

Council of Directors of Student Academic Services

AGENDA | October 30, 2024 | 10:30 AM – 12:00 PM

IMPORTANT UPDATE: The November DSAS meeting is canceled, our next meeting will be December 18th.

1. UNIV Uniform Policies Update– Shannon Baker

S. Baker shared that she brought up the discussion over UNIV uniform policies with instruction council, and the council mirrored what many of the DSAS members had said in a previous meeting about the requirements for students who should take the course, those who shouldn't, and how transfer students should be addressed. The next steps will be for the colleges to speak with their instruction council representatives to make sure everyone is on the same page. At that time the motion can be moved forward and voted on, if needed.

The general consensus that the council came to is that FTICs, no matter what other statuses they might have, they should take UNIV 1111 in person, unless the student is a fully online student. For students needing to retake the course, the council agreed that this should be an online section with a differentiated curriculum designed to help get the students back on track. The instruction council agreed that transfer student sections should be taught by the colleges since transfer students need different information and more college, upper level, and program specific information. If a transfer student already has the equivalent, they do not need to take the course.

B. Morris asked what section Tulsa FTIC transfer students would be placed in since they cannot offer a lower division course in Tulsa.

S. Baker explored the idea that they could be added into the distance student section, but this section is a Stillwater online section, so the group agreed that the best way to go about that would be to add a Tulsa distance student section of the course.

S. Baker circled back to the retake student section being an online section and added that there would need to be a certain focus on reaching out and engaging with these students as they are likely needing to retake due to lack of engagement in their first attempt.

S. Baker also circled back to the sections for transfer students who have not taken an equivalent course being taught by the colleges. There were concerns about how these courses would fit into the degree plans, and S. Baker shared that she would take this question back to C. Francisco.

L. Burns brought up the issue that the UNIV 1111 fees would need to be designated properly. S. Baker agreed and shared that the fees would be apportioned to the colleges according to what belong to them.

R. Peaster suggested that since the transfer course will not be teaching the same content, the course shouldn't be labeled as UNIV1111. This way, each college could have their own version of the course, since transfers need the more college specific information, and the degree requirements could require "UNIV 1111" or "equivalent," and then list the equivalent college courses that meet the UNIV 1111 requirement.

N. Holmes advocated that the transfer courses start with a 3 because transfer students are often lacking in upper division hours and have too many lower division hours.

L. Millis asked if there were any situations where a student, under the right circumstances, would not need to satisfy a UNIV 1111 requirement? He gave an example of a student who is 30 years old and has five years of experience in the field and has attended multiple different colleges.

S. Baker offered for the conversation to be brought back to their instruction council representatives and then the group could reconvene and try to land on a more unanimous and definitive consensus. S. Baker also reminded the group that L. Burns was working on a way to gather data that would inform the group of the quantity of students that would fall into special circumstances like this as well, which would help the group make a decision.

B. Morris asked what party would be responsible or making the decision to waive the requirement for the special circumstance students.

S. Baker answered that the colleges would make the decision, and she would be the one to sign off on it.

K. Seuhs asked what the prefix for the transfer course should be since it cannot be UNIV 1111 or UNIV 3111, since this would conflict with other existing courses. She asked if the transfer course prefix would then need to reflect the colleges. For example, CEHS 3111, CEAT 3111, etc.

L. Burns informed the group that naming them this would be an issue for CAS, and S. Baker added that they would need to investigate the option because it may disrupt restrictive enrollment issues since it is defined by the prefix.

N. Holmes suggested that there be an agreement that these college taught courses are equivalent, so if a student switched their major to a different college, then they do not need to retake the course.

K. Seuchs expressed concern for CEHS's capacity to take transfer students into their supplemental course due to lack of manpower.

S. Baker summarized that she would take these issues and questions back to C. Francisco and instruction council to discuss further. Overall, it seems like the group is in agreement for the direction to pursue.

2. General Education Changes – Shannon Baker

S. Baker reminded the group that there was some concern for the general education changes going into effect. She shared that there will be training for the change to the Gen Ed curriculum. The OKState advising group is planning their advising conference for February 7, and there will be a mandatory session on general education and the trails. Tammy Mix, Chris Francisco, Academic Advisors, Trails Pilot Advising Managers, a keynote speaker from Wichita State, and more will all be presenting. For the Trails, there will also be opt-in rate data that will help give the group a better idea of what to expect in terms of opt-in rates as they implement in their colleges. Currently there are only 3 trails offered, and some colleges will see more opt-ins than others. For example, Ferguson and the "Farm to Fork" trail.

B. Morris asked if the old Gen Ed codes will remain as they are and if the new gen ed codes will simply be added.

R. Peaster answered that the courses will have both the old course attributes and the new attributes. The course titles will be updated to reflect the new attribute, and degree works will read either code/attribute.

B. Morris asked if admissions would be reviewing the process for transfer credits. For example, courses that OSU currently accepts as an (I), will they automatically receive a (G)?

L. Burns answered that they should as long as they are set up in the catalog correctly.

S. Baker asked that if anyone had any thoughts about things that should be included in the training for advisors, to please let her team know via email.

S. Baker shared that in the future we will still have a highlight that will help us each build an appreciation for what each member does to contribute to Student Success, and it may bring to light themes or ideas that need to be discussed.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM

Minutes recorded by A. Pinion