

Idaho State University  
**Academic Standards Council**  
Minutes

Wednesday, October 1, 2008

3:00 PM

Faculty Senate Conference Room, REND 301

In Attendance: Denner, A. Frantz, B. Frantz, Enos, Germino, Johnson, Krumwiede, Mickelsen, Selvage (Chair), Stowe,  
Excused: Steiner, Swetnam  
Absent: Wabrek  
Non-voting: Ford, Hertz, Jensen (ASISU), McKenzie, Wallace (Recording Secretary), Wasden (Office Assistant)

### **Announcements & Introductions**

Selvage had the new members introduce themselves: Peter Denner, elected by the College of Education; Whitney Jensen, ASISU representative; and Megan Wasden, Senate Office Assistant. Matt Germino from Biology came in a bit later.

### **Continuing Business**

#### New Charges from Senate:

- 1) **Convert Exams to Credits proposal by College of Technology**
- 2) **Resident Credit policy statement in Undergraduate Catalog**

Selvage reminded Council members that the charges had originated from some concerns Curriculum Council had about curricular proposals they had reviewed. McKenzie read aloud the three-part charge from Faculty Senate. She said the issues raised were part of a much broader range of policies regarding the granting of ISU credits. The main crux of the matter was **what kinds of course work, work experience, professional or technical training or exams should be counted as ISU credit towards academic degrees**. The Council needs to review the policies written in the undergraduate catalog and determine whether they are adequate as-is or require revisions. Selvage suggested forming a subcommittee to examine and evaluate the existing credit-granting policies. **McKenzie, Enos, Mickelsen, Johnson, A. Frantz and Ford** volunteered to work on the issue.

**ACTION:** Johnson moved to **form a subcommittee, comprised of the above volunteers, to review policies regarding Resident Credit, conversion of exams to credit, and the issue of granting ISU credits as a whole and to make recommendations for changes as necessary**. A. Frantz seconded the motion. No discussion. The motion **passed** unanimously.

### **New Business**

#### Registrar's Questions regarding Banner Software Implementation – Laura McKenzie

McKenzie briefly outlined the reasons for purchasing the new Banner software system and the expected implementation timeline for her portions of it. The new class-scheduling software, ASTRA, is almost implemented. Once Banner is up and running, ASTRA will be revised to provide analysis and forecasting capability. **Banner's Admissions portion is scheduled to be online and in use for Fall 2009**, so McKenzie needs to know very soon which features faculty

want to have set up. An **electronic degree auditing system** will also be installed. The three questions McKenzie needed answered were:

- 1) What *metrics* should be used to *evaluate incoming students for admission*?
- 2) Do faculty want *prerequisite checking* which would prevent students from registering for classes unless they have fulfilled the prerequisites?
- 3) Do faculty want *automatic wait-listing* for closed courses that would fill open slots on a first-come, first-served basis?

The Council discussed their various constituents' reactions and reported mixed experiences from people they knew who were familiar with Banner. *Prerequisite checking* was generally felt to be a good idea. *Wait-listing* was more problematic, especially for seniors who must take a particular course to graduate but might be sidelined by juniors who had tried to register first. This problem might be solved by implementing the *Instructor Consent* feature which would require authorization from the instructor before a student is allowed to register for the class. Questions that arose about wait-listing were:

- 1) Can wait-list criteria be tailored to a specific course?
- 2) Can departments prioritize wait-lists or add people to the top of the wait-list?
- 3) Can wait-lists be course-specific, section-specific or subject-specific?

**McKenzie said she will look into the Council's questions about Banner's wait-listing options and will update the Council at their next meeting.**

The current evaluation metrics for admitting new students include GPA predictions, which Banner will not support. The relative merits and drawbacks of using SAT/ACT test scores, class ranking, COMPASS testing, Grade Point Averages (GPA) and other such metrics were discussed. An evaluation system that uses **multiple commonly used metrics was favored**; non-standard metrics do not have enough supporting validity studies to warrant their use.

GPA's alone are poor indicators of a student's actual performance because of rampant grade inflation and Idaho's law against identifying special needs students on their transcripts. ISU has experienced many problems admitting students who, despite their high grades, are not prepared for college level courses. Using standardized test scores when evaluating a student's likely performance at ISU would help mitigate that situation. University of Idaho uses different criteria for different categories of students, e.g. high school graduates, GED students, transfer students, first-generation college students, or home-schooled students. That sort of categorization can be accommodated by Banner if desired. Hertz said that in her experience regular advising intervention with at-risk or disadvantaged students does have a positive effect on retention. Members agreed that at a minimum some baseline level should be set that will help flag students who are likely to experience problems passing classes.

The Council felt it was time **to reevaluate ISU's admissions policies** since predicted GPAs as specified in the catalog were no longer going to be used, the minimum 2.0 GPA requirement is weakened by grade inflation, and other possibly outdated information is contained in the current policies. Raising admission standards and admitting more qualified students will also help solve retention problems. Admission interviews were also discussed as a possible requirement. Ford urged Council members to talk with their constituents and get their opinions regarding admissions criteria. The Office of Institutional Research, the Admissions Office and other institutions' admission requirements should be tapped for information.

**ACTION:** Moved by A. Frantz and seconded by Johnson **to form a subcommittee to identify information resources that can provide relevant data and gather information regarding**

**admissions criteria** for the council to consider. No discussion. The motion was **passed** unanimously. **Ford, Hertz, Germino, and McKenzie** volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

**ACTION:** Stowe moved to have **Banner require prerequisite and co-requisite checking**.  
Seconded by Denner.

Discussion: In response to A. Frantz's question, McKenzie said students currently enrolled in a prerequisite class would be allowed to enroll in the more advanced course, but a report will be generated that will require their final grades be verified as meeting the minimum requirement. Johnson asked for and received clarification that paper overrides are possible, so students could be allowed to register by the instructor on a case-by-case basis. The Council members voted and the **motion was passed**.

Readmissions Policy – JoAnn Hertz – *deferred until next time*

### **Elect a Vice Chair**

Selvage is scheduled to have knee surgery between now and the next Council meeting. He plans to participate in the meeting via telephone, but the Council should elect a Vice Chair to run the next meeting and take over his duties in case something prevents him from returning as planned.

**ACTION:** Stowe moved and Enos seconded to **appoint Alan Frantz as Vice-Chair of the Academic Standards Council**. Frantz agreed to serve. The motion **passed**.

**Marcella Enos** volunteered to serve as **Chair of the ISU Transcript Credit Policies Subcommittee**.

**Larry Ford** volunteered to serve as **Chair of the Admissions Requirements Subcommittee**. He will **task Suzanne Peck** to help gather data for the committee.

### **Minutes from September 10, 2008**

Stowe pointed out a grammatical error on page 2, 5.a. which would be corrected by the insertion of the word "**been**".

**ACTION:** Moved by Stowe and seconded by Jensen to **approve the minutes as amended**. No discussion. The motion **passed**. **The minutes were corrected accordingly**.

**Adjournment:** 4:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Wallace  
Administrative Assistant I  
Faculty Senate Office

Approved by Academic Standards Council: October 15, 2008  
Accepted by Faculty Senate: October 27, 2008