IUPUI
Academic Policies and Procedures Committee
Agenda
Friday November 4, 2005

Minutes

- The minutes from the 10/7/05 meeting were distributed.

Announcements from the Chair

- Students displaced by Katrina
- Subcommittee to establish Campus Performance Assessment for IUPUI student support services
    - o Trudy Banta will bring together a group to establish the performance indicators for IUPUI student support services. Once the indicators are established, APPC will serve as the group that receives the data and makes the determination on how IUPUI is performing.
    - o The group should meet before the next APPC meeting and an update will be provided.
- SIS 8.9 upgrade
    - o See attached information
        - ▪ Update on 8.9 Upgrade Planning Activities
        - ▪ 8.9 and 9.0 Planning Activities Timeline
    - o Information on the principles that will be used in making decisions on modification requests and the list of requests will be distributed to APPC as the information becomes available.
- Office of Student Financial Aid will present a workshop for academic unit personnel on Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) on November 18 from 11-12:45 am in Lecture Hall 101.
    - o The workshop will provide the participants with information on the federal regulations that drive the determination of satisfactory academic progress for the purposes of awarding federal financial aid.
    - o All academic units should plan on sending at least one representative to the workshop. For those who can not attend, the workshop will be taped.
- Retention reports for the 2004 Cohort have been added to the University Reporting & Research website.
    - o You can access reports on Persistence to the Second Year for the 2004 Cohort at http://www.indiana.edu/~urr/retention/2004_cohort.shtml. You will also find a new Retention Highlights link, which provides some quick facts on retention rates across the campuses, as well as some information on first-year grades in relation to retention.
- IU position on Dual Enrollment
    - o Excerpt from email from Ken Gros Louis to Ken Sauer, ICHE
    - o Indiana University supports the establishment of clear, rigorous, and consistent academic standards for dual enrollment. We appreciate the efforts of the Indiana General Assembly, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education, and our partners at Indiana postsecondary institutions and high schools for their efforts in this regard. Thank you very much for being so very thoughtful and responsive in the development of the academic standards portion of the document. It is a job well done.
    - o However, the "additional conditions for receiving postsecondary enrollment change funding" outlined in the proposed policy draft will function as a de facto tuition price control and is based on

1

```
        a completely impractical funding model. By proposing these
        "conditions," the Commission is working outside its statutory
        authority by establishing tuition and fees for dual enrollment
        courses. In addition, the funding model needs a great deal more
        work.
```
- o After much consideration, we respectfully request that the language in the "additional conditions for receiving postsecondary enrollment change funding" be removed from the draft, since it is an attempt to set tuition and fees. It is our position – and we believe most of the Indiana's state postsecondary institutions agree – that the Indiana Commission for Higher Education does not have the authority to set tuition and fees. Our trustees are vested with this authority. Adoption of this proposal sets an unacceptable precedent for tuition price controls. The tuition price control concept was not adopted by either the College Affordability Task Force or the Higher Education Subcommittee of the Government Efficiency Commission.
- o Moreover, the funding mechanism that is proposed is unrealistic and unresponsive to the concerns we have expressed to the Commission staff, both privately and publicly. As was indicated during the meeting of IU representatives and other CHE staff members, the recommended course fee is completely arbitrary. The assumption of full funding of enrollment change for these programs seems highly unrealistic given Indiana's current economic climate and renders the financial aspects of the policy practically inert. While we remain open to more realistic alternatives to the current funding mechanism proposed in this document, but we cannot support the "additional conditions for receiving postsecondary enrollment change funding." And strongly urge that this section be removed from the document while we find a more realistic means of funding these important programs.

