

Indiana State University
Faculty Senate Student Affairs Committee
March 21, 2014

1:30 p.m., Federal Hall, Room 222, Scott School of Business

Present: Committee: Azizi Arrington-Bey, Cheryl Blevens, James Buffington, Jeff Hauser, John Liu. Ex-Officios: April Hay (Registrar), Craig Enyeart (Director of Student Conduct & Integrity), Josh Powers (Associate Vice President for Student Success), Rich Toomey (Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management, Admissions and High School Relations). Guests: Brian Bunnett (Cunningham Library, Public Services Department Chair), Chris McGrew (International Affairs Director, Center for Global Engagement), Kristie Bigler (Office of Information Technology), Larry Rosenheim (Physics Department), Linda Maule (Dean of University College), and Yihua Bai (Office of Information Technology).

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Buffington welcomed the guests: Ms. Bigler, Mr. Bunnett, Mr. McGrew, and Ms. Bai.

II. Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda will be adapted to accommodate the arrivals of individuals who will address the committee.

III. Approval of Minutes (SAC 13/14:6, 2/21/2014)

Move approval as distributed: Maule/Arrington-Bey. Motion passed. 5-0-0.

IV. Charges for 2013-2014

1. Faculty representative to SGA Senate meetings. J. Hauser.

Mr. Hauser will provide the Chair with a summary of SGA's activity during the 2013-2014 academic year. The report will be used in the Chair's year-end report to the Faculty Senate.

2. Monitor international student enrollment; investigate whether foreign consulate policy changes are having a negative effect on international enrollment; investigate the extent to which ISU is fulfilling its obligations to international students. J. Buffington.

The Career Center adopted SAC's recommendation to modify their employer registration forms to include information about whether or not the employer was interested in international students. During the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 Career Fairs, 61 employers (excluding educational institutions) indicated interest. Caveat: at least one employer, having attended both fairs, indicated "yes" in Fall 2013 but "no" in Spring 2014. Possible issues: depending on who completes the registration form, information may be inaccurate or depending on the time of the year, there could or could not be a need to hire international students. SAC is pleased with the amount of interest shown in international students and encourages the Career Center, perhaps with the Office of Global Engagement, to educate international students on the benefits of this service. Mr. Buffington believes that the Company Profiles can serve as an incentive to employers to sign up early to participate. Indiana State University should educate students about the

availability and usefulness of the Company Profiles. This valuable resource could provide current and future students with a clear picture of potential employees which might enhance their interest in those companies. Mr. McGrew, citing the content of Charge #2 explained that he was here to make himself available to answer any questions SAC might have regarding issues concerning the international students. Dean Maule stated that she had brought up the issue regarding the effects of foreign consulate policy changes and ISU's obligations to international students. It is ultimately the obligation of the international student to meet the policies of his/her funding body (e.g., foreign consulate or sponsor). While academic advisors should be made aware of policies and remind their advisees about these policies, they are not responsible for ensuring international student adhere to external policies imposed by extra-institutional funding groups.

3. Monitor student quality measures that go beyond HSGPA, consider making recommendations regarding adjustments to admission and/or retention standards. L. Decker/R. Toomey/J. Powers/L. Maule.

Dr. Larry Rosenheim provided SAC with a brief summary of his research into average admission (SAT, etc.) scores at ISU, IU, Ball State, and University of Southern Indiana. (see **ATTACHMENT #1**) Discussion ensued. Dean Maule stated that the data Dr. Rosenheim presented was familiar to her and that she would find data that went beyond SAT scores to be helpful. She thanked Mr. Rosenheim for opening a dialog about the issue of SAT scores being significantly lower than other state institutions of higher education. Institutional research at ISU has many data points relevant to standardized test averages. Aside from genuine questions regarding the data set provide by other Indiana institutions, the discussion focused upon declining SAT scores and one concerned faculty member's opinion regarding, "what type of institution do we want to be?" Mr. Toomey offered that the broader recruitment goals of the university involve more than just standardized test scores. Aside from the increasing average cumulative grade point average for incoming students, the substantial increase in the eligible honor's program students (11% of new student population in fall 2013), and increased core 40 and academic honors diploma completion rates, other priorities guide enrollment planning. And although numerous goals and priorities are assigned in recruitment efforts, one specific priority was cited during this discussion. The University's desire is to attract and enroll a more diverse student body whereas specific to the comparison of University of Southern Indiana (USI), their new student cohort for fall 2013 was self-identified as 4% minority. ISU reported a 31% self-identified minority student enrollment. (see **ATTACHMENT #2**) Dr. Josh Powers noted that in 15 years, 4 and 6 year completion rates have moved relatively little regardless the entering characteristics of students during this period. Mr. Buffington expressed his appreciation for Dr. Rosenheim's work and thanked him for sharing it with SAC.

