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Chair: Peggy Daniels Lee, Ph.D.
Members: Term Expiring June 30, 2020:
Gavrin, Andrew (Science); Lee, Peggy Daniels Lee (Business); Lu, Xiongbin (Medicine); Menard, Laura (Medicine Library); Tezanos-Pinto, Rosa (Liberal Arts)

Term Expiring June 30, 2019:
Boyne, Shawn (Law); Crowder, Sharron (Nursing); Fu, Yao (Health and Human Sciences); Magee, Paula (Education); White, Angela (University Library)

Liaisons for 2018-2019 (or Ex Officio):
Gladden, James (Division of Undergraduate Education) (Administrative Liaison), Myers, Mary Beth (Registrar) (Ex-Officio), Watt, Jeff X. (Science) (Executive Committee Liaison)

Action Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits transferred from campuses within both the IU and Purdue systems, how credits outside these systems are viewed by IUPUI, and how many credits must be taken at IUPUI before an undergraduate diploma may be granted at the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>Ongoing and recommended for continued discussion and resolution in 2019-2020. See full report for details of committee discussions. This and the following two issues were subsequently discussed together due to the synergies between the issues involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of grade replacement policy (F to F*)</td>
<td>Complete. See full report for details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How degrees are awarded on diverse campuses and internationally by programs within the IU and PU systems and how they might affect programs on the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>Ongoing and recommended for further action in 2019-2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty. | This issue was discussed briefly and deferred to 2019-2020 due to more pressing matters.
---|---
Continue work with IUPUI+ development. | No work to be done. IUPUI+ approved in May 2018.
Use of LMS (Canvas) data for instructional monitoring (online courses) | Recommendation made to Chris Foley (Associate Vice President and Director, Office of Online Education) with regards to the methods to be used and how faculty would be involved. Work to continue in 2019-2020. See full report for details.
Review of grade assignment for cases of academic dishonesty. | Complete. See full report for details.
NEW from Registrar: Percentage of a certificate that needs to be completed using IUPUI courses | Complete. See full report for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits transferred from campuses within both the IU and Purdue systems, how credits outside these systems are viewed by IUPUI, and how many credits must be taken at IUPUI before an undergraduate diploma may be granted at the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>In progress. Issues related to residency for IU Online students are complicating factors. This action item and “review of credit transfers and residency” were discussed together because of the online residency issue. See full report for details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of credit transfers and residency.</td>
<td>In progress. Issues related to residency for IU Online students are complicating factors. See full report for details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How degrees are awarded on diverse campuses and internationally by programs within the IU and PU systems and how they might affect programs on the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>Based on feedback from IFC EC, continue to research this area and develop recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty.</td>
<td>Discussed briefly and yet postponed due to more pressing matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of LMS (Canvas) data for instructional monitoring (online courses)</td>
<td>In progress. On agenda for first meeting in 2019-2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Boost, software that “proactively prevents students from missing assignments”.</td>
<td>In progress. On agenda for first meeting in 2-19-2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Suggested new action items for 2019-2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and provide feedback on IUPUI Test Optional Task Force Report, Jan 17, 2019.</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please attach any completed documents, minutes, or recommendations made by your committee during this report year. One copy of this report and supporting documents will be sent to the IUPUI University Archives.

**Report due:** June 30, 2019

**Submit to:** Karen Lee  
Office of the Faculty Council  
klee2@iupui.edu
Committee members for this Academic Year
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Gavrin, Andrew (Science); Lee, Peggy Daniels Lee (Business); Lu, Xiongbin (Medicine); Menard, Laura (Medicine Library); Tezanos-Pinto, Rosa (Liberal Arts)

Term Expiring June 30, 2019:

Boyne, Shawn (Law); Crowder, Sharron (Nursing); Fu, Yao (Health and Human Sciences); Magee, Paula (Education); White, Angela (University Library)

Liaisons for 2018-2019 (or Ex Officio):

Gladden, James (Division of Undergraduate Education) (Administrative Liaison), Myers, Mary Beth (Registrar) (Ex-Officio), Watt, Jeff X. (Science) (Executive Committee Liaison)

Introduction

The Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) is charged with making recommendations to the IUPUI Faculty Council (IFC) regarding “general, not school specific, educational curriculum matters, establishing and revising academic calendars, degree formats, graduation requirements, the academic structure of IUPUI, and other related matters” (Bylaw III.B.1).