Academic Affairs Committee Report   *Betty Jones, Chair*
- ▪ Proposal for revised Principles of UG Learning presented at last Tuesday's IFC. This was the first reading.
  - o Proposed Revisions to the Principles of Undergraduate Learning - October 2005 (shown side-by-side with original PULs [1998]) - from the IUPUI Academic Affairs Committee
    http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/PUL_proposal_10-05.htm
  - o Original PUL document Faculty Council approved in May 1998--and the version of the Proposed Revisions to the PULs discussed at the "open session" at the 9/6/05 IFC meeting.
    - ▪ **VIEW** Original PUL 1998 document
      http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/original_PULs_1998.htmor
    - ▪ **VIEW** Combined Tracked-Proposed changes to Original 1998 FC PUL Document 7-05
      http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/proposed_PUL_changes_7-05.htm
  - o Academic Affairs Committee will meet on November 16th to consider the comments Faculty Council members offered at the 11/1/05 IFC meeting, along with any others Betty Jones receives by the meeting. Betty invites comments from APPC members.
- ▪ Policy on Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement
  - o Vote on the document was deferred until the December meeting

- o There is a need to have a common understanding of the terminology and the processes for readmission/reinstatement
- o The original purpose for crafting the policy was to reduce the confusion for students since each academic unit seemed to have a different policy. This policy would establish a baseline; academic units can still have higher standards.
- o If the policy is implemented with the IUPUI GPA as the basis for actions, the Purdue mission schools will ask to be exempted since they must include Purdue grades in determining these actions.
- o AAC will consider the comments that have been received and determine if the document needs additional changes
- ▪ During the discussion Cathy Buyarski mentioned that the UC faculty will review a policy that permits individuals with greater than 56 hours to be in University College under specific circumstances.
- ▪ UFC-EPC has been working on
    - o IU Admission statement
        - ▪ http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY06/circulars/U9-2006.htm
    - o General Education policy/guidelines
        - ▪ http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY05/Circulars/GenEd.htm

Items for Review, Discussion, or Action

- • Academic unit policies on student emails from non-IUPUI email accounts—*Cathy Buyarski*
    - o In September, Cathy polled academic units on what their policies are on
    - o Results of survey distributed and are attached to minutes
    - o A primary concern was how to keep the faculty informed on the best way to respond to student emails from non-iupui accounts
    - o Ingrid Toschlog, Jane Lambert, and Andy Gavrin will contribute the polices that are being used in their units
- • National Student Exchange (NSE)—*Cathy Buyarski*
    - o The program booklet and posters for the NSE were distributed
    - o It is a domestic version of study abroad
        - ▪ It is an opportunity for students to study at 160+ institutions for up to one year and pay IUPUI tuition
    - o It will permit students to pursue a specific academic interest that is not offered at IUPUI and provides an opportunity to check out graduate opportunities at other institutions while an UG
    - o By bringing in students from other institutions, it will help us to broaden the student body at IUPUI
    - o IUPUI will not take in more students than we sent out so that it is cost neutral for the institution
    - o Cathy Buyarski is the contact person
        - ▪ There is to be a signed transfer credit agreement before the student leaves
        - ▪ Students need to plan ahead sufficiently so that they would be registering about the same time as we register at IUPUI unless they are going to a quarter basis school.
- • Evaluation of Transfer Credit—*Mike Donahue*
    - o See attached
    - o The change in process was developed in anticipation of the adopting of the Higher Education Reauthorization act which is likely to prohibit institutions from refusing to transfer credit from an institution solely on the basis

- o Members of APPC are asked to review the document and comment to Mike Donahue before the next meeting
- Experiential Learning—*Mary Beth Myers*
  - o Project to track and record community based experiential learning on the transcript will require an emergency maintenance modification to appropriately record the information on the transcript
    - ▪ This will delay implementation and do not know if it can be implemented for spring courses
  - o A question was asked if, in the future, could we designate a way to record completion of the PULs
    - ▪ Probably not on the official academic record

Future Agenda Items

- Prior Learning Assessment--*Amy Warner*
- Intercampus Transfer & Returning Student Processes--*Enrollment Center*
- Retention Issues
- Transfer Students
  - o Policy and Business Practice Impediments

