IUPUI Faculty Council Committee
Annual Report 2019-2020

Committee Name: Academic Affairs Committee

Chair: Peggy Daniels Lee, Ph.D.

Members: Term Expiring June 30, 2020:

Gavrin, Andrew (Science); Lee, Peggy Daniels Lee (Business) (Chair); Lu, Xiongbin (Medicine); Menard, Laura (Medicine Library)

Term Expiring June 30, 2021:

Blacklock, Brenda (Science); Brant, Herbert (Liberal Arts); deRose, Barb (Nursing); Fu, Yao (Health and Human Sciences); Kacius, Carole (Public Health); Picard, Christine (Science); Rayman, Denise (University Library); Zarrinmayeh, Hamideh (Medicine)

Liaisons for 2019-2020 (or Ex Officio):

Gladden, James (Division of Undergraduate Education) (Administrative Liaison), Myers, Mary Beth (Registrar) (Ex-Officio), Tezanos-Pinto, Rosa (Liberal Arts) (Executive Committee Liaison)

Action Items – Assigned:

Action Item(s)	Status
Student Engagement Roster (SER): Review proposal and provide feedback on IFC endorsement to the Executive Committee. The Student Affairs Committee is reviewing as well.	Complete: wording of the committee's support of the SER is included in the full report, which follows.
Voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty within the schools (working with Faculty Affairs Committee).	In Process: variation in policies among the schools is from school-wide policies to individual policies by department. Policies also varied whether voting on hiring decisions or school policies and procedures. A folder in the AAC box account contains policies submitted so far.

IU Online (Face-to-Face and residency) – Collaborate with the Student Affairs Committee	In progress. Deferred until 2020-2021
Review and make recommendations regarding the Global Learning Outcomes dated April 3, 2019	Complete. See full report for details of committee discussions.
Review and provide feedback on IUPUI Test Optional Task Force Report of January 17, 2019.	Complete. See full report for details of committee discussions.
Percentage of a certificate that needs to be completed using IUPUI courses.	Complete. Recommendation made, shared with Student Affairs Committee, presented to IFC-EC and passed on May 5, 2020.
ACA-66: Grading Policies: Review and Provide feedback to IFC-EC	Complete. The committee expressed their agreement with the IUB – Educational Policies Committee that a task force be convened to fully study the proposal and its ramifications. Sent to IFC-EC via email to President John Watson.

Action Items - Ongoing

Action Item(s)	Status
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.	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.
Review of credit transfers and residency.	In progress. Issues related to residency for IU Online students are complicating factors.
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.	Complete. Recommendation conveyed to Prof. Yost, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.
Use of LMS (Canvas) data for instructional monitoring (online courses)	In Progress. 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 2020-2021. See full report for details.
Use of Boost, software that "proactively prevents students from missing assignments".	Complete. Concerns addressed expeditiously and satisfactorily by Ben Motz.

Action Items to Carry Over to 2020-2021:

Action Item(s)	Status
Voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty within the schools (working with Faculty Affairs Committee).	In Progress: variation in policies among the schools is from school-wide policies to individual policies by department. Policies also varied whether voting on hiring decisions or school policies and procedures. A folder for compiling this information is in the AAC box folder: https://iu.app.box.com/folder/57786794486

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, 2020**

Submit to: **Karen Lee**
                    Office of the Faculty Council
                    klee2@iupui.edu

Annual Report of the Academic Affairs Committee
2019-2020

Committee members for this Academic Year

Members with 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, 2021:

Blacklock, Brenda (Science); Brant, Herbert (Liberal Arts); deRose, Barb (Nursing); Fu, Yao (Health and Human Sciences); Kacius, Carole (Public Health); Picard, Christine (Science); Rayman, Denise (University Library); Zarrinmayeh, Hamideh (Medicine)

Liaisons for 2019-2020 (or Ex Officio):

Gladden, James (Division of Undergraduate Education) (Administrative Liaison), Myers, Mary Beth (Registrar) (Ex-Officio), Tezanos-Pinto, Rosa (Liberal Arts) (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).