4. Monitor scholarship GPA maintenance standards. Specifically, what are the standards for maintaining scholarships for out-of-state students receiving 125% tuition limits. Are these standards appropriate and/or are they harming Illinois-student retention in particular. R. Toomey.

No report.

5. Administer the Faculty Scholarship. Investigate “fast-tracking” of scholarship winners to the Executive Committee. A. Arrington-Bey/J. Liu/A. Waite.

Mr. Liu reported that the available amount for scholarships is \$1,394.67. The subcommittee reviewed 81 scholarship applications. Characterizing the pool as being of impressively high quality with many candidates having very strong profiles of 4.0 GPA, excellent essays and strong recommendation letters, the subcommittee selected three top candidates:

- Zach Wittman (42 hours earned, sophomore, finance major, Scott School of Business, Overall GPA: 4.0)
- Mackenzie Shae Carpenter (honors student, nursing major, College of Arts & Sciences, Overall GPA: 3.72)
- Kyle Mullins (58 hours earned, language studies major, College of Arts & Sciences, Overall GPA: 3.92)

The subcommittee recommended two options:

- (1) Award two scholarships: \$697.33 each to Zach Wittman and Mackenzie Shae Carpenter,
- (2) Award three scholarships: \$500 each to Zach Wittman and Mackenzie Shae Carpenter, and \$394.67 to Kyle Mullins.

Move to accept option one: Hauser/Maule. Motion passed. 5-0-0.

Mr. Liu will take care of the notification of the appropriate institutional departments, and will also correspond with the scholarship awardees, inviting them to the April 17th Faculty Senate meeting where they will be introduced. Mr. Buffington will contact Faculty Senate Chairperson Steve Lamb, to request that the awardees and their families be introduced at the start of the meeting, so they can avoid having to sit through lengthy Senate business.

6. Continue to monitor late textbook purchases in 2013-2014. C. Blevens/ R. Toomey/L. Maule.

Ms. Blevens reported that at the February 25th meeting of the Textbook Oversight Committee, Barnes and Noble representatives proposed the creation of a Bookstore Innovation Group (“BIG,” **see ATTACHMENT #3**) that would operate at ISU to advise the bookstore. Suggested representatives to this group would be students, faculty, and administrators who would likely meet after each major textbook ordering period to “share insight and ideas for the bookstore, ask questions and provide constructive feedback that identifies trends and uncovers opportunities.” The Textbook Oversight Committee will likely meet once more this semester, to draft training and information for next fall, review the status of book orders after registration has started (when all orders are supposed to be in) and the BIG proposal.

7. 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. J. Buffington.

Kristie Bigler presented a PowerPoint that featured research she had conducted on the Enterprise Survey tool in Blackboard. She also distributed a written summary,

“Course Evaluations Using Blackboard,” (see ATTACHMENT #4). The purpose was to investigate the potential and possibility of using the Enterprise Survey tool in Blackboard as a replacement or alternative for current course evaluation methods. Ms. Bigler will set up a test site and share it with all SAC voting members and ex-officio members, asking for their input. Discussion centered on points of Blackboard being something that is already in place, it can be easily modified to accommodate evaluative needs, and it offers significant “per student per course” cost savings over other products (ESIRS \$0.90, SIRS \$0.28, custom surveys using scantron \$0.06). An initial pilot study conducted with Baccalaureate Nursing Completion, and History and African American Studies departments resulted in results pleasing to both departments. Response rates were comparable to previously used methods of Qualtrics and paper surveys. Ms. Bigler stated that while using Enterprises Survey requires an investment in time and labor, that investment is well within her team’s current investment. Based on the results as presented in the PowerPoint, SAC agreed that Blackboard’s Enterprise Survey tool was likely the best option for ISU.

8. Work with AVP J Powers regarding a change to the Student Success Council as per proposal offered at 8/20/13 Exec Meeting. J. Powers.
Charge completed.
9. Complete a Year End Report and provide that to the Faculty Senate Officers. J. Buffington.
No report.
10. Investigate the desirability of ISU’s adopting a Medical Amnesty Policy. L. Valentine/L. Decker/C. Enyeart.
Mr. Buffington will send the results of SAC’s activity on this charge to Faculty Senate Executive Committee as an information item.
11. Investigate the desirability of sending midterm grades to all students. L. Valentine/J. Hauser.
Mr. Buffington reported that at the March 4 meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, SGA President Logan Valentine and other members of SGA, made a presentation to the Senators that garnered compliments from Faculty Senate Chairperson Steve Lamb and applause from the Senators. Results of senate activity are that the timing of the interim report (nee Midterm report) has been changed from the 9th week to the 7th week. Additionally, they approved sending this report to all undergraduates, not just to first semester freshmen, those on academic probation, and those with a C- or lower grade. There has been a huge development with SGA’s concern about faculty providing timely feedback: there is a proposal to a Handbook change which will require faculty to state feedback policy in their course syllabi. At their March 18 meeting, Exec unanimously passed a recommendation which affected “**310.1.2 Course Outlines and Syllabi**” and “**310.1.3 Methods of Instruction.**” (see ATTACHMENT #5 “**Midterm Grades Recommendations.**”) Ms. April Hay expressed her thoughts on the proposed policy revision. She has concerns with how the current policy affects non-standard term courses such as eight week courses and how the proposed

revision would affect that situation. Reporting “midterm” by no later than the seventh week causes problems since it is very close to the end of an eight week course. The time-consuming process of dropping a course due to a deficient midterm grade doesn’t allow much time to enroll in a replacement eight week course. Also, by locking it in to a specific timeframe, there is no flexibility if there is a concern for spring break. She talked to OIT; OIT should be ok with the changes that need to be made as long as the revised policy is approved before the semester ends. She feels that it is important to bring the issue forward as changes to the current policy are under consideration.

Move to endorse Faculty Senate’s two revisions to SAC’s proposals (timing of interim report changed from ninth to seventh week and having grades reported to all undergraduates, and inclusion in faculty syllabi, posted at the beginning of the semester, content including reasonable expectations for timely feedback: Maule/Enyeart. Motion passed. 5-0-0.

12. Charge to All Standing Committee Chairpersons: Convene as a Taskforce on the Handbook, with the FAC chair as the chair of this taskforce. The other members will be the chairs of the standing committees. Identify all handbook inconsistencies. Focus on sections 245, 246 and all 300’s. Assign the perceived inconsistencies to the appropriate standing committees for review and amendment. J. Buffington.
No report.
13. Investigate proposed revisions and updates to the Code of Student Conduct. C. Enyeart.
Mr. Enyeart has been working on a revised Code of Student Conduct. An outside team of consultants led by Dr. D. Matthew Gregory, President for the Association for Student Conduct Administration reviewed the proposed code. The Faculty Senate Exec also reviewed it and drafted their comments. Mr. Enyeart provided SAC with copies of the proposed code, a memorandum which provided context to the work done, and a communication he received from Dr. Gregory when he’d asked Dr. Gregory to review the code again after providing him with Faculty Senate Exec’s comments. (See ATTACHMENT #6 “Memorandum: Code of Student Conduct Review and Proposal” & ATTACHMENT #7, communication from Dr. D. Matthew Gregory, External Consultant Review – Indiana State University.) In his letter, Dr. Gregory congratulated Mr. Enyeart on “the culmination of what appeared to be a model institutional Code of Student Conduct.”
Move to endorse the proposed Code of Student Conduct as amended: Maule/Hauser. Motion passed. 5-0-0.
14. Investigate amending the University Handbook to include both the Dean of Students and the University College as ex-officio members of SAC. J. Buffington.
Mr. Buffington’s primary impetus to bring this charge to SAC was a concern that there are two offices that should routinely participate in SAC discussions: the Office of the Dean of Students and University College. Both of these offices are included in SAC mailing lists and both offices have made significant

contributions to the review of student issues but neither is listed among the representatives to SAC in the University Handbook.