Meeting Dates and Locations

December 2, 2005	1:00 to 3:00	CA 136
January 6, 2006	1:00 to 3:00	CA 136
February 3, 2006	1:00 to 3:00	CA 136
March 3, 2006	1:00 to 3:00	CA 136
April 7, 2006	1:00 to 3:00	CA 136
May 5, 2006	1:00 to 3:00	CA 136

Update on 8.9 Upgrade Planning activities
November 2005

- Oracle announced they will extend support for HR/SA 8.0 for an additional year. **Support for HR/SA 8.0 now ends August 31, 2008**.

- Initial planning efforts by the HRMS and SIS functional experts and stakeholders have identified **February** as the optimal month for a major upgrade. The February date works well for all areas with the exception of the FMS tax area.
    - o UITS technical upgrade activities will continue given the significant environment changes that come with the 8.9 toolset
    - o SIS representatives will begin upgrade **fit-gap and prototyping activities in FY 06-07**.

- During the upgrade project, functional and technical staff will support ongoing PeopleSoft updates (regulatory and tax updates, required maintenance, emergency maintenance) for version 8.0, however, enhancements to version 8.0 will need to be put on hold (this date has not yet been established).

- Budget and staffing requirements for the upgrade project will be re-evaluated for the 2006-07 budget construction period.

SIS/SES Executive Committee Recommendation

- The HRMS and SIS stakeholders reviewed the strategy for 8.0 and 9.0 upgrades and recommend the following:
    - o **Upgrade HRMS/SA 8.0 to Campus Solutions 8.9 in February 2008**
    - o **Upgrade HRMS/SA 8.9 to Campus Solutions 9.0 in February 2009**

The executive committee recommendation in based on the following:
- Budget planning for FY 06-07 needs to be finalized by February 2006, unknowns surrounding version 9.0 make it difficult to plan for a 9.0 implementation until late 2006/early 2007.
- The executive committee members envision a rolling upgrade process where the management of new releases and version upgrades will be a continuous activity. The 8.9 and 9.0 should not be viewed as two distinct projects but a continual effort to improve and deliver advanced technology infrastructure, new features & functionality, and ongoing bug fixes.
- This approach will be more sensitive to individual workloads, allowing the work to be spread over a longer period of time.
- From a budgetary standpoint, knowing that work on new releases and upgrades is a continual process will permit appropriate allocation of resources on an annual basis rather than attempting to budget for and staff backfill positions when upgrade spikes require significant shifts of home office staff to work on upgrades.
- Give student service areas more time to do effective communication and training with IU community.

Update on 8.9 Upgrade Planning activities
November 2005

New Oracle Support Policy

Release	General Availability (GA)	Premier Support (updates, fixes, upgrade, security alerts)	Tax, Legal, Regs Support ends	Extended Support ends (Additional fee)
HRMS/SA 8.0	*September 2001*	*August 2008*	*August 2008*	*Not Offered*
Campus Solutions 8.9	*December 2004*	*December 2009*	*December 2010*	*December 2012*
Campus Solutions 9.0	*2nd Half 2006*	*2nd Half 2011*	*2nd Half 2012*	*No dates published*
Fusion (NG)	*No dates published*	*No dates published*	*No dates published*	*No dates published*

- Comprehensive support for the PeopleSoft Enterprise products will be available for 5 years from the GA date
- Extended Support (years 6 – 8)
    - Will include an additional fee (10% year 1, 20% year 2 & 3)
- Campus Solutions 9.0 support dates not published, however, the dates listed adhere to the new policy
- Fusion Planning (next generation product)
    - Oracle Campus Solutions strategy said they will *begin* thinking about Fusion apps in 2006 – their focus in 9.0
    - Replacement product GA date for Oracle Student Systems (OSS) and PeopleSoft Campus Solutions has not been announced.
    - If support for PeopleSoft Enterprise products end 2012-2013 then a replacement product is needed that gives Higher Ed sufficient time in which to perform PeopleSoft -> Fusion migration.

Proposal to consider a modification to the IUPUI transfer credit procedures

Background—IU has a policy that college courses will be considered for transfer credit if the sending institution is accredited. (Memorandum of January 25, 1994 from President Ehrlich to Trustees, Memorandum from IUB Admissions (Palmer) to Don Weaver, Director of State Relations (March 27, 1991), Memorandum from IUB Admissions (Morgan) to Sara McNabb, University Registrar (January 24, 1990). These documents do not specify type of accreditation required. Other documents mention regional accreditation (M.D. Sherer, University Registrar and Director of Admissions Memo dated August 7, 1978 to Members of University Committee on Admissions and Memo of November 12, 1981 to Edward Whalen, Director of Budgeting). The practice at IUPUI has been to transfer credit only if the institution was regionally accredited, e.g. North Central Association of Schools and Colleges or Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.

As Congress is debating the Higher Education Reauthorization Act, the Chairman of the committee is advocating for language that requires (1) colleges and universities be specific about their transfer credit policy, (2) schools not exclude coursework for transfer solely on the basis of lack of one type of accreditation, and (3) each college annually report the number of transfer students and the number of credits posted by type of accreditation.

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) has a policy on transferring college credits. Many institutions have formed an alliance called the Higher Education Transfer Alliance (HETA). See www.chea.org/HETA/ . IUPUI is part of that alliance. See appendix A for CHEA and ACE recommendations.

As CHEA notes, the transfer of credit from one institution to another involves the:

(1) educational quality of the learning experience which the student transfers;
(2) comparability of the nature, content, and level of the learning experience to that offered by the receiving institution; and
(3) appropriateness and applicability of the learning experience to that offered by the receiving institution in light of the student's educational goals.

Proposal:

A. In order for course work to be considered for possible transfer, the following two conditions must be met.

1. Institution must be listed in the annual list of Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education by *American Council on Education*
2. Institution must be listed as an Accredited Degree-Granting institution offering associate and/or bachelor degrees.
3. Any exception, including internationnal institutions, must be considered on a case by case basis and be approved by the Dean of the Faculties or designee.

B. To determine transfer credit from nationally accredited institutions, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions will follow these procedures.

1. Each course will be considered on a course-by-course basis and the course syllabus must be used to determine applicability and appropriate level.
2. Initial review by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions will result in the transferring of course credit either as specified course –by course equivalents or as undistributed elective credit assigned the appropriate academic level and department. Undistributed transfer credit will be limited to 15 hours of credit. The student may request an additional 15 hours if appropriate and if the Dean of the IUPUI academic unit that offers the student's major approves the additional undistributed credit. In these cases the credit will be posted as academic unit undistributed credit. e.g. LIBA # 100
3. In instances where no course articulation exists or no equivalent is established by the Admissions Office, however, a student may (after review by the Admissions Office) contact the appropriate department to determine whether the course is equivalent.
4. Students wishing to appeal a decision will follow the established procedures used by the Office of Undergraduate Admission for departmental review.
5. For school or departmental review, the Dean of the school, designee, or Chair of the department (within which the course would be considered for transfer credit) has the final determination on appeals, e.g. Liberal Arts courses can only be reviewed and approved by appropriate Liberal Arts dean or designee.

Appendix A

The following is a discussion by CHEA.

Making Transfer Decisions: Roles and Responsibilities to Assure Quality
Institutions, accreditors and national higher education associations play significant roles and sustain important responsibilities in the transfer process. Each has responsibilities with regard to quality assurance and fairness.
The Role and Responsibilities of Institutions. Colleges and universities are ultimately responsible for decisions about the admission of transfer students and the acceptance or non-acceptance of credits earned elsewhere. Typically, academic faculty and student affairs professionals (working within the framework of faculty rules and standards) determine the transferability of courses and programs. Institutions must balance responsiveness to students' preferences about transfer with institutional commitment to the value and quality
of degrees or other credentials.
The Role and Responsibilities of Accreditors. Institutional (national and regional) accreditors have policies and standards that, in turn, call on institutions and programs to develop and maintain clear transfer policy and practices. Accreditors have expectations, for example, that degree requirements for native students be consistent with those that apply to transfer students. Specialized (programmatic) accreditors often have policies or standards to address transfer, with particular attention to admissions practices and assuring equitable treatment for transfer students.
Accreditors are responsible for assuring that institutional transfer practices are consistent with accreditation standards and policies on transfer. They are responsible for maintaining effective communication among accrediting organizations as a means to meet students' needs in the transfer process while also sustaining quality.
The Role and Responsibilities of National Higher Education Associations. For many years, institutions and accreditors have based their scrutiny of transfer primarily on three criteria contained in the 1978 Joint

Statement on Transfer and Award of Academic Credit developed by three national higher education associations.
These criteria are:
• the educational quality of the sending institution;
• the comparability of credit to be transferred to the receiving institution; and
• the appropriateness and the applicability of the credit in relation to the programs offered by the receiving institution.
National higher education associations lead the ongoing national conversation about transfer. They work with agencies of the federal government to address transfer issues that reach the level of national public policy, and they provide a national voice for assuring that students are well served by transfer practices that meet students' needs while also sustaining the quality of the system itself.

Criteria for Transfer Decisions
CHEA believes that the three criteria of quality, comparability, and appropriateness and applicability offered in the 1978 Joint Statement remain central to assuring quality in transfer decision-making. The following additional criteria expand this list and are offered to assist institutions, accreditors and higher education associations in future transfer decisions. These criteria are intended to sustain academic quality in an environment of more varied transfer, assure consistency of transfer practice and encourage appropriate accountability about transfer policy and practice.
Balance in the Use of Accreditation Status in Transfer Decisions. Institutions and accreditors need to assure that transfer decisions are not made solely on the source of accreditation of a sending program or institution. While acknowledging that accreditation is an important factor, CHEA believes that receiving institutions ought to make clear their institutional reasons for accepting or not accepting credits that students seek to transfer. Students should have reasonable explanations about how work offered for credit is or is not of sufficient quality when compared with the receiving institution and how work is or is not comparable with curricula and standards to meet degree requirements of the receiving institution.
Consistency. Institutions and accreditors need to reaffirm that the considerations that inform transfer decisions are applied consistently in the context of changing student attendance patterns (students likely to engage in more transfer) and emerging new providers of higher education (new sources of credits and experience to be evaluated). New providers and new attendance patterns increase the number and type of transfer issues that institutions will address—making consistency even more important in the future.
Accountability for Effective Public Communication. Institutions and accreditors need to assure that students and the public are fully and accurately informed about their respective transfer policies and practices. The public has a significant interest in higher education's effective management of transfer, especially in an environment of expanding access and mobility. Public funding is routinely provided to colleges and universities. This funding is accompanied by public expectations that the transfer process is built on a strong commitment to fairness and efficiency.
Commitment to Address Innovation. Institutions and accreditors need to be flexible and open in considering alternative approaches to managing transfer when these approaches will benefit students. Distance learning and other applications of technology generate alternative approaches to many functions of colleges and universities. Transfer is inevitably among these.

The following is a statement from the American Council on Education

Transfer and Credit Equivalency (American Council on Education)
Colleges and universities are not the sole providers of teaching and learning in higher education. Students can and do receive education and training from a variety of sources including the military, the workplace, apprenticeship and training programs and indigenous high school advanced placement programs. To help institutions reach judgments about how to treat such education for transfer purposes, ACE's Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials operates programs to determine credit equivalencies for various modes of extra-institutional learning. Virtually every higher education admissions office has the following two references, both of which are published by ACE:
• *The National Guide to Educational Credit for Training Programs*

This guide evaluates formal educational programs and courses offered by organizations for their employees, members, or customers and makes college credit recommendations accordingly. These organizations include business and industry, labor unions, professional and voluntary associations, schools, institutes, and government agencies. In addition, the guide contains credit recommendations for courses offered by home-study schools that are accredited by the Distance Education and Training Council.

• *The Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*
This guide evaluates and makes credit recommendations for formal educational programs and courses offered by the United States armed services. The guide also makes credit recommendations for Military Occupational Specialties (MOS). In addition, this guide is available in an online searchable format.

Credit by Examination
ACE evaluates examinations published by a variety of organizations and has recommended college credit for students who are successful in passing them. The more prominent examinations include: the ACT Proficiency Examination Program (PEP); Regents' College Examinations; the College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) Program; the College Board's College-Level Examination Program (CLEP); and the Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Education Support (DANTES) Subject Standardized Testing (DSST) Program. The examinations cover a wide spectrum of the subject matter taught in higher education. In practice, the majority of higher education institutions accept the examinations for credit in one form or another. Institutions may have varying standards for acceptance and applicability toward the student's academic program. However, the examinations have been an integral and accepted component of the transfer
process for many years. To assist the colleges and universities in making credit decisions, ACE publishes the *Guide to Educational Credit by Examination* that reviews the content and psychometric properties of these tests and industry certification examinations. Specific credit recommendations are included based on student scoring levels and overall performance.

8.9 & 9.0 Upgrade Planning

Upgrade Scenarios and Activities	FY 05-06 Jan-Mar Apr-Jun	Fiscal Year 06-07				Jul-Sep Oct-Dec	Fiscal Year 07-08		Jul-Sep Oct-Dec	Fiscal Year 08-09	
		Jul-Sep	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun		Jan-Mar	Apr-Jun		Jan-Mar	Apr-J

On-going Releases & Enhancement Projects

Enhancement projects — Freeze 8.0 Development work

Refine business processes
Infrastructure projects (i.e. PT upgrade, DB, etc)

1. Upgrade 8.0 to 8.9 - February 2008

1st pass of 8.9 upgrade | 8.9 work | Feb   Go Live

~ 19 month project

> UITS technical work begins FY 05-06; functional work begins July 2006

2. Upgrade 8.9 to 9.0 - February 2009

9.0   avail | 1st pass of 9.0 upgrade | 9.0 work | Feb   Go Live

~ 15 month project

Project may begin sooner; depends on resource availability

Version 9.0 is targeted to be available late 2006 with upgrade scripts trailing by 3 months

12

Academic Policies and Procedures

School	Formal E-Mail Policy	Other Information
Admissions	University ID or other unique identification	Will respond to inquiries for general information without identification. University E-Mails are not yet set up when communication occurs through Admissions.
Bursar	IUPUI E-Mail address w/EID#	
Education	No Policy	Tell students they use IUPUI accounts when corresponding. Only IUPUI accounts are used when the school initiates the E-Mail.
Health and Rehab Sci	IUPUI E-Mail address	
Herron	No Policy	
Informatics	No Written Policy	Tell students they use IUPUI accounts when corresponding.
Kelley School of Business	IUPUI E-Mail address	General questions answered via any e-mail address.
Labor Studies	No Policy	
Liberal Arts	IUPUI E-Mail address	Will accept withdrawal requests via an official IUPUI E-Mail address.
Medicine	IUPUI E-Mail address is official communication	They do respond to questions and inquiries from non-IUPUI E-Mail accounts.
Science	IUPUI E-Mail address	Faculty members may not adhere to the same policy.
Social Work	No Policy	School is small enough that they feel confident that they know all students. Even then no confidential infdormation is given via e-mail.
SPEA	IUPUI E-Mail address	They do respond to questions and inquiries from non-IUPUI E-Mail accounts.
TCEM	IUPUI E-Mail address	