

INSTRUCTION COUNCIL

MINUTES

August 24, 2017
204 Whitehurst
8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

In attendance: Laurie Beets, Ryan Chung, Cynda Clary, Bruce Crauder, Rich Frohock, Keith Garbutt, Diane Jones, Marlys Mason, Leon McClinton, Shiretta Ownbey, Rita Peaster, Libby Reigh, Chris Ross, Jenn Sanders, Randy Seitsinger, Celeste Taber, Candace Thrasher, Jean Van Delinder and Pamela Fry, Chair.

1. Honors Residential College Concept – Keith Garbutt and Leon McClinton

Dr. Keith Garbutt, Dean of the Honors College discussed the residential college concept. The concept where scholars live in the dorms with the students is quite old. The living environment is part of the education. This concept is gaining traction across the country as a way to support high achieving students. The underlying mission / vision of the residential college concept is building a strong community of honor students who will ultimately go on to take leadership positions on the university campus. From an honors perspective, this is a great way to stay competitive on the local and national level.

Typically, the faculty housing contains a great room where students and faculty meet for all sorts of interactions. This is a way to integrate social with academic experience. The emphasis is for faculty to offer a variety of programs in an effort to connect with every student in the residence hall. Cultural diversity can be emphasized as well.

Dr. Leon McClinton, Director of Housing & Residential Life added that the university is attempting to increase the number of honors students. Stout Hall and Bennett Hall have the infrastructure to accommodate a residential college, and Bennett Hall is the focus for this concept. The residence hall could hold a large faculty apartment that could accommodate 30-40 students for various programs, dinners, etc. There is also space for classrooms and offices. The estimated cost could start at \$2 million. Housing and Residential Life is working to identify funding sources. From a housing perspective this is a good way to entice high achieving students. Periodic faculty/student dinners would be in addition to the meal plan – anywhere from \$10,000 to \$18,000. The prospective timeline for a functioning residential college hall is Fall 2019.

R. Chung questioned the aspects of program assessment (ex. measurement of student success and student learning.) K. Garbutt responded that research shows that faculty being fully immersed in residential communities can have a positive impact on students' GPAs, as well as helping students with emotional issues. Nationally, this population tends to have more issues in the mental health area than general population. The type of support that can be given in this area will have a positive impact on these students. R. Seitsinger indicated his approved of this idea and the importance of selecting the appropriate facility and faculty members. He felt that this program will attract donors because they see a value in it. K. Garbutt offered that this program could be implemented in all colleges; however Honors happens to have the expertise at this time. The Garbutts have volunteered as faculty. However, if there are other faculty members who would like to consider the residential college living, the Garbutts will mentor them. Currently there are 2000 honor students and approximately 600 first-come first-serve students would be admitted into the residential college hall. A board will be created to detail all aspects of this concept. This will be a multi-year student facility, but the majority will be first year students. There will be opportunity and privilege for upper classmen to live in the residential hall as mentors and tutors to the first year students. Instruction Council (IC) members discussed addressing diversity among the residents. P. Fry mentioned that at sometime in the future, many of the honor students coming to campus may be classified as a junior in college due to their AP/concurrent courses. K. Garbutt encouraged members to consider the importance of having an honors residential college hall for academic support for these students.

2. Course Deactivation/Reactivation Requests
(Informational Item Only)
Deactivations:
HIST 3003 – Soviet Union: History, Society, and Culture
IEM 5803 – Human Factors

3. Curricular Requests
College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology

FROM	TO	FROM	TO	FROM	TO	ACTION
PREFIX/NUMBER		TITLE		ACTION		
<u>ADDITIONS</u>					<u>New Course Description</u>	
ARCH 4131		Environmental Science Lab Architectural Science Lab			Laboratory experiments for building systems. Systems may include heating, cooling, electrical, lighting, acoustics and plumbing	NEW COURSE

R. Seitsinger stated that this proposal was presented to IC at the 8/3/17 meeting. The course remains with same with the exception of a name change to Architectural Science Lab.

