfer credits. Therefore, if they passed the class and it transfers to ISU, what difference does the grade they earned make as long as they passed the class? There should not be a difference.

6. Whether we are talking about 5 transfer students or 100 each year being affected by this policy, ISU's philosophy has been and continues to be one of concern for each individual student on this campus. ISU expends significant resources toward the recruitment of prospective students to ISU. Every student we get to enroll here matters; therefore, the suggestion that this policy perhaps doesn't impact a significant enough number of potential students and therefore is a "non-issue," is without merit and dismissive.

7. This is not change for the sake of change. Everyone knows that budgetary allocations from the State of Indiana are focused upon dollars per full time enrolled student. Our need to increase enrollment at ISU is critical. We should not let policies that work against that objective stand.

8. This is not about lowering ISU's academic standards. This is about allowing transfer students to bring in credit hours that they earned and paid for and to put us in conformity with the mainstream of our true peer institutions. ISU should be doing everything it can, such as the four year graduation degree program recently implemented, to entice these students to enroll at ISU, not create barriers to it.

Based upon these findings, the SC recommends adoption of the revised transfer credit policy as set forth hereinabove.

Lastly, I would like to thank each member of the subcommittee, Della Thacker, Marlon DeChausay, Brian Coldren and Matthew Copas for their assistance. I would especially like to thank Marlon and Brian for their extra efforts in researching and brainstorming this issue. Without their expertise and assistance, this proposal would not have gotten done timely. On behalf of the subcommittee, I would also like to thank Sarah Wurtz, Director of Scholarships, in the ISU Admissions Office for her insight and assistance.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,
Joel McMullen
Assistant Athletic Director for NCAA Compliance
SAC Sub-Committee Chair

ATTACHMENT FOUR: MODIFICATION UNDERGRADUATE COURSE REPEAT POLICY

Proposed Modification to the Undergraduate Course Repeat Policy

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

- Supports the 4 year Graduation Guarantee and moves students forward in progress toward degree completion.
- 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](#)) 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.

The desired effective term of the new policy would be Fall 2013.

Current policy:

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.

Proposed policy:

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.