SAC recommends amending Section 246.9.1.2 to read as follows (additions underlined):

246.9.1.2 Administrative Representation. *One (1) representative from each of the following areas: Academic Affairs, Registration and Records, Admissions, Financial Aid, Student Academic Services, Leadership, Student Activities and Greek Life, Residential Life, Hulman Memorial Student Union, Intercollegiate Athletics, Division of Student Affairs, and University College.*

Move approval of recommendation: Blevens/Arrington-Bey. Motion passed. 5-0-0.

V. Administrative reports

A. Chair. J. Buffington.
No report.

B. Ex-Officios
Dr. Josh Powers invited everyone to attend the students’ event of the “Sycamore Madness” Bash, tonight, March 21, 6-8 pm, at the Student Rec Center. This is an opportunity for students to learn about summer school at ISU. Food, games, and door prizes are part of this fun event. Dr. Powers also reported that Deans are actively working with departments on their student enrollment and success plans.

C. SGA
No report.

VI. Open Discussion
No report.

VII. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 p.m.

ATTACHMENT #1

FRESHMAN CLASS SAT SCORES

	ISU			IU	Ball State	USI
Year	SATM	SATV	combined	comb.	comb.	comb.
2003	471	474	945			962
2004	477	474	951	1103		960

2005	473	476	949	1111		968
2006	476	472	948	1121		962
2007	473	466	939	1146	1051	952
2008	471	466	937	1152	1055	962
2009	469	464	933	1175	1053	962
2010	469	462	931	1174	1073	975
2011	461	467	928	1170	1065	988
2012	463	460	923	1166	1066	1007
2013	457	457	914	1175		1013

All numbers taken from institutional data reporting sites:

ISU: <http://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/index.cfm/main/data/fb>

Ball State: http://cms.bsu.edu/-/media/WWW/DepartmentalContent/Factbook/1213PDFs/firstfresh_12.pdf

IU-Bloomington: http://www.iu.edu/~uirr/reports/standard/doc/beg/frosh_4138.pdf

USI: <http://www.usi.edu/opra/pdfs/factbook/2013/Academic%20Background%20.pdf>

ATTACHMENT #2

For fall 2013:

<http://irt2.indstate.edu/ir/assets/main/data/ret/2013/success/FTFTBDSSuccessFall2013Ethnicity.pdf>

Average SAT for African American new students: 820.7

2011 550 836.3

2012 654 821.8

2013 723 820.7

Average SAT for white students: 955.2

2011 1691 958.1

2012 1668 963.8

2013 1570 955.2

Given this example of the differing, and sometimes competing, priorities to shape the student enrollment at ISU, strategic decisions are made.

Richard J. Toomey

Associate Vice President of Enrollment Management, Office of Admissio

ATTACHMENT #3

Partnership for Success

BARNES & NOBLE
b&ncollege

CAPTURING INSIGHTS: CREATING A BOOKSTORE INNOVATION GROUP

Barnes & Noble College's promise to bring its campus partners "what's next" in retail excellence and next-generation educational content is fueled by our commitment to acting as a trusted resource and strong advocate of higher education.

Student, faculty and campus partner feedback is an integral part of building a successful bookstore, helping us to identify trends and opportunities, drive innovation and provide the products and services your campus wants.

By partnering with you to host a Bookstore Innovation Group, also known as BIG, we create a dialogue that provides that critical feedback, enabling us to better integrate the bookstore's offerings to meet your institution's needs.



Effective Bookstore Innovation Groups:

- Identify emerging opportunities
- Drive product and service innovation
- Strengthen relationships
- Provide insight

WHAT IS A BOOKSTORE INNOVATION GROUP?



The Bookstore Innovation Group serves as a trusted ally to the campus bookstore, focused on collaborative innovation to enhance the bookstore's relationships with the campus community, deliver superior products and services and drive overall growth. Representing students, faculty and administrators, the group generally meets after each Rush period to share insight and ideas for the bookstore, ask questions and provide constructive feedback that identifies trends and uncovers opportunities.