Motion was made to accept the curricular request from the College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology for the addition of a new course – ARCH 4131 – Architectural Science Lab and approved.

4. Demystifying the Undergraduate Repeated Courses Process – Rita Peaster
Refer to the "Banner Repeat Processing" handout. R. Peaster explained that there has been a significant number of questions from advisors and graduation specialists regarding this process. Refer to University Academic Regulation (UAR) 6.13. Basically if a student repeats a course and the original grade was a D or F, then the second attempt would be used to figure the grade point average (GPA) and the first grade would be excluded, even if the second grade is lower. If a student repeats a course more than once all subsequent instances would count toward the GPA. But only one instance should be included in earned hours. If the first grade is higher than a D then all of the instances will be included in the GPA, but only one instance (the highest grade) will be included in the earned hours.

In the previous university grading software system – SIS – the repeats converted to Banner by the following:

SIS OSU Courses	SIS Transfer Courses	Converted OSU and Transfer Courses in Banner	Exclude from GPA and Earned Hours	Include in GPA Only (not in Earned Hours)	Include in GPA and Earned Hours
Repeat "excluded from GPA"	*	E	Y		

Repeat (included in GPA)	@	A		Y	
(No indicator)	(No indicator)	(No indicator)			Y

Banner Custom Repeat Process

E = excluded from GPA and earned hours

A = included in GPA only (not in earned hours)

I = included in GPA and earned hours

Does not re-evaluate instances previously marked as excluded

- Does look for new repeats of those excluded courses (three or more attempts)
- Will adjust A and I indicators if needed
- I indicator assigned to included instances with highest grade

When the repeat process information was transferred from SIS to Banner, SIS limitations were discovered. Therefore, Banner inherited translated problems from SIS. Banner is programmed to search for the instance with the highest grade, and that instance will be included in both GPA and earned hours. Due to Banner's logic, there is no need for submission of the Repeated Course Override form.

There are limitations to the Banner custom repeat process (same limitations existed in SIS).

- Courses repeated in the same term may not be marked as expected (ex. repeated 8-week course in the same semester)
- Zero ending course types are not considered
- Courses with special grades that don't count in GPA are not considered
- Courses that are not in the Banner course catalog (ex. Math 2---) are not considered

The process runs three ways:

- Daily – transfer work that been processed earlier that day
- Student ID – runs weekly - students who have had a grade change / reprieve / renewal, etc.
- Term based – end of term processing after all grades are recorded and grades are rolled to history, looking at students who are enrolled that semester and just the courses they were enrolled in that semester to see if they have been repeated.

Refer to the multiple scenarios in the handouts for detailed repeated process examples. There will be instances where the repeats can be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The Registrar's Office has developed a process of the case-by-case reviews to be requested.

- Request should come from the student's academic advisor or college dean's office
- Change that is contrary to the OSU repeat policy cannot be considered
- Scenarios that are neither clearly specified in policy nor handled in an optimal way by the automated process can be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- Contacts: Rita Peaster, Amber Todd, Casey Oldenberg, Greg Stine

Side note - the only other university in the Big 12 Institutions with an automated repeat process besides OSU is West Virginia University.

5. Other

- Discussion regarding parking for faculty and staff on Thursday, August 31 prior to the Thursday night football game. Multiple faculty/staff lots will be restricted to Posse parking only starting at noon on the 31st. Shuttle busses will be available from the Monroe parking garage.
- C. Taber reminded members that Fall 2017 semester will present a compressed time after the semester ends and the university closes for the holidays. IC approved the plan to collect grades at noon Tuesday for Fall 2017. A reminder was sent to instructors who were concerned by the date. C. Taber encouraged IC members to promote understanding of this issue to their instructors.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:31 a.m.

Minutes were recorded by Diane Jones.