

INSTRUCTION COUNCIL

AGENDA

Thursday, November 21, 2019

204 WH

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

In attendance: Chad Blew, Aaron Christensen, Ryan Chung, Cynda Clary, Richard Frohock, Jami Fullerton, Margi Gilmour, Jeff Hartman, Kelva Hunger, Susan Johnson, Diane Jones, Tom Joyce, James Knecht, Marlys Mason, Brenda Masters, Rita Peaster, Kyndal Roark, Adrienne Sanogo, Randy Seitsinger, Jean Van Delinder, Missy Wikle, Tom Wikle and Jeanette Mendez, Chair.

1. ACE Overview – Tom Joyce

T. Joyce, an academic advisor with the aviation program in the College of Education, Health and Aviation, presented information regarding the American Council on Education (ACE). ACE is 1700 members strong, including Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE). Members include public and private schools, universities, colleges and technical schools. ACE provides program evaluation and recommendation of higher education credit for military courses and occupations. The faculty members who comprise this group are not affiliated with the military, and the faculty evaluation teams are subject matter experts in the courses and occupations they are evaluating.

From 2015 to 2019 there was a 40 percent decrease in military / veteran enrollment at OSU. One of the factors which contributes to this number is how military credits are assessed when transferred to OSU. Most of the military courses submitted transferred as lower level electives. The overwhelming theme from military and student veterans is that their military credits are insignificant to OSU. There is a large number of military personnel in our vicinity that could and would most likely attend OSU if their transferring credits were assessed as credits that could be effectively used for their degree. T. Joyce would like to see a more robust military guide presented by OSU to the military facilities in this region as a way of supporting more military / veteran personnel and boosting OSU enrollment.

The short-term goal for assessing ACE credits is to work closely with OSU Admissions to ensure that the military courses are assessed at the level they are recommended according to the ACE military guide. J. Hartman informed IC that the course description in ACE is not enough information to give a one to one comparison. T. Joyce offered to, upon request, reach out to military installations to gather syllabi for their courses in order to provide OSU Admissions and faculty members with the required information.

The long-term goal includes T. Joyce working with advisors and faculty members to create a useful military guide. When faculty members agree to a course substitution or course equivalency for military credit, that information should be forwarded to Admissions to add to the transfer guide to start slowly building the military guide that can be publicized to all military installations in and around Oklahoma. Approximately 60 percent of military are looking to further their education by bachelor's degree and/or graduate degrees. Many of them attend other universities that offer better transfer course equivalences, with Purdue University being the preferred choice for many. Investigating and patterning their programs may be beneficial. Faculty is needed to work with T. Joyce to review the military course syllabi. T. Joyce also recommended that OSU investigate the Soldier for Life program to promote OSU as a military-friendly university.

2. **APR Review Process on Certificate Programs Follow Up – Brenda Masters**

Refer to The Importance of Program Assessment 11-21-19 document. “Assessment of student learning outcomes in all academic programs is essential for the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) institutional accreditation and for the Academic Program Review (APR) for the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE).” B. Masters informed Instruction Council (IC) members that she has been working on assurance reviews that will be available to HLC in the spring. She compared HLC current criteria with future criteria (changes effective 9-1-20). One of those changes being the HLC Subcomponent on Program Review. “A. The institution ensures the quality of its educational offerings. 1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews and acts upon the findings.” This addition brings to light the unembedded certificate. The term “program” refers to degree or certificate. The purpose for assessment is to 1)improve teaching – learning; 2)provide accountability and institutional effectiveness. Every institution is required to assess students using 1)course placement; 2)general education; 3)academic program learning outcomes assessment; 4)student engagement and satisfaction.

OSU offers 39 unembedded certificates. IC members expressed their concerns regarding the assessment plans for certificates. A regular degree program contains 30-60-90 credit hours, while a certificate may only require 9 hours. Assessing a 9 hour certificate program appears excessive. There was discussion regarding the assessment plans for these certificates in past years that lead IC members to believe that assessment for certificates would not be necessary. B. Masters recommended that all unembedded certificates develop an assessment plan.

3. **Advisor Survey Discussion – Kelva Hunger and James Knecht**

K. Hunger distributed the OSU Student Engagement Survey document. She explained that previously OSU measured engagement thru third party programs – programs that were quite costly and time consuming – with little return on investment. After the significant response rate to the Student Satisfaction Survey created by OSU University Assessment and Testing, UAT administration decided to propose a Student Engagement Survey. This new survey has been discussed at the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE) and at Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC). IC members expressed their support for the Student Engagement Survey distribution, alongside the 3rd annual Student Satisfaction Survey.

J. Knecht explained that the Advisor Annual Survey is now moving from once a year survey to offering colleges the ability to submit surveys more often (for example – within a week of the student/advisor appointment). This opportunity would allow college personnel to be trained to deliver the survey themselves. UAT will meet with each interested college to build the basic survey, while allowing the capability of adding questions as appropriate for each college. The basic survey will continue to have ten (10) common multiple-choice questions and two (2) open ended. J. Mendez mentioned working on messaging to ensure that students realize they have complete anonymity.

4. **Winter Intersession Excessive Hours – Rita Peaster**

Refer to Maximum Credit Hour Load document. R. Peaster explained that the State Regents determine the number of hours in which undergraduate students are allowed to enroll in a given semester. The fall and spring semesters allow up to 19 credit hours per student each semester without being considered excessive. When looking at the shorter parts of term, the maximum credit hour load for the 4-week summer sessions is 6 credit hours for undergraduate courses and 4 credit hours for graduate courses. However, the maximum credit hour load for the 4-week winter intersession is currently 3 credit hours for undergraduate courses and 3 credit hours for graduate courses. R. Peaster would like to treat all 4-week sessions the same, accepting a maximum of 6 credit hours for undergraduate courses and 4 credit hours for graduate courses.

Motion was made to accept a maximum of 6 credit hours for undergraduate courses and 4 credit hours for graduate courses in all 4-week sessions and approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

Minutes were recorded by Kyndal Roark