Partnership for Success

Barnes & Noble College's *Partnership for Success* is a collaborative initiative with our campus partners designed to extend your brand while cementing your campus bookstore as a key social and academic ally. The initiative features innovative programs aimed at students, parents, faculty and administrators that celebrate and promote your school's brand while driving sales at your campus bookstore.

WORKING TOGETHER TO DRIVE SALES

The higher education bookstore industry is changing rapidly as a result of new technology, shifts in student behavior and evolving retail trends. As the leader of the digital evolution, your campus bookstore is a valuable resource to help navigate this new environment. Likewise, the campus community is a valuable resource for the bookstore.

By collaborating with key campus stakeholders to identify their needs and wants, Bookstore Innovation Groups gather important market research. And, by involving this group in what's happening on campus, you help build loyalty that drives sales and encourages word-of-mouth marketing for your campus bookstore.

Who should be involved? Consider including representatives from these areas:

- Alumni
- Athletics
- Deans
- Department Chairs
- Faculty Leadership
- Financial Aid
- LMS Administration
- Recruiting
- Registrar's Office
- Student Government

HOW IT WORKS



Bookstore Innovation Groups are coordinated and run by your Store Manager. He or she will meet with you to identify the appropriate potential group members. From there, the bookstore will extend an invitation to prospective members, and will plan and facilitate one-to-two discussion sessions per semester. Participation in a Bookstore Innovation Group is not time-intensive for members, and is a fun, easy

way to build collaboration between your bookstore and the campus' key stakeholders.

Following the Bookstore Innovation Group meetings, your Store Manager will review the group's feedback, thoughts and ideas and take action on those that will enhance the bookstore experience and drive traffic to the bookstore, its website, social media platforms or e-commerce site.

Help form a Bookstore Innovation Group on your campus.
Contact your Barnes & Noble College bookstore partner.

BARNES & NOBLE
b&n college

BRINGING YOU WHAT'S NEXT

ATTACHMENT #4

COURSE EVALUATIONS USING BLACKBOARD

PURPOSE

Investigate the potential and possibility of using the Enterprise Survey tool in Blackboard as a replacement or alternative for current course evaluation methods.

Is the Blackboard Enterprise Survey tool adequate for course evaluations?

Will the Blackboard Enterprise Survey tool compare favorably to the current evaluation methods?

What resources are required to implement the Blackboard Enterprise Survey tool?

Will switching course evaluations to the Blackboard Enterprise Survey tool result in a net savings to the University?

PRESENTERS

Kristie Bigler
Instructional Tools Support Manager
Kristie.Bigler@indstate.edu, x7824

Yihua Bai
Academic Programmer
Yihua.Bai@indstate.edu, x2678

CURRENT EVALUATION METHODS

Academic departments use a variety of evaluation methods. Most common are the paper or online versions of the SIR as purchased from ETS. Many departments develop their own evaluation methods using Scantron, plain paper, Qualtrics or self-developed tools.

THE BLACKBOARD SURVEY TOOL

Any course can use the Blackboard survey, even if they do not have an active course site. The link to the survey is sent via email.

Surveys created in Blackboard can use five different question types: Likert, Either/Or, Matrix, Multiple Choice, and Open Entry. The answer options are customizable and allows for weighted scoring.

After creating the survey, several steps are involved in deployment. A “Response Period” must be set up for each set of questions, each semester. The method for selecting courses to be included is quite cumbersome, and involves checking each individual course. Notification and reminders are set up in the Response Period, so once the deployment is finalized it does not require any intervention. Notifications and reminders, which include the class and instructor information, are sent via email and Blackboard announcements. The Response Period also allows for a “release date” to be set for when the results will be available.

The Blackboard report will be available to instructors immediately after the release date by clicking on a link in Blackboard. They will have the option of running a report on an individual course or a summary of all the courses they teach. These reports are fairly straightforward and graphical; they should serve the purpose of the majority of faculty. Blackboard reports that summarize results for all courses included in the Response Period are only available to survey “owners”. Owners are set up at the administrative level. We also have the ability to create customized reports using Argos. The Argos reports can be emailed to the appropriate people as needed, but will take a longer time to deliver.