The chair was asked to manage the committee in October, 2018. The first order of business was to convene and decide on a meeting schedule, review the action items and determine how they would be discussed and managed. That meeting occurred on November 4, 2018.

This report describes the action items assigned to the AAC by the IFC for the 2018-2019 academic year in the order in which they are covered on pages 1-3. Some action items were discussed together because they are similar in topic and scope.

Action Items and Resolutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items 1 and 2</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits transferred from campuses within both the IU and Purdue systems, how credits outside these systems are viewed by IUPUI, and how many credits must be taken at IUPUI before an undergraduate diploma may be granted at the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>The action items are ongoing for research, discussion, and recommending a policy in 2019-2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of credit transfers and residency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion and Resolution

These two items were discussed together. Jeff Watt provided the committee with an overview of the issues confronting the IFC Executive Committee. There is a disparity between Purdue and IU with regards to credits required for residency and how many can be transferred. A student can be awarded a Purdue degree as long as the student has taken at least 32 credit hours in residency at any Purdue campus. On the other hand, IU requires that the 32 credit hours of residency be taken at the campus from which the degree is awarded. For example, there are a
limited number of credits that can be transferred from another campus to IUPUI. This number is determined by the individual academic unit (i.e., the schools).

As long as the courses are face-to-face courses, the issue of residency is not central to the transfer of credits. When the courses are online, several issues arise. Which campus awards the degree? How many online credits will each campus accept as “transfer credits” from an online program? Who owns the online curriculum and how is the quality of the courses determined? IU Online has recently (as of January 2019) been ranked highly among online programs (20th tied with Colorado State, George Washington University, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, and Washington State University). [https://www.usnews.com/education/online-education/bachelors/rankings](https://www.usnews.com/education/online-education/bachelors/rankings)

Other issues that need to be considered include:

a. Financial ramifications and academic preparation
b. How one determines residency for online courses;
c. The quality of online courses and how it is measured: rigor or faculty or students
d. Does performance in subsequent courses matter?
e. How do we prevent students from “shopping around” for courses perceived to be “easier”?  
f. Can a student “cobble together” enough credits from different campuses without having established “residency” in on campus? If so, what policies can we put in place to prevent that, IF that is the end goal?
g. Accreditation: it should not be different for online vs. face-to-face and it provides a framework within which to address rigor 
   i. Shawn Boyne submitted the following excerpt from HLC standard Criterion 3. Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources and Support, which states: Core Components, 3A.3

   "The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

After considerable discussion, it was decided that the chair would seek guidance from the EC regarding its expectations of the AAC, especially what is by May, with regard to the following:

- How to determine residency for the collaborative online degrees  
- How should MOU’s for collaborative online degrees handle this issue?  
- Is it expected that we will distinguish between online and face-to-face academic policies?  
- Is rigor relevant?  
- If the residency requirement is 32 credits, how is that determined for transfer purposes?  
- Some schools (academic units) require 25% of credits to be taken in residence in order to award the degree. Campus requirement is 32 credits. Are they the same?

**Point of Clarification:** Are you looking for a report of internal and external practices regarding transfer credits and the definition of residency OR are you expecting that we will propose policies for IUPUI, especially taking online course credits into consideration?

**EC's Answer:** There has been a lot of discussion at all levels about transfer credits and online sources, including rigor, quality of courses across the campuses, and how to assess the programs. It was agreed that a bigger issue is those courses not included in the collaborative online degrees since the courses included in those degrees are covered under the MOUs. There is a fairly standard template for the MOUs for collaborative online degrees. They agreed with the ACC concern about students “shopping around” to cobble together a degree formed from online and face-to-face courses from multiple courses.
The EC’s expectation is that the AAC will collect the information needed for us to recommend a policy around these issues. Kathy Johnson suggested that the ACC ask the APPC to give the ACC the information needed. Mary Beth Myers will be consulted. Margie Ferguson said that there would be an upper level committee formed to address these issues and develop overall policies for IUPUI and IU Online.

**Status:** Mary Beth Myers made aware of the need for information. The action items are ongoing for research, discussion, and recommending a policy in 2019-2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items 3 and 8</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of grade replacement policy (F to F*)</td>
<td>Complete. Recommendations made to the AAC by Mary Beth Myers as outlined below. AAC unanimously agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of grade assignment for cases of academic dishonesty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion and Resolution**
These two action items were discussed together and resolved based on recommendations made by Mary Beth Myers, summarized below.

There is a discrepancy between the Faculty Grade Replacement Policy and the IUPUI Code of Conduct and Responsibilities. The following outlines a recent student situation faced by the Registrar, provided by Mary Beth Myers to support clarifying changes to the respective policies.

Sentence One of the IUPUI Grade Replacement Policy (formerly known as the FX policy) states that the policy was revised effective with the Fall 1996 semester. 

http://registrar.iupui.edu/replace.html

The IUPUI Code of Student Conduct and Responsibilities: 
Reference page 13, below:

**Appendix F: Action by the Office of the Registrar**

If the penalty includes a failing grade for the course, the Registrar will be notified that the grade was given because of academic misconduct. The Registrar will record the grade of “F” on the student's permanent academic transcript without any notation concerning the reason for the grade. In accordance with other academic policies or procedures, such as the “FX” or grade replacement policy, the Registrar must, however, follow procedures to ensure that the grade of “F” will not thereafter be removed from the transcript. An “F” given because of academic misconduct must be calculated in a determination of the student’s grade point average, but the grade will not prevent the student from repeating the same course for credit.

**RECENT STUDENT SITUATION**
- Academic Misconduct on a paper resulted in D+. Finding came at end of the semester. She had an "I" that was then changed to a D+ after the academic misconduct committee ruling.
- Student retook class and got A-. Student filed for grade replacement.
- Student informed that she could not replace original grade because the initial grade indicated academic misconduct.

**RESEARCH**
IUPUI Code of Student Conduct and Responsibilities outlines ramifications of academic misconduct. Same Code states that the opportunity to replace the class will not be an option when a student **FAILS** a course *(emphasis added)*.

The only option for replacing any grade prior to 1996 was replacement of an “F.” See Grade Replacement policy above where first sentence mentions that the policy was revised in 1996 after formerly being known as the FX policy.

The Grade Replacement academic policy changed to allow replacement of any grade, not just “F,” but it would appear that same change did not make it to the IUPUI Code of Student Conduct OR there may have been a decision that grade replacement should continue to be eliminated as an option ONLY in cases of an original “F” grade (that replacement could occur for other grades).

Officials in the Office of the Registrar and Office of Student Conduct believe it is the former case above (not the latter) that most likely occurred.....that the Code was not updated to reflect that **any** prior grade for academic misconduct (not just an “F”) cannot be replaced.

**DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION:**
What is the appropriate action for this particular student who believed her D+ could be replaced?

It is recommended that this discrepancy be discussed and remedied via the Academic Affairs Committee and appropriate processes of the IFC.

**AAC discussion and action:** Mary Beth Myers suggested that the IUPUI Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct, Section B.2.c.(i) be changed to remove “as well as the final course grade.” Section B.2.c.(iii) be change to read: "The student may receive an F a reduced course grade, including an F for the course that will be recorded by the registrar as a permanent grade that is not able to be replaced using a grade replacement policy."

No changes would be required to the IUPUI Grade Replacement Policy.

