

CMDM Policy/Definition Reporting Chart

Date	Description of Issue to be Addressed Or Needed Definition	Recommendations/Further Actions
5/29/02	<p>Who has a list of courses approved for Distance Education delivery? What are the criteria, how are they published, how are they enforced, etc.?</p>	
<p>Response: 1</p>	<p>Background: According to SACS, distance education is defined as “any formal education process in which the majority of the instruction occurs when the student and instructor are not in the same place.” Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous employing correspondence study, video teleconferencing, satellite technology, television, CD ROM, video or audiotape delivery, and online or web delivery techniques. The University Senate passed a resolution in 1999 clarifying the University procedures necessary complying with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) guidelines for substantive changes in courses and programs offered off-campus. Essentially, the paths of information flow are the same as those currently used for proposing new or changed courses or programs. The main point is that the information pertinent to any new or significantly changed offering of campus courses and programs must also be reported/approved. New forms are being considered to expedite this. The Senate resolution can be found at http://www.rgs.uky.edu/gs/Senate-DL-CoursesMemo.html. The Senate Council Office disseminates a listing of the Council’s actions including approved courses for distance delivery, though an “official” aggregated list of approved courses has not been maintained. The Distance Learning Technology Center is compiling a retrospective list of approved courses and monitors the Senate Council memos for new additions.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Upon approval of a course change for distance education delivery by the University’s Senate Council, it should be coded in SIS. The nature of this coding might include some indication of the nature of the delivery format and technology, i.e. Multimedia, Interactive Television (ITV), Web based, etc. (2) Courses approved for distance education delivery should receive a 200 level section number so that enrollments can be reported to the CPE and other agencies. (3) It should be possible to produce a list of approved courses for distance education delivery for the use of various offices on campus. (4) A procedure should be established to review, waiver, or deny the delivery of courses scheduled for distance education delivery but have not received appropriate Senate Council approval.

6/05/02	Define a Smart Classroom.	
<p>Response: 2</p>	<p>Background: A review of policies at other institutions quickly reveals that there is no standard definition for what constitutes a “smart classroom.” There is a wide range of functionality that can be incorporated into a smart classroom, though not all classrooms may need to be equipped in a similar manner. Some institutions classify their classroom by levels, e.g. Level I, II, etc. A more useful approach may be to select room codes and labels that are more descriptive of the functionality of the room.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A review of existing classrooms should be made to inventory their current technological capabilities. Other instructionally relevant non-technological features should also be included such as a moveable configuration of seating for class interaction. (2) Rooms could be classified simply as an: “Electronic Classroom” those having an Internet connection and a podium mounted computer and/or connection for a laptop, with a graphic projector or TV monitors for viewing. A more media rich environment could be classified as a “Multimedia Classroom” that builds on the electronic classroom infrastructure to include such items as a DVD, VCR, document camera, sound system, etc. The third classification would be an “Interactive Television Classroom” or ITV classroom that would be a special use room having features of the electronic and multimedia rooms with the addition of cameras, monitors, etc. for two-way audio-visual transmission. (3) A systematic plan should be developed for upgrading classroom and coding them in the classroom scheduling program. Upgrades should be made in a manner that will provide access to such rooms evenly across campus. (4) SIS should provide for the requests of a specific type of classroom so that the instructional needs can be matched to Class scheduling process.

6/05/02	Is there a need to track Strategic Indicators and will they change?	
Response: 3	Background: From a policy standpoint, it seems reasonable to expect that there will be a need to tie many potential data points within SIS to strategic indicators, accreditation reports, and other reporting requirements required by SACS, CPE, etc. for both internal assessment and external reporting. It should be recognized that the strategic indicators are likely to change every four to six years with the revision of the University's Strategic Plan and other agencies will adjust criteria over time thereby requiring differing analyses of existing data and possibly the creation of new sets of data variables.	Recommendation(s): (1) It should be anticipated that the data warehouse would contain data sets that are integral to the creation of institutional progress reports reflective of the strategic indicators & other reporting requirements. (2) The Registrar's Office should be involved early in the process to identify how best data can be collected for reporting purposes.
6/05/02	What should the metric be for distinguishing high and low demand course sections?	
Response: 4	Background: The discussion of this suggests that the following factors be considered: (1) <i>High Demand</i> to be defined as any course section that is critical for graduation or has unmet enrollment demand; (2) <i>Low Demand</i> to be defined as not critical for graduation and does not exceed an enrollment minimum; and (3) consideration of (1) and (2) in conjunction <i>Frequency of Offering</i> , i.e. when the class was last offered and is scheduled to be offered again. Currently, the decision to offer a course resides at the academic department or college level; however, this decision should not be predicated simply on available resources driven by "have" and "have not" units. Once the institution has a degree audit system in place, the identification of courses needed for graduation will be simplified. Since some courses meet multiple major requirements and is constantly evolving, it does not seem reasonable to program the logic for every given situation. Ultimately, the system will not be able to replace the function that academic advisors perform, but should be able to focus decision making on issues related to high and low demand courses.	Recommendation(s): (1) Arriving at a metric that can be consistently applied should reflect: enrollment demand, importance and urgency to students' meeting graduation requirements, and frequency of course offerings. (2) The metric for classifying courses, as high and low demand, should be applied campus wide so as to drive the decision on the basis of serving students rather than solely as a resource issue.