This report describes the action items assigned to the AAC by the IFC for the 2019-2020 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

Action Item #1 - Assigned	Status
Student Engagement Roster (SER): Review proposal and provide feedback on IFC endorsement to the Executive Committee. The Student Affairs Committee is reviewing as well.	Complete: wording of the committee's support of the SER is included in the full report, which follows.

Discussion and Resolution

The committee discussions centered around implementation, specifically as it relates to faculty time, level of detail for student feedback, value of the feedback and timing of the feedback. The following statement was submitted to the IFC-EC as the committee's support of the SER.

> "The Academic Affairs Committee has been charged with reviewing the Student Engagement Roster and provide feedback to the Executive Committee. The AAC supports the use of the Student Engagement Roster by faculty and encourages all

faculty members, especially those teaching Gateway courses, to provide feedback to students *regarding attendance and homework during or before the fourth week of classes. This is considered the minimum standard. More frequent interaction via the SER is strongly encouraged."*

Action Item #2 - Assigned	Status
Voting rights of non-tenure-track faculty within the schools (working with Faculty Affairs Committee).	In Progress: variation in policies among the schools is from school-wide policies to individual policies by department. Policies also varied whether voting on hiring decisions or school policies and procedures. Continue work into 2020-2021.

Discussion and Resolution

AAC members shared their policies. The policies vary significantly from one policy for the academic unit to multiple policies by department within the academic unit. The AAC needs to know the question that the EC is asking in order to provide a comprehensive report. Rosa Tezanos-Pinto agreed to help the committee with clarity.

There is a desire to have all NTT faculty vote at all levels. The goal is to develop an IUPUI-wide policy; but the challenges are in hiring and promotion. There are multiple policies across campus. The key issue is how to reconcile the variance in these policies. The committee agreed to determine common elements that can be used to propose a common policy. Consequently, this item will be continued into 2020-2021

Action Item #3 - Assigned	Status
IU Online (Face-to-Face and residency) – Collaborate with the Student Affairs Committee	In progress. Due to other, more pressing matters, this item is deferred to 2020-2021

Discussion and Resolution

Given other, more pressing matters, the committee recommends that the discussion and resolution be continued to 2020-2021.

Action Item #4 - Assigned	Status
Review and make recommendations regarding the Global Learning Outcomes dated April 3, 2019	Complete. After reviewing comments from the Student Affairs Committee, the AAC submitted the statement in Attachment A to the IFC-EC.

Action Item #5 - Assigned	Status
Review and provide feedback on IUPUI Test Optional Task Force Report of January 17, 2019.	Complete. Feedback was provided to IFC-EC in August 2019. See Attachment B for details of the committee's comments.

Discussion and Resolution

Concerns were expressed regarding the impact of this policy on underrepresented students who may require academic and social support once on campus. New and continuing initiatives with Bridge and other orientation programs (such as SPAN) will help in this regard. See Attachment B for details of the committee's comments.

Action Item #6 - Assigned	Status
Percentage of a certificate that needs to be completed using IUPUI courses.	Complete. The committee unanimously agreed on the Registrar's recommendation of 25% of the credit hours. The recommendation was shared with the Student Affairs Committee, presented to IFC-EC and passed on May 5, 2020. See Attachment C for a copy of the resolution.

Action Item #7 - Assigned	Status
ACA-66: Grading Policies: Review and Provide feedback to IFC-EC	Complete. The committee expressed their agreement with the IUB – Educational Policies Committee that a task force be convened to fully study the proposal and its ramifications. Sent to IFC-EC via email to President John Watson.

Action Item #8 – From Student Affairs Committee	Status
Permanence of a grade given as a result of academic misconduct	Complete. The committee discussed this on September 2019 and reported to APPC. The statement below was sent in an email to Diane Sturek, Chair of the Student Affairs Committee.

Discussion and Resolution

The following statement was sent to the chair of the Student Affairs Committee on March 1, 2020:

Mary Beth Myers (Registrar) suggested the following additions to the current policy:

Grade Replacement/Academic Misconduct Policies: The policy will be updated to: 1) reflect expanded-x policy whereby a student may replace any grade (not just F grades) and then 2) any academic misconduct grade cannot be replaced (not just F grades). We also wanted to include a clause that reflected the FERPA consequences of talking to someone for a background check.

