

# ADAC Meeting Minutes

November 28, 2016, 2016

Milton Hall, room 85, 2 hr.

**Type of meeting:** Regular ADAC Meeting

**Facilitator:** Kathy Brook

**Notes:** Yvonne Mendoza

**Attending:** Jeff Hackney, Kori Plank, Sonya Cooper, Tim Ketelaar, Rolfe Sassenfeld, Jerry Hawkes, Greg Fant, Susan Brown, Norma Grijalva, Ellen Bosman, Mark Cal, Beth Pollack, David Smith, Shelly Stovall, John Walker, Karen Kopera-Frye, Bill Serban, Andrew Nwanne, Kathy Brook.

**Guests:** Susie Bussmann

	<b>Agenda Item:</b>	<b>Attendee:</b>
	Call to order	<b>K. Brook</b>
	<b>Approval of Minutes – October 24, 2016</b>	<b>Group</b>
Motion to approve minutes by B. Pollack, and seconded by John Walker. Motion approved		
	<b>Peer Review of Distance Education</b>	<b>G. Fant / S. Bussmann</b>
<p>At a recent update meeting regarding Distance Education, some questions came up regarding DE and how the peer reviewers will be evaluating our DE when they come to NMSU.</p> <p>Greg Fant passed out a form created by the Higher Learning Commission. The idea is to introduce the document with a brief discussion and a follow up on some specific points on the document. The form pertains to DE and is used by peer reviewers as a guide to help them with their work (assessments/evaluations).</p> <p>This form is being shared as a self-assessment guide for the colleges to take an audit approach, to obtain documentation and evidence relating to the criteria and core components listed on the right hand side of the document.</p> <p><b>Example of criteria and core components assessment question.</b>  <b>7. Evaluation and Assessment #3.</b> <i>Assessment and evaluation methods used for distance-delivered offering, and their equivalence to those used in traditional face to face offerings. Are we doing this? How are we doing this, and is there documentation/evidence?</i></p> <p>We might go through some exercises over the next 6 months, so that we can be prepared for reviewers. We will touch base on this subject after the winter break. The topic is recommended as a discussion item with department heads so that we can identify what we don't know and need clarification on.</p>		
	<b>Centralized Advising</b>	<b>K. Kopera-Frye</b>
<p>The discussion of centralized advising was brought forward by Dr. Frye.</p> <p>It was mentioned that there are several different advising structures being used in the colleges. For example, Arts and Sciences has centralized advising in their college while ACES and Engineering use faculty led advising.</p> <p>K. Frye asked about the centralized advising model, and how it is envisioned when we have very tight standards with the accreditation bodies for some programs.</p>		

G. Fant stated that he has not been in the discussions relating to centralized advising.

B. Pollack stated that the Dean of Arts & Sciences, and the head of advising for the college have spoken with the Provost about moving toward a model that would require 40-plus advisors.

J. Hawkes stated that the College of ACES has surveyed students, faculty, and staff, about the advising process. The response was heavily in favor of faculty led advising, with 100% of the students responding in favor of the faculty led model. In addition, 95% of the faculty that responded to the survey were in favor of continuing with the process.

It was stated the centralized advising idea is being discussed with the deans and a meeting is scheduled for advisors and the Provost on December 9, 2016.

The Georgia State model of centralized advising has resonated with some individuals on campus. Georgia State's retention numbers have increased by 80%, and NMSU needs to improve its retention numbers. This model is a one stop area where students go to get advised.

T. Ketelaar expressed support of centralized advising model. He also stated that Jennifer Hodges from Arts & Sciences has talked about two different types of advising, mentoring, and curricular advising. He suggested that we should try documenting some of our best practices in mentoring, so that if and when we do centralize curricular advising we know how to do the other type of advising well. We should recognize the work of those departments that are already doing a good job of mentoring and encourage them to continue. His perception is that some departments are so busy doing curricular advising that it detracts from mentoring students.

S. Cooper stated that the American Society of Engineering Education has published a lot on the topic of advising and has reported that for retention purposes the faculty model is by far the best. They also say that students really want that relationship with faculty members, and when they can provide it, it does wonders.

S. Stovall stated that our data for decades has told us that advising has been a problem. K. Brook stated that our student surveys have not served us well, in identifying what that means.

J. Hackney stated that when we see these surveys, many of those issues have nothing to do with advising. The biggest change in the last 10 years is course scheduling; we used to offer many more sections of courses at a much wider variety of times. Building schedules has been much more difficult recently.

K. Brook's concern about this potential change is that advisors in some colleges have responsibilities that are not strictly advising and that if they are doing more advising, colleges will have to figure out how to fill the gaps.

<b>Academic Integrity Proposal</b>	<b>T. Ketelaar</b>
------------------------------------	--------------------

T. Ketelaar presented an update on the academic integrity policy revision, and gave some history. He stated that back in 2010 our student government, ASNMSU, presented a proposal for NMSU to adopt a more centralized academic integrity policy, based on Oklahoma State's model.

One reason for the proposed change was ASNMSU perceived that there was not a lot of consistency across the colleges on how academic misconduct was handled; they wanted students to be treated in the same way across every college and to be treated in a fair way. They also wanted the process to be transparent and visible to every student.

Currently a student wanting to know about academic misconduct and how it is handled would go to the student handbook, which states that it is handled within the college. In discussions, students have commented that they would hear different things from different colleges. Also there hasn't been enough communication and still isn't, enough between colleges. Currently we don't have a clear mechanism for dealing with multiple offenses that occur across colleges.

The other interest in modeling OSU policy is that it has different levels of sanctions -- minor sanctions, more serious sanctions, and possibly higher standards for graduate students or repeat offenders. There is also an interest in a clear appeals process.

Tim stated that this is a faculty supported initiative. Two of the key recommendations from faculty input were to create an institutional office for academic integrity and also to create a flow chart to show how allegations of academic misconduct are handled. An Academic Conduct Officer would be created and would be the person with whom a faculty member would file a report alleging academic misconduct. The officer would also be the communicator with students and faculty pertaining to any allegations, or investigation, or hearing. A standardized procedure is being developed on how we convey the information to the student informing them of about the sanction being issued. The timeline is also being developed pertaining to the delivery of decisions on investigations or hearing results.

In response to a question Tim indicated that this is to be implemented system wide.

Tim will email the document on request and will take any questions. The committee will be meeting in late January, early February in hopes to have the document finalized by February.

	<b>Transfer Policy</b>	<b>S. Stovall</b>
<p>The current transfer credit, NMSU policy 6.89 was distributed.</p> <p>Shelly stated that she had received minimal feedback on the revised transfer credit document. She also stated that the document in some areas has contradictory language and areas of inconsistency and that comments and feedback are needed within the next two weeks.</p>		
	<b>CAF Processing Once Per Year</b>	<b>B. Pollack</b>
<p>Will be discussed at the next ADAC meeting.</p>		
	<b>Proposed redesign of the Bachelor of Science in Surveying Engineering Program for a Bachelor of Science in Geomatics</b>	<b>S. Cooper</b>
<p>S. Cooper moved to approve the change of the BS in Surveying Engineering to a Bachelor of Science (BS) in Geomatics, and to approve the redesigned content of the degree. The motion was seconded by T. Ketelaar, and the motion passed.</p>		
<p>Adjourn: 3:00 pm</p>		