6/05/02	What metric should be used for the number of credit hours that should be generated given a percentage of Instructor DOE (Distribution of Effort)?	
Response: 5	Background: It is recognized that considerable variability exists across colleges in the determination of teaching loads and assigned percent of effort. This issue is believed to be beyond the knowledge and authority of the committee.	Recommendation(s): (1) The Provost with Deans should develop a metric that reconciles the institution's need for productivity and the possible variations that may exist in course pedagogies and ways of assigning faculty efforts, i.e. multiple instructors teaching course, etc.
6/05/02	When should the University take snapshots of enrollment data?	
Response: 6	Background: Historically the snapshot was taken once per semester for the purpose of CPE reporting. For this CPE report, the Registrar's Office takes a snapshot 3-4 weeks into the term (this item is not retained), perform edits so that the data can be as clean as possible when the report is submitted. Actual reporting is done Oct. 15 for Fall and March 15 for Spring. Several snapshots should be taken over the course of the semester in order to track the attrition of course enrollments over the duration of a semester from year to year, and to identify the optimum snapshot time frame for CPE reporting.	Recommendation(s): (1) The University should take snapshots immediately after each major calendar event in SIS in that each of these events may be related to students' decisions about their enrollment status.
6/12/02	How are alternate deliver modes defined?	
Response: 7	Background: In general the SACS standard is applicable in that "any formal education process in which the majority of the instruction occurs when the student and instructor are not in the same place" would be considered an alternate delivery mode including face-to-face instruction at an off-campus location. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous and employ many combinations of delivery modes. Currently the DLTC Office indicates the type of primary delivery used for a course with the following codes: 02–Off Campus; 04–Kentucky Educational TV (KET); 05–Videotape; 06–Compressed Video (Video Teleconferencing or ITV); 07–Satellite; 08 – Internet; 09-Telecommunications Cable (UKTV; Insight Channel 16). Note: An additional numerical code for CD-ROM delivery is needed and codes can be added to the look-up table for additional types of program delivery modes on screen 137. It has been noted that the codes that are on that table do not match what UK reports to Frankfort and a process of translation is conducted for reporting to the CPE.	Recommendation(s): (1) The University's definition should largely accommodate the guidelines proposed by its accrediting bodies since alternate modes of delivery tend to have implications for assuring the equivalency of academic rigor and students' access to support services. (2) Codes used to identify delivery modes should be as consistent as possible with those used for reporting purposes.