COMPARISON OF KEY FEATURES

Cost of materials	The Blackboard Enterprise Survey tool is an included feature of Blackboard, so there is no additional cost. ESIRs are \$0.90 per student per course. SIRs are approximately \$0.28 per student per course. Custom surveys using scantron are approximately \$0.06 per student per course. Plain paper surveys involve the cost of paper. Qualtrics and self-developed tools have no additional cost.
Method of delivery	Blackboard, Qualtrics, eSIRs, and the self-developed tools are only available online. SIR, plain paper and scantron surveys are only available via paper.
Individual reports	Reports are available using all methods.
Department reports	Reports are available using all methods.
Labor requirements	Online tools such as Blackboard, eSIR, and Qualtrics have a moderate time and labor requirement. Most of the resources are necessary in the initial set-up and reporting. Tools such as Qualtrics and the self-developed programs are implemented at a department level and cannot take advantage of institution level resources without a major time investment. Paper-based tools have very high time and labor requirements.
Course availability	Online tools have the ability to be sent to all courses, while paper-based tools may only be used in on-campus courses.
Question sets	The SIR and eSIR have a pre-defined set of questions. All other methods require the department or institution to define a question set.

PILOT OF BLACKBOARD ENTERPRISE SURVEY TOOL

Our first trial of using Blackboard for course evaluations was Fall 2013. The piloting departments were Baccalaureate Nursing Completion and History and African and African American Studies. BNC had previously used Qualtrics, with HAAAS used a paper survey. Both departments were pleased with the Blackboard tool and plan to use it going forward. They found the response rate and overall results were similar to previous methods. Of the 650 students who were involved, approximately 20 reported some technical issue, mostly stating the email link did not work. Every student who responded to our follow-up indicated that the technical issue was resolved by trying the link again, or using a different browser.

POINTS OF CONSIDERATION

- During the pilot, departments are still using their custom question sets. It would be a much more efficient process if we used institution level question sets.
- Many personnel involved in course evaluations are not current Blackboard users and will need a moderate level of training. Standardized questions will limit the personnel involved. Custom question sets will put much of the obligation onto departments.
- There are many issues that still need to be decided, several questions are: (1) Should we use standardized questions? (2) If we use standardized questions, what will they be? (3) What departments will be involved and what level of access should they have to reporting? (4) What data needs to be included on reports? (5) How should the scoring be weighted and compared?

CONCLUSION

The initial pilot indicates that the Blackboard Enterprise Survey tool is adequate for course evaluations and compares favorably to other tools currently in use. While it does require an investment in time and labor, that too is well within our current investment. Overall, the Blackboard Enterprise Survey tool represents potential savings for the University.

ATTACHMENT #5

MID-TERM GRADE RECOMMENDATIONS

SAC presented its recommendations move the Midterm reports to earlier in the semester at the March 4 meeting of the Senate Executive Committee. Exec passed the following recommendation on a 7-0-1 vote:

No later than the Wednesday of the seventh week of classes, all undergraduates will receive progress reports in the form of letter grades based on assessments offered through the sixth week.

Even though SAC had discussed requiring these reports for all undergraduates, it was not part of our recommendation. Exec believed the reports to be appropriate for all students.

Exec tabled our 2nd, 3rd, and 4th recommendations at its March 4 meeting. It was suggested that we could resolve certain specificity issues more elegantly than what we recommended. At the March 18 Exec meeting, the following recommendation was unanimously approved:

310.1.2 Course Outlines and Syllabi. Faculty members are required to prepare course outlines or syllabi for their courses. Two (2) or more faculty teaching the same course may use the same outline or syllabus. An outline of each course shall be available to students from the beginning of each term. Course outlines and syllabi should be published and accessible to students

throughout the term. Faculty are expected to inform students of revisions to the information provided in course outlines and syllabi when they are made.

310.1.2.1 Required Elements. Each outline and syllabus shall provide information that facilitates communication and promotes student success, including contact information for the faculty member and the department in which the course is offered, faculty office hours, a list of required course texts and materials, explanation of how course grades will be determined, and reasonable expectations that students may have for receiving timely feedback on work submitted for assessment. Faculty are encouraged to review department and College guidelines for preparation of course outlines and syllabi.

310.1.2.2 College and Departmental Required Elements. Colleges and/or departments may establish additional required elements on course outlines and syllabi through appropriate governance processes.