Action Item #9 & #10 – Ongoing	Status
#9: 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.	In Progress. Issues related to residency for IU Online students are complicating factors, especially for students at IUPUI taking online courses elsewhere in the system. The students "residency of record" may be the determining factor for the awarding of credits. Credits from IU campuses are not transferred because they are on the student's IU record. Rosa Tezanos-Pinto agreed to seek clarification on this issue.
#10: Review of credit transfers and residency	In progress. Issues related to residency for IU Online students are complicating factors

Discussion and Resolution: Continued conversation within the AAC and other entities on campus is needed to develop a position and recommendation on this issue. Thus, the committee elects to address these issues in 2020-2021,

Action Item #11 - Ongoing	Status
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.	In progress. Based on feedback from IFC-EC, continue to research this area and develop recommendations.

Discussion and Resolution: Given other, more pressing, matters and the IFC-EC feedback, the committee elected to defer this item to 2020-2021.

Action Item #12 - Ongoing	Status
Review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty.	Complete. Recommendation conveyed to Prof. Yost, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee via email on January 29, 2020. See communication below.

Discussion and Resolution: The following was sent to Prof. Robert W. Yost, chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee on January 29, 2020.

The IFC-Executive Committee charged the Academic Affairs Committee to "review and recommend to the Faculty Affairs Committee standards used in hiring adjunct faculty". After significant discussion and review of which standards would be best to follow, the Academic Affairs Committee recommends that the Higher Learning Commission guidelines be followed since it appears to give schools flexibility in hiring adjuncts. This flexibility allows each school/academic unit within IUPUI to establish hiring criteria based on its needs.

The HLC policy regarding faculty requirements and qualifications can be found here: http://download.hlcommission.org/FacultyGuidelines_2016_OPB.pdf

Action Item # 13 - Ongoing	Status
Use of LMS data for instructional monitoring (online courses).	In progress. Time constraints and work on other, more pressing, matters for both parties precluded the opportunity for Chris Foley to attend an AAC meeting. In lieu of that, see his email statement below.

Discussion and Resolution: In response to an invitation to attend the May 4, 2020 AAC meeting to discuss progress on this project, we received the following:

"As a general update, we've been working on the following:

(1) Working with the Canvas team to begin to organize the data in Canvas to be able to accurately create usable data extracts similar to how we handle SIS data.
(2) Reducing lags in accessing the data so that it is more real-time.
(3) Creating a few dashboards at the request of some campuses to assist their academic leadership help their faculty be prepared for courses (e.g., identifying which courses have been published in Canvas).

We believe we'll make more headway on this over the summer an be able to leverage some of Ben (and other's) work in this environment." (Verbatim from email from Chris Foley dated May 1, 2020). ***He was unable to attend for obvious reasons, i.e. COVID-19 and the work to support online education.***

Action Item # 14 - Ongoing	Status
Use of Boost, software that "proactively prevents students from missing assignments".	Complete.

Discussion and Resolution:
The primary concerns of the committee were: 1) faculty actions needed to "activate" Boost; 2) impact on student behavior; 3) whether Boost is enabled in Canvas, requiring only that the faculty member enable it on their Canvas site. Concerns address expeditiously and satisfactorily by Ben Motz. See his comments below.

"Starting in Fall 2019, Boost was made active in all courses across the IU system. As soon as a course in Canvas is published, it's "boostable" no matter what the faculty member does. But by default, the Boost LTI tool is *not* enabled in Canvas -- a faculty member would need to enable "IU Boost" in order to see the left navigation menu and widget in Canvas. So there might be some confusion -- a faculty member might assume that they need to enable the "IU Boost" tool before it works, but that's not true (the LTI tool is just for transparency and reporting). Whether the tool is enabled in Canvas does not affect Boost's functionality. (I'm hoping this is making sense; It occurs to me that this is a funny distinction: whether the Boost app is visible in Canvas is not the same as whether Boost is operational for that Canvas site.)