**AAC members unanimously agreed with Mary Beth Myers’ changes to the IUPUI Student Code of Conduct and recommends to the EC that they be accepted. The changes will be referred to the Student Affairs Committee.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 4</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How degrees are awarded on diverse campuses and internationally by programs within the IU and PU systems and how they might affect programs on the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>Ongoing and recommended for further action in 2019-2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion and Resolution**
Given other, more pressing matters, the AAC recommends that this action item be a major item for research and discussion in 2019-2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 5</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty.</td>
<td>This action item was discussed briefly and deferred to 2019-2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion and Resolution**
The AAC discussed this action item briefly. The AAC believes that this action item resides with the Faculty Affairs Committee and will confer with the FAC in 2019-2020 on input they require from the AAC.

### Table: Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue work with IUPUI + development. No work to be done. IUPUI+ was approved in May 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Use of LMS data for instructional monitoring (online courses). Recommendation made to Chris Foley with regards to methods to be used and how faculty would be involved. Work to continue in 2019-2020.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion and Resolution

The AAC discussed this action item at its meeting on February 6, 2019. It was expressed that the primary reason for this issue is to be able to determine attendance in online courses. This is important for financial purposes. Since the AAC members agreed that the Financial Aid office can get this information from Canvas, it was decided that the chair would seek clarification from the Executive Committee.

**Executive Committee’s Answer:** *This issue arose because Chris Foley came to the EC with a request to access “big data” with regards to online classes and student behaviors, one purpose of which was to determine whether students are attending class. It was the impression of the EC that Chris Foley needed more than just access to Canvas for financial aid purposes. The EC suggested that the AAC ask Chris to attend an AAC meeting to discuss his needs. We would then make a decision based on his needs, student privacy concerns and faculty privacy concerns.*

On April 10, 2019, Chris Foley attended the AAC meeting via Zoom to discuss IU Online needs for big data that could be obtained from Canvas. The primary question to be answered was the need and use of student data. The AAC also expressed concerns about student and faculty privacy. Chris Foley explained that there are two reasons for accessing data on student behaviors: 1) Compliance and 2) to establish student behaviors (e.g., are absences similar across campuses, why or why not?) with regards to online courses across campuses.

Compliance: *This issue is fairly urgent because IU Online needs to alert campuses when classes are not meeting Federal government requirements, especially with regards to faculty-student interaction. There have been some complaints from students, so this is a very important reason to be able to see across courses and campuses.*

Identification of student behaviors across courses and campuses: *the purpose of this objective is the see if students are having issues, not only across different classes but also across campuses. These data will also help faculty to help students in the same way that FLAGS does. Chris noted that other online organizations are doing this to help faculty to help students.*

During the ensuing discussion, the AAC members asked several questions to determine how best to meet Chris’ objectives as well as ensure student privacy and faculty cooperation. Since there are two different purposes, Chris agreed that they could be handled separately. He would need to create “report objects” (e.g., “what is a syllabus?”) to use to filter the data. Instructure could be asked to help; but we would need to specify what data are needed. Before that can happen,
Chris needs to fully understand what data are available. He came to the AAC to obtain the AAC’s guidance and/or endorsement that the AAC would be willing to look at the data and put it in front of people to give examples of what is there and how it could be used. IUPUI is on board and is ready to put together a team to investigate what the data are saying about student behavior.

Andy Gavrin suggested that the approach be similar to an “IRB”, looking to see how the data are structured, with an opt-out option for faculty. The purpose would be similar to a research project, designed to improve the way we deliver courses in the future. This would give Chris the ability to determine what data is there while helping to determine student behaviors. This suggestion met with general approval of those present since it has the potential to identify and/or predict when a student is having problems and prevent those problems from happening or getting worse. This could help with face-to-face courses as well. It was expressed that this use case (helping face-to-face courses) would improve buy-in. Taking a retrospective approach as well as a prospective approach would help everyone.

When asked if Chris would consider doing the compliance piece first, Chris replied that the Federal regulations “do not define what that is”. He gets to look at what people do now, which he can do with existing systems. The AAC agreed that using data in Canvas for identifying (and potentially predicting) student behaviors in online classes should be explored, with a caution to ensure student privacy and give faculty the ability to opt-out. The action item discussed at the May 1 AAC meeting at which time the Committee reviewed Chris’s summary of our April 10 meeting. A direct quote from his email to the chair follows.

1. There’s general interest in having more insights developed on LMS data from the AAC, but there are some concerns about not knowing exactly what will be examined;
2. They endorsed launching a research project style investigative study with IUPUI instructors of online undergraduate courses under the following restrictions:
   a. We would inform instructors in advance that such a study would take place;
   b. We would inform them of the purpose and examples of outcome;
   c. We would offer faculty an opportunity to opt out of the study;
   d. Student and instructor information would be anonymized in reviewing the data;
   e. We would report back to IUPUI leadership about the findings to discuss next steps.

(Email from Chris Foley to Peggy Daniels Lee on April 22, 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 9</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW from Registrar: Percentage of a certificate that needs to be completed using IUPUI courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion and Resolution**

There is currently no provision in the policies on the percentage of a certificate that must be completed using IUPUI courses. As a result, Mary Beth Myers recommended that certificates use the same standard as the Bachelor’s and Associate’s degrees, which is 25%. Her recommendation and rational are replicated below.

**Academic Affairs Committee**  
May 2019

**Number of Credit Hours Required for IUPUI Conferral of Certificate**
The Higher Learning Commission has outlined specific criteria with respect to the minimum number of credit hours required for an institution to confer a bachelor’s or associate’s degree

*The institution maintains structures or practices that ensure the coherence and quality of the programs for which it awards a degree. Typically institutions will require that at minimum 30 of the 120 credits earned for the bachelor’s degree and 15 of the 60 credits for the associate’s degree be credits earned at the institution itself, through arrangements with other accredited institutions, or through contractual relationships approved by the Commission. Any variation from the typical minima must be explained and justified.*

Based on the established minimum number of credit hours, a Bachelor’s or Associate’s degree requires that 25% of the course requirements be completed by the conferring school. Using this same standard, an IUPUI certificate may be conferred when a minimum 25% of the required credit hours are completed at IUPUI.

Example: A 15-credit hour certificate (based on five, 3-credit hour courses), requires that at least two of the courses be completed at IUPUI to award the certificate. The 25% calculations come to 1.25 courses or 3.75 credit hours which would round up to 2 courses, in this example.

Example: An 18-credit hour certificate (based on six, 3-credit hour courses) requires that at least two of the courses be completed at IUPUI to award the certificate. The 25% calculations come to 1.5 courses or 4.5 credit hours which would round up to two courses, in this example.

The policy will appear here: RegistrarAdminStaff/Academic Structure/Certificates/

**AAC Discussion and Action:** The AAC members present unanimously agreed with the Registrar’s recommendation.

**Action Items to be carried over to 2019-2020:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits transferred from campuses within both the IU and Purdue systems, how credits outside these systems are viewed by IUPUI, and how many credits must be taken at IUPUI before an undergraduate diploma may be granted at the IUPUI campus.</td>
<td>In progress. Issues related to residency for IU Online students are complicating factors. This action item and “review of credit transfers and residency” were discussed together because of the online residency issue. See full report for details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of credit transfers and residency.</td>
<td>In progress. Issues related to residency for IU Online students are complicating factors. See full report for details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How degrees are awarded on diverse campuses and internationally by programs within the IU and PU systems and how they might affect programs on the IUPUI campus.

Based on feedback from IFC EC, continue to research this area and develop recommendations.

Review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty.

Discussed briefly and postponed due to more pressing matters.

Use of LMS (Canvas) data for instructional monitoring (online courses)

In progress. On agenda for first meeting in 2019-2010.

Use of Boost, software that "proactively prevents students from missing assignments".


Suggested new action items for 2019-2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and provide feedback on IUPUI Test Optional Task Force Report, Jan 17, 2019.</td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This concludes the annual report of the IFC Academic Affairs Committee for the 2018-2019 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy Daniels Lee, Ph.D.
Chair, Academic Affairs Committee
IUPUI