310.1.3 Methods of Instruction. Specific or uniform methods of instruction are not prescribed. Faculty are expected to adapt their methods to the nature and content of each course. Selection and organization of content of particular courses and the development of departmental curricula are faculty responsibilities. Teaching method is the responsibility of the individual faculty member. The quality of his/her teaching will be given high priority in the faculty evaluation process. Faculty are encouraged to avail themselves of the services of the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence, which provides an array of opportunities for faculty to continue their professional development as teachers.

ATTACHMENT #6

MEMORANDUM: CODE OF STUDENT CONDUCT REVIEW AND PROPOSAL

Purpose:

In interacting with students, faculty and staff regarding student expectations and University Conduct process, the office of Student Conduct and Integrity (SCI) concluded revisions to the *Code of Student Conduct* (Code) should be considered. The focus for revisions centered on aligning the conduct process to enhance learning, providing clear expectations, ensuring all rights of the students are clearly identified, as well as adjust prohibited behavior to align with national and technological changes. The current Code used terminology deeply rooted in a legalistic system (i.e. plea agreements, court, justices). Alterations to wording were necessary to assist the students in understanding the criminal and University processes are separate.

Review Process:

In May of 2013, the office of Student Conduct and Integrity requested permission from the Vice President for Student Affairs to undertake a lengthy review process. Student Conduct and Integrity, as charged by the Board of Trustees, has direct oversight of the University conduct process as well as adjudication of conduct matters. Assistant Dean of Students/Director, Student Conduct and Integrity, Craig Enyeart, lead this review. Craig Enyeart has over 12 years of experience working in the area of student conduct, is a certified diversity professional and has over 150 hours of conflict resolution and restorative justice training. Craig Enyeart currently

serves as the State of Indiana Coordinator for the Association for Student Conduct Administration.

An intensive review process proceeded beginning with the review of 22 institutions consisting of other Universities within the State of Indiana as well as others identified as peer institutions across the nation (listed at the end of this document). These institutions were utilized in considering common Code language as well as reviewing how other institutions have integrated recent legislation.

To ensure best practice, Dr. Matthew Gregory, Associate Dean of Students at Louisiana State University and President for the Association for Student Conduct Administration, has graciously served as an external reviewer. His comments and recommendations have been incorporated into the existing Code proposal. Dr. Gregory is a leading authority in student rights, restorative justice and conflict resolution. During this time, University Police and the Office of Residential Life were consulted for comment and recommendations.

In December 2013, the Code proposal was provided to the Faculty Senate/Student Affairs Committee (SAC) for review and recommendations outlined in the University Handbook 245: Constitution of the Faculty of Indiana State University (specifically, 245.2.3: Advisory Authority).

On January 23, 2014, Student Conduct and Integrity convened a Policy Review Committee including the following: Amanda Knerr (Executive Director, Residential Life), Dr. Virgil Sheets (faculty and faculty justice), Student Government Association, Residence Hall Association, Brooks Moore (Associate Dean of Students for Student Activities and Organizations), Joseph Newport (Chief of Police, Indiana State University Police Department), Kourtney Barrett (Associate Director for Student Conduct and Integrity), and Zachariah Mathew (Associate Director, International Affairs).

On January 16 and January 30, 2014, Vice President Tillery presented the Code proposal to her cabinet for review and comment. All recommendations were considered for inclusion in the Code proposal.

On January 17, 2014, SAC discussed the proposal and all members were charged with review and comment on the Code proposal.

On January 28, 2014, Student Conduct and Integrity met with the President's Cabinet to discuss the Code proposal and receive feedback and/or recommendations. Of note, this is the first interaction the office of Student Conduct and Integrity had with President Bradley regarding revisions to the Code.

On January 28, 2014, President Bradly requested a letter from SAC stating they have had the opportunity to review the Code proposal and inform him if SAC is supportive, or not, of the proposal.

On February 13, 2014, having received no recommendations from any SAC members, the chair of SAC opened an electronic vote. On February 14, 2013 all voting members signified 'aye' in support of the proposal with a vote of 7-0-0.

On February 21, 2014 the Code Proposal was on the agenda for passage by the Board of Trustees. Faculty Senate requested the item be removed from the agenda citing concerns of the shared governance on the topic. Vice President Tillery and President Bradley agreed to withdraw the item.

On February 25, 2014, Faculty Senate Exec. voted to remand the Code proposal back to SAC for further review and recommendation.

Based on comments made during Faculty Senate Exec, the language for passive participation has been altered. The past version read: "Students passively participating in or assisting others in to committing acts prohibited by the University will likely be sanctioned to the same extent as if one had committed the prohibited act." In the current version, "will likely" has been changed to

“may.” Currently, the Code has one sentence regarding aiding and abetting by your presence and/or knowledge. This policy was discussed with several students, who stated it was much clearer than what is currently in the Code and the location is such that they are more likely to read the policy.

One concern discussed during Faculty Senate Exec. was the issue of computing policy not including personal devices. The language was not altered due to concern of privacy and basic human rights. The University should not be concerned with what is personally owned; however, can address the use of University services regardless of property rights of a device. An addition was made to include violation of all other computing policies not specifically described in the Code.

8.2 Amendments to the Code no reads: “Recommendations made by the Policy Review Committee will be provided to the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) for review and comment and proceed to Faculty Senate prior to submitting the recommendations for approval.”

Reviewers:

Matthew Gregory, Ph.D., Associate Dean of Students, Louisiana State University/President, Association for Student Conduct Administration.

Carmen Tillery, Ph.D., Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

Craig Enyeart, Assistant Dean of Students/Director, Student Conduct and Integrity

Kourtney Barrett, Assistant Director, Student Conduct and Integrity

Brooks Moore, Associate Dean of Students for Student Activities and Organizations

Kenneth Chew, Psy.D., Director, Student Counseling Center

Stephanie Jefferson, Ph.D., Director, C.E.Brown African American Cultural Center

John Lentz, Director, Student Recreational Sports

Al Perone, Associate Dean of Students/Ombudsperson

Aimee Janssen-Robinson, Assistant Dean of Students for Student Advocacy

Amanda Knerr, Executive Director, Residential Life

Joseph Newport, Chief of Police, Indiana State University

Melony Sacopulos, General Counsel for Indiana State University

Shelbie Schomber, Student

President's Cabinet

Student Government Association

Residence Hall Association

Student Affairs Committee (SAC) - All members including ex-officio and guests (i.e. Dr. Josh Powers, Dr. Linda Maule, student guests)

Institutions Reviewed:

Illinois State University, Ball State University, Central Michigan University, East Carolina University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, University of Northern Colorado, Louisiana Tech University, East Tennessee State University, Bowling Green University, Cleveland State University, Eastern Illinois University, Idaho State University, Tennessee State University, UNC Charlotte, University of Akron, University of Arkansas—Little Rock, University of Missouri (Kansas and St. Louis), UNC Greensboro, University of South Alabama, University of South Dakota, Wichita State, Wright State



ATTACHMENT #7

D. Matthew Gregory, PhD

EXTERNAL CONSULTANT REVIEW – INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

To: Craig Enyeart, CDP
Assistant Dean of Students
Director, Student Conduct and Integrity
Indiana State University

From: D. Matthew Gregory, PhD
Consultant, Higher Education

Date: March, 21, 2014

RE: Proposed Code of Student Conduct Review

Mr. Enyeart,

Again, thank you for the opportunity to visit Indiana State University on November 7th and 8th for the purpose of conducting an external review of the ISU Code of Student Conduct, a review of Student Conduct and Integrity, and to provide staff training on conflict resolution to ISU staff.

I recently had the opportunity to read the proposed Indiana State University: Code of Student Conduct. As you may recall, I provided recommendations in advance of my November and following my November visit that were intended to represent what I perceive to be recommended practice nationally and in-line with recent guidance from the Department of Education (2011 Dear Colleague Letter, 2013 UM Resolution Agreement). Upon my review, I feel my feedback was taken into consideration and appears, in the majority of instances, to have been incorporated into the proposed version of the Code of Student Conduct. Additionally, and upon subsequent review, I am of the opinion that the proposed version of the Code of Student Conduct is in-line with national recommended practice for student conduct processes and procedures.

At this time, I have no essential recommendations to offer. Congratulations on the culmination of what appears to be a model institutional Code of Student Conduct.

Sincerely,

D. Matthew Gregory

Consultant, Higher Education

<http://www.nchemr.org/consultants/d-matthew-gregory/>