There is no opt-out mechanism per se. That is, a faculty member can't "turn off Boost" for their course any more than they can turn off Canvas notifications for their course. However, if a faculty member is deeply resistant to the idea of these notifications, they could change the assignment settings to prevent Boost from operating. This could be accomplished by removing an assignment's deadline, or making an assignment worth 0 points in Canvas.

So I think everything's as it should be – Boost works for all students in all courses, and faculty (if they desire) can add the LTI tool to their Canvas sites to see additional information about Boost's notifications. But if there's something else we can do, please let us know!"
(Verbatim from email received on January 30, 2020)

Item Received from IFC-EC on April 23, 2020: Report of the UFC/ALC Joint Task Force on a Policy on Course Evaluations for IU

Action Item: Discuss and draft a position statement for IFC
Status: In Progress:

Discussion & Resolution: The committee discussed the task force report at length at its meeting on May 4, 2020. Each task force recommendation was discussed and comments added to the document, which is in a separate document to this report. In general, the committee's comments centered on the following themes:

Use of numerical results: AAC agrees with the spirit of the statements with regards to numerical results; but do not agree that they should be eliminated. Great care should be taken that these

are no compared to departmental or university averages. Reviewers should be given information on how to interpret numerical and other information. Numerical information should be compared against some norm. There should be formative processes rather than summative and the results should be used to for professional development and continuous improvement.

Student Impressions of SETs: Guard against giving students the impression that SETs are not valued. Ensure that students are aware of their implicit biases either through a form or a statement just before completing the course evaluation. Ensure that students understand that it is the course being evaluated, not the faculty person.

Use of SETs for Faculty development and Continuous Improvement: AAC agrees with this assertion. However, we doubt that that students' perceptions can be boiled down to the two questions on page 4. How will the course evaluations be used for Promotion & Tenure? Who will interpret the students' evaluations? The committee agreed that department chairs should perform the diagnostics to assist faculty in becoming better teachers through mid-semester evaluations, CTL workshops, robust peer evaluations with constructive feedback, just to name a few actions.

The AAC also agreed that faculty should be encouraged to engage in self-reflection and have peer reviewers on a regular basis, not just for promotion and tenure. Continuous improvement and professional development.

Given the importance of this issue, it should be carried over into 2020-2021 to draft a position statement for IFC.

This concludes the annual report of the IFC Academic Affairs Committee for the 2019-2020 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

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

ATTACHMENT A

IFC Academic Affairs Committee – Comments on Global Learning Outcomes
November 13, 2019

The following are verbatim comments from the members of the committee who were able to respond on short notice.

1. "They seem to be heavily slanted toward humanities courses/activities. While I understand that it is not intended that all twelve be used in one instance, I am finding it difficult to see even one that might be applicable to a hard science course/activity (e.g. Chemistry, Physics, Biology). It can be challenging to design an activity in many science courses that would considered a global learning experience. Having a GLO or two in which a Chemist, for example, can see their discipline would help us think about how to incorporate an activity into a course.

   It would be great to see each on the GLO's specifically mapped onto the IUPUI Profiles."

2. "…..the GLOs are in good shape."

3. "They look great to me!"

4. "I've looked over the documents you sent, and I'll share my reactions with you. Please edit, rephrase, or discard them as you consider them for inclusion in the committee's response.
   a. The twelve outcome statements are ambitious —perhaps too ambitious—, and they cover a very wide array of academic disciplines. Is there an accompanying list of options for *how* these outcomes will be assessed? That is, is there a list of acceptable/desirable assessment mechanisms, and is there an expectation that the assessment will occur by means of various assignments per course, or a global assessment at the end of each course? Or will the assessments come at the end of the undergrad / grad curricula prior to graduation?

   b. Is there a threshold number of intercultural experiences that we should consider as *optimal* for a graduating student at IUPUI? Or should we take the statement from the Strategic Initiative that "at least ONE substantive and meaningful global learning experience" is an acceptable minimum? And is there a definition for what constitutes "substantive" and "meaningful"?"

5. "From an assessment perspective, twelve learning outcomes is too many. However, the GLOs need to be utilized across multiple disciplines at IU and Purdue. Mapping the GLOs to the IUPUI Profiles would provide users with a mechanism for implementation in the academic units. I can see how my school can assess most of the GLOs. The challenge will be at the course level in courses where internationalization may not be

readily apparent. The only question remains is will the academic units be required to assess all twelve of them?"

Conclusion:
Overall, these was concern about covering all academic disciplines, especially science; mapping to IUPUI Profiles; and assessment methods.   Two school representatives had already reviewed the GLOs and support them fully.

ATTACHMENT B
IFC Academic Affairs Committee Feedback
on the Undergraduate Admissions Test Optional Task Force Report
August -July, 2019

Commenter 1:
Glad to weigh in on this. I've seen it from several directions, including the Admissions committee. My feedback follows. As usual, it comes in several flavors. My opinions about going test optional, about what will be required to do a good job, and about the report itself are related, but not identical!

Ongoing test optional

- First and foremost, I think going test optional is a good idea. It is right for us and for our students.
- There are several places where SAT/ACT scores are useful (E&T, supporting math placement, Honors admissions), merit aid. I think we will find it necessary to require test scores for sub-populations, at least for the foreseeable future.

Regarding the process, I think it is going to take some work, and I would NOT want to do it prematurely, or risk a bad implementation that could tarnish a good idea. Some details on this:

- The report notes that "After taking into account high school GPA, AP credit, and number of honors classes, SAT/ACT has a small effect on retention." *We need to be committed to coding these three critical values to make our decision.*
- Other variables mentioned, such as 4 years HS math and level of senior year math may be secondary for the campus, but may be vital to particular schools (SCI, E&T, and INFO come to mind) for direct admission decisions.
- Essays can be even more time consuming, and I am not convinced they are as good a differentiator. I would not invest as much in essay reading as I would the process above.
- My primary concern is about the image issue. We have been working to overcome misperceptions of IUPUI for years, and are not there yet. If we do this, we need to market the change carefully, and we don't always have complete control of our message.
- Making this shift in concert with IUB would probably help.

On the report itself, I think it is good overall, but there are some issues that concern me. I am confident there are answers (and I am not asking for them), but I have already heard from colleagues that they do not entirely trust the report because of issues like these:

- The "colored chart" on pp. 3-4 is confusing. Why are there colors for high/neutral/low and good, where low and good are the same color? Is good better than high? Was "bad" a possible choice?
- Same chart identifies "Image/Perception" as "Low." but then goes on to say, essentially, that we have no information. If we have no information, what is "Low"?
- The section on graduation rates also seems misleading. It starts by saying "Existing research shows that graduation rates did not suffer as a result of an institution moving to test-optional. As stated in the study Defining Access: How Test-Optional Works," but then goes on to reveal that the data is entirely from non-peer institutions.
- The cost issue is critical, both for admissions in general "More in-depth analysis would be needed to get estimate total cost." and for honors and direct admissions "...challenge is how to gather the best indicators and then how to provide the resulting additional review." It would be a mistake to give faculty the impression that we intend to move forward before clarifying this issue.
- On cost again, this comment is buried under the graduation rates section "Given the potential needs of non-submitters, additional resources and programs may need to be created to support this student population to ensure student success."
- There is a general feel that the "positive" information is highlighted over the "negative." For instance, under "How would test optional impact image/perception of IUPUI on influencers?" The lead is with information about guidance counselors, and supporting data is bulleted. Then, negative information from honors and informatics is included at the end, not in bulleted form. In

SUMMARY

1. I am personally in favor of shifting to test optional admissions
2. It may take more than one year, and it is essential that admissions have enough staff support to code the relevant data before we make this change.
3. Image problems are real, and we need to have a plan in place to address them. Making this move in concert with IUB would help.
4. The report itself is thorough and well-written, but some readers find it to be slanted in favor of the test optional outcome.

Commenter 2:
I agree with all the comments made by [Commenter 1]. Here are some additional thoughts to consider for implementation:

- Of the schools in the midwest that have implemented test-optional admissions (like Ball State), it is a small percentage of the applicant pool opting for this, but would this increase over time? The current seniors in high school have gone through college prep

thinking SAT/ACT scores are required - so 10 years from now would the majority of applicants not have these scores, once the word gets out?

- Currently, liberal arts and fine arts programs seem to be the majors that most of these students are seeking.
- If IUPUI approves this, it changes the minimal admission requirement for the "campus" but any school can have higher requirements - and many/most do have higher requirements.
    o Therefore, if a student wants to major in math, and selects test-optional admission, he may be admitted to IUPUI in UC, but not science because math may require a minimal SAT-Math score.
    o or if the student has credit for MATH 16500 say via AP AB Calculus with a score of 4 or 5, the student would become a direct/dual admit to Science/Math, or
    o after the fall semester, if the student earns a grade of C or better in MATH 16500 and has at least a 2.00 GPA, then he is automatically admitted to Science/MATH.

So what I am adding to [Commenter 1's] comments: in the "campus" implementation of test-optional admission, most departments/schools have to adjust their dual admission criteria - else, they will be admitting students directly into their programs based only on a minimal high school GPA, which is not standardized across high schools (creating an equity issue?).

I am generally in favor of test-optional admission, especially if it is a small percentage of applicants, because the down-side is resources required in admissions to further screen students (say the essay, which is time intensive and more costly). Also, we would then have to require a proctored MATH placement exam for these students - again more cost, and takes time during orientation. This decision will place a higher cost on some units on campus: Math, Admissions, Testing Center, Orientation, UC Advisors — so small numbers can be absorbed, large number of students is a real cost to some units.

Commenter 3: The idea appears to be a good one; it may have unintended consequences. An example are those students who do not have great GPA; but test well and have stellar SAT/ACT scores. This person expressed that the impact on some URM populations may be negative in that they would be admitted based solely on GPA and they are not fully prepared. This person also expressed the perception issue, meaning that IUPUI's reputation is likely to be perceived as being of a lesser quality than IUB.

Summary of comments from the Kelley School of Business Undergraduate Advising Staff
1. What do you think of the idea?
    - It's a good idea
    - Likes the idea; but cautious about unintended consequences
2. What are the potential drawbacks to KSBI and prospective students?
    - Resources (staff, advisers, support services, process applications, faculty

- Perception: KSBI's reputation could be erroneously viewed as less than it was previously, and comparatively worse than Bloomington, if this issues is not addressed up front.

3. What are the potential benefits to KSBI and prospective students?
   - Increase in enrollments, especially URM students
   - Recognition for innovation in admissions by recognizing that standardized test scores are not a true measure of a student's ability
   - Admissions will become more competitive
   - Admissions criteria revised (i.e., weighted GPA, involvement, essay, etc.)
   - Employers would know that KSBI is graduating the highest number of Undergraduate URM students in Indianapolis

4. Do we expect that admissions/enrollments will increase, decrease, or stay the same?
   - Increase; but will determine the number of students who met GPA requirements, but did not meet the SAT/ACT requirements
   - Increase dramatically

5. How (and when) should this be implemented?
   - At least 1-2 years after IUPUI has implemented it
   - Announce a year before implementation (announced in Fall 2020, implemented Fall 2021)
   - Wait to determine the impact on the Honors College and IUPUI

Attachment C
Percentage of IUPUI Courses
Required for Conferral of Certificate

Scope
Students completing a certificate program from IUPUI with
completed courses from another IU campus or external institution.

Policy Statement
IUPUI requires that a minimum of 25% of the credit hours earned
for the conferral of a certificate be earned at IUPUI.

Reason for Policy
While specific policies exist for the conferral of a bachelor's or associate's degree, no policy
currently exists for the conferral of IUPUI certificates.

Procedures
In reviewing requirements for the conferral of an IUPUI certificate, academic units must require
that at least 25% of the completed coursework be earned 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.

Sanctions
Conferral of an IUPUI certificate with fewer than 25% of the coursework earned at IUPUI could
result in rescinding the certificate.

History
The <u>Higher Learning Commission</u> 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

> *1   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. This same standard should be used for conferral of an IUPUI certificate.