6/12/02	How is a first time, full time “student” defined?	
Response: 8	Background: The University has had a standard set of definitions that are well understood within the institution by the Admissions and Registrar’s Office. If a student is enrolled in 12 or more hours for credit and this is the first college work attempted at UK - AFTER high school graduation - then the student is classified according to one of four codes: FAP – “Pure” first year student – first time/full time FRX – Transfer student with less than 24 hours FPW – First year student with prior college credits (earned while in High School) RMP – Remedial Minority student Note: MA 108 - Remedial Math - though not counting toward graduation, it does count toward full-time status.	Recommendation(s): (1) The current codes and definitions should be continued. They are the same as used by CPE. (2) An additional code should be created for those students enrolled in the Fall Semester who started collegiate work at UK during the summer session immediately prior. This will permit easier tracking of this cohort and still allow them to be counted as first time students as of the Fall Semester
6/12/02	What is the definition of a full-time student?	
Response: 9	Background: The definition of a full time student (UK & LCC) is accepted as: Undergrad: 12 or more credit hours (spring/fall) and 9 (summer) Grad: 9 or more hours for credit (spring/fall) and 6 (summer) Dentistry or Medicine: 1 or more hours for credit Pharmacy: 12 or more hours for credit Law: 10 or more hours for credit Exceptions: Students enrolled in specific courses (identified in SIS) are considered full-time for enrollment purposes such as EGR 399, ACC 399, graduate level courses of 748, 749, and 769, etc. These are not always full-time for tuition purposes, however they enable students to be retained in the system as active enrollments & remain eligible for loan deferment, health insurance, financial aid, etc. See SIS table UXTUX201 for courses having less than full time credit hours but count as full time enrollment.	Recommendation(s): (1) In the data mart, the calculations for determination of full-time students should be done at the point of extraction based on the logic to the left, and a flag created/set to 0 (not full-time) or 1 (full-time), so users do not have to program the logic in their reports.
6/12/02	How are duplicated room counts to be defined and handled?	
Response: 10	Background: As we understand this problem (to use 10 sections of the Psychology Courses as an example) there are two hours of common lecture plus a separate lab or recitation session for each of 10 sections. When scheduled, each of the 10 sections lists the same lecture hall and a separate room for the third hour. When determining room utilization the lecture hall is counted ten times rather than just once. But because several sections meet	Recommendation(s): (1) Create two related courses that must be taken together and list the lecture for 2 credits in the large lecture hall and the lab or recitation as a separate 1 or 2-credit experience in a separate room. This is

	together in a large room, if they did not combine the enrollments of all the sections meeting in that room, then the utilization report would show the room as under-utilized with only 26 students rather than 260.	done for lecture lab courses elsewhere within UK. This would require a relatively straightforward course change. (2) A programming modification could be done to accommodate courses of this nature, or it could continue to be done off-line, however this does not solve the problem, only manages it.
6/12/02	How will multiple majors be handled?	
Response: 11	Background: SIS can currently store 4 majors and 2 minors. All majors are reported to the CPE, minors are not required. It is believed that the system can adequately accommodate recording these degree accomplishments.	Recommendation(s): (1) Majors and minors should be recorded in SIS for future analysis and reporting.
6/12/02	How are Independent Study Courses identified?	
Response: 12	Background: The term "Independent Study" is used in two different ways when referring to courses. For courses within a major or department that might also be called "directed study," the "IND" activity type associated with the course provides the identification. For "correspondence courses," identification is made by an "I" in the section number -- these courses do not count toward a student's full-time status, but enrollments are report the to the CPE. The following logic could be used to identify independent study courses: (SecColCD EQ 'OT') or (ActivTypCD EQ 'IND') or (SecSecCD EQ 'IS') or (COURN EQ '395 ' OR COURN EQ '396 ' OR COURN EQ '397 ' OR COURN EQ '398 ' OR COURN EQ '399 ') or (COURP EQ 'IES') or (SECF EQ 'I') – first digit of section number.	Recommendation(s): (1) In the data mart, the calculations for determination of an independent study course should be done at the point of extraction based on the logic to the left, and a flag set to 0 (not independent study course) or 1 (independent study courses), so users do not have to program the logic in their reports. Users can then use this field to total the number of independent study courses.
6/12/02	The Academic Year is defined as Fall, Spring, Summer 1, and Summer 2. Should this be changed?	
Response: 13	Background: There is an increasing frequency of non-standard delivery patterns in the summer, i.e., courses compressed into fewer weeks, courses starting or ending on a non-standard timetable, and courses falling partially into both the 4 and 8-week sessions. A new definition of full time status for the summer may be required. The use of Summer 1 and Summer 2, or Fall 1 And Fall 2, etc. for class sessions within a term would have no effect on the aggregate data for the academic year for the three major terms.	Recommendation(s): (1) Defining the academic year as Fall, Spring and Summer should suffice. Session numbers can be used to distinguish the time frame in which the course is offered during the term.

