

CND Campus Advisory Committee
Conference Call
November 5, 2007, 2:00 – 3:00 PM
Mark Lowe, Peggy Lucke Co-Chairs

Participants:

Jeff Jacobs, BSC
Mark Lowe- DSU
Joann Kitchens - LRSC
– MaSU
Jonelle Watson – MiSU
Jim Borkowski – MiSU-B
Mike Renk - NDSCS
Viet Doan – NDSU
Peggy Lucke –UND
Marcia Pritchert – VCSU
Brenda Wigness – WSC
Julie Schepp- NDUS

HECN:

Mick Pytlik
Scott Mahar

This was an interim conference call to hear reports from the work groups addressing Academic Standing, GPA, Satisfactory Academic Progress, Transcripts and Social Security.

Academic Standing – The work group addressing academic standing made the following recommendation:

1. *Each institution should review their academic standing policy for complexities and determine if policy can be streamlined or changed to make it more automated.*
2. *The academic standing policy is a faculty policy on each campus and each policy was/is based upon the legacy system which allowed both institutional and cumulative GPA's. The Academic Standing Complexity Issue relates directly to the Grade Point Average Issue and cannot be determined until the GPA Complexity Issue is addressed. The Academic Standing Working Group would like, however, to propose the following:*
 - a. *An analysis be made of how data is going to be converted from current system to 9.0 for all institutions (ex: what field does the Institutional GPA convert to, if it converts to Cumulative GPA field, it would be erroneous and would not work with multiple GPA's), with the possibility of developing an institutional GPA Field prior to "go live", and*
 - b. *Since 9.0 will support multiple GPA's, development should be made to have both a cumulative (all inclusive GPA with transfer and institutional grades) and an institutional GPA (only institutional grades) be determined and identified so either (or both) an institutional or cumulative GPA could be utilized on each campus.*

GPA – The work group addressing GPA made the following recommendation:

At this time, no changes be made regarding how the 11 institutions use and/or report student GPA at their institution. Institutions should, however, review their transcript legend and update their GPA definitions if necessary. The work group also recommends further investigation of GPA functionality to be delivered in Campus Solutions 9.0 which includes, but is not limited to:

- 1. Functionality to calculate and/or store cumulative and institutional GPA,*
- 2. Functionality that allows institutions to choose which GPA is reported on transcripts, and*
- 3. Processes that accommodate both cumulative and institutional GPA (e.g. satisfactory academic progress, academic standing).*

In the interim, the work group suggests that a group be convened to discuss the GPA, Satisfactory Academic Progress, and Academic Standing issues as they are interrelated. The work group feels that any future recommendation should support the mission and policies of each institution.

The work group also brought forth the following challenges:

The primary challenge for the work group was the varying missions and policies of the institutions. The work group did not feel that any recommendations could be made that would not involve institutions making changes to their policies. In many cases, the policy regarding GPA was written by University/Faculty Senate. Asking institutions to change these policies without a full understanding of what Campus Solutions 9.0 is capable of did not seem to be a wise recommendation.

A second challenge we found was the varying definition of cumulative and institutional GPA across institutions. For instance, cumulative GPA could include:

- 1. All transfer and all institutional coursework, or*
- 2. Some transfer and all institutional coursework.*

And institutional GPA could include:

- 1. All transfer and all institutional coursework,*
- 2. Some transfer and all institutional coursework, or*
- 3. Just institutional coursework.*

Following discussion, it was moved by Joann Kitchens, second by Jeff Jacobs to accept the recommendations of the Academic Standing and GPA work groups, motion carried.

Jeff Jacobs also moved that representatives of the Academic Standing, GPA, and SAP work groups do further study on the issues that face all three areas, second by Viet Doan, motion carried.

Satisfactory Academic Progress – No written report was presented. Jeff reported that the SAP work group is unable to proceed and/or make a recommendation until the Academic Standing and GPA issues are resolved.

Transcripts – The transcript work group presented the following:

The consensus of the group was that the current setup does not call for modifications and neither will the upgrade to Campus Solutions 9.0. The current system provides the institutions with flexibility within the setup. This is a delivered functionality. A standardized setup would reduce the time spent troubleshooting. However, the Business Analyst felt that this is not necessary at this time.

It was moved by Mark Lowe, second by Mike Renk to accept the report from the Transcript work group, motion carried.

Social Security – The Social Security work group made the following recommendation:

We could not come up with a common number of credits to be used for graduate students. We recommend that six credits be coded into the query for half-time undergraduate students. For the graduate students, we would like a prompt added requesting “number-of-credits”. If the programmers need to treat both undergraduate and graduate the same way, we would recommend adding a prompt for “number-of-credits” for both. Since the update does not update graduate students anyway, the update could be left alone.

It was moved by Viet, second by Jonelle to accept the report from the Social Security Work group.

Peggy and Mark will report the findings of the work groups and the action taken by the CAC to the Steering Committee during an IVN meeting scheduled for November 6, 2007. The CAC will be informed of any action taken by the Steering Committee.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Lowe