6/12/02	How are changes in Major to be handled?	
Response: 14	Background: Changes in major are tracked on screen 257 by term and by date and numerous major changes can be accommodated.	Recommendation(s): (1) If recommendation 6 is adopted regarding the implementation of more frequent snapshots, major changes by students can be tracked within the system.
6/26/02	What is the definition of “Prime Time?”	
Response: 15	Background: At the October 12, 1998 meeting of the University Senate adopted a policy on Academic Facilities (Utilization of Classroom Space) for the Lexington Campus. This policy establishes standardized meeting patterns for prime time and prime time was defined as 8:00 AM to 3:00PM for MWF classes and 8:00AM to 3:15PM for TR classes .	Recommendation(s): (1) Since students and faculty tend to avoid 8:00 AM classes, it is recommended that consideration be given to revising the definition to 9:00 AM to 3:00/3:15 PM. (2) An analysis of course demand data and enrollment persistence over the semester should be made through weekly snapshots to test the accuracy of the Senate’s definition.
7/03/02	Does the Facilities Review calendar need to be changed to be in sync with the calendar for course enrollment snapshots?	
Response: 16	Background: Currently the review calendar indicates that facility information is updated within three time periods a year: by September for Spring, by November for Summer and by February for Fall. The time lag between the update and the start of class introduces an opportunity for inaccuracy.	Recommendation(s): (1) The Facilities Review calendar should be updated several times/semester, and as close to the start of classes as possible. In this way classroom changes, e.g. seating capacity, technology, or unavailability can be factored into the scheduling process.
7/03/02	Define the security levels to be maintained within the Data Warehouse .	
Response: 17	Background: The critical issue seems to hinge on student names and social security numbers. If these identifying formational items were to be concealed, less stringent security would seem to be necessary. The Data Stewards have recently approved the value-based security for SIS data to be academic unit, and the financial department number for FRS, HRS and FES data. This	Recommendation(s): (1) The CMDM needs to be developed in such a way that students’ identities can be hidden from those who have no need of the information or for whom it would

	security is based on the security within the online systems. The CMDM needs to be developed in such a way that students' identities can be hidden. For example, if a pre-defined report is generated with drill-down to details, and it is to be made available on the web, then the detail should not include students' names or SSNs. However, if a staff member has direct access to the CMDM, then they would be able to access students' names and SSNs.)	present a security issue.
7/17/02	Who should collect and maintain information about percentage allocations of multiple mode courses.	
Response: 18	Background: This data will be important in tracking the increased use of instructional technology and will necessitate matching the course modes to the classroom technology (smart classrooms). Currently the system does not have the capability to code the various modes and the percentage of each mode being employed within a course.	Recommendation(s): (1) A new coding system should be developed that permits a reflection of the current pattern of modes and percentages with additional coding capacity to accommodate new modes as they become available. (2) Each department should enter the mode %'s at the time the course is listed so that student advisors are aware that it is not a traditionally offered classroom course.
7/17/02	Do retention rates for groups other than first time students need to be looked at, such as graduate level; and if so, what other groups?	
Response: 19	Background: As the University engages in greater analysis of how it is serving its various student constituencies, it seems important to be able to track and identify where the institution can improve its retention rates. SIS coding already permits the tracking of many groups that might be identified for longitudinal study, although it is not routinely done currently. Admission categories in combination with other demographic and student characteristics would enable the institution to use in identifying at risk groups of students and prepare appropriate interventions, as well as shaping admission and other policies.	Recommendation(s): (1) It is recommended that retention rates be tracked for a variety of groups in order to have available pertinent data. In particular, the following groups were identified: (a) Transfer students from KY Community & Technical Colleges (KCTCS). (b) Transfer students from other 2-Year institutions public & private (non-KCTCS) (c) Transfer students from other four-year institutions (public and private) (d) Graduate students (e) First year students who have some prior college credits (FPW)

		<p>(f) Non-degree students (g) Readmitted Students (h) Students still in high school (2) Need to add the above retention statistics to the Performance Measures and then define the fields and values in SIS.</p>
7/17/02	Should student SSN and/or NAME be part of the Data Mart or hidden from most or all users?	
Response: 20	<p>Background: The subcommittee was unable to thoroughly evaluate this issue. The committee believes summary data (without identifying information) should be readily available for analysis and policy formation. Student specific information should be limited to a need-to-know basis.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s): (1) The committee endorses the decision of the Data Stewards where by they have approved the value-based security for SIS data to be academic unit, and the financial department number for FRS, HRS and FES data. This security is based on the security within the online systems. The CMDM needs to be developed in such a way that students' identities can be hidden from those who have no need of the information or for whom it would present a security issue. For example, if a pre-defined report is generated with drill-down to details, and it is to be made available on the web, then the detail should not include students' names or SSNs. However, if a staff member has direct access to the CMDM, then they would be able to access the students' names and SSNs.</p>
7/17/02	How is the cost to be calculated for developing and delivering a course through differing delivery modes?	
Response: 21	<p>Background: A response to this question is closely tied to an agreed upon set of cost variables related to traditional face-to-face instruction, similar to the highly detailed costing models that have emerged for distance education delivery. Although such cost information has value in and of itself, it does not enhance decision-making unless comparative information is used regarding the construction and maintenance of buildings, teaching loads as a percent</p>	<p>Recommendation(s): (1) A special task force should be created to conduct a pilot study to identify pertinent costs variables and gather data to produce a costing model for the institution that could ultimately be applied across the</p>

	of effort, and other elusive and often nonstandard data. The absence of fixed and variable costs as would be employed in other industries is unique to higher education in general often being confounded by debates about institutional purpose and quality. The subcommittee does not believe itself to be adequately informed to suggest a formula or have access to pertinent data.	institution and its academic programs.
7/18/02	What is the basis for defining “contact hours” for a course, student and faculty? How is each to be calculated?	
Response: 22	Background: Senate Council Rules do not address this matter. The basis for calculation is limited to the CPE guidelines for face-to-face instruction wherein a credit hour is equated to 800 minutes per credit hour for lecture and 1600 minutes per credit hour for lab. Further elaborations to these initial guidelines results in calculations of anticipated student effort, e.g., 2-3 hours of study and preparation for contact hour of class. So too is this often used in calculating distribution of effort for faculty members though pre-post class effort varies across academic units. Such definitions do not lend themselves to teaching in an online environment though most faculty members say that their effort is greater than face-to-face instruction. The need for this calculation is unclear.	Recommendation(s): (1) Deferred to Provost and Vice President level determination. These questions are related to Response 21 above.
7/18/02	Should it be recommended that LEC and LAB be entered so that they can be tied to meeting patterns?	
Response: 23	Background: Activity codes in SIS already accommodate this classification.	Recommendation(s): (1) This matter needs to be prioritized by the Data Custodians and then it becomes dependent on Mike Cantrell's staff making changes to the meeting pattern record and screens to enter this information.
7/18/02	How should the percent allocation of effort be handled in calculating contact hours, cost of course, percent of faculty effort, etc.?	
Response: 24	Background: The approaches to these questions of standardizing contact hours in order to derive percent of faculty effort and calculate subsequent instructional costs are quite varied across the campus at this time. In the opinion of the sib-committee, these matters are steeped in an organizational culture that is influenced by historical academic traditions and faculty	Recommendation(s): (1) This appears to be a matter that the University Senate should advance in the interest of enabling the institution to better project its use of intellectual and financial

	governance. In institutions where collective bargaining exists, there appears to be considerably more standardization - for better or worse. This matter is not without alternatives but the subcommittee is not a viable forum for such a debate.	resources in a systematic manner.
7/18/02	What are the rules to be for defining full-time/part-time students?	
Response: 25	<p>Background: The definition of a full time student (UK & LCC) is accepted as: Undergrad: 12 or more credit hours (spring/fall) and 9 (summer) Grad: 9 or more hours for credit (spring/fall) and 6 (summer) Dentistry or Medicine: 1 or more hours for credit Pharmacy: 12 or more hours for credit Law: 10 or more hours for credit</p> <p>Exceptions: Students enrolled in specific courses (identified in SIS) are considered full-time for enrollment purposes such as EGR 399, ACC 399, graduate level courses of 748, 749, and 769, etc. These are not always full-time for tuition purposes, however they enable students to be retained in the system as active enrollments & remain eligible for loan deferment, health insurance, financial aid, etc. See SIS table UXTUX201 for courses having less than full time credit hours but count as full time enrollment.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <p>(1) Inherent in the acceptance of the full time student definition as noted, a part-time student is defined as enrolling in fewer hours than the minimum full-time hours or an absence of enrollment in other courses that meet the full-time condition.</p>
7/24/02	Definitions of various activity types, i.e. laboratory, discussion, seminar, etc. are not clear and consistently used across colleges. There are labs for physics, computer science, and engineering, but each mean something different. In some cases, it may be a team or group meeting. The current definitions do not address computer-assisted courses and others.	
Response: 26	<p>Background: A few years ago a slate of new codes were presented to the University Senate and no new definitions were approved. The list of codes made available for review follows however, only the definitions are provided relative to activity types on Screen 129 in SIS as they have been in effect for many years</p> <p>CLI: Clinical – A course in which the students are involved with direct treatment or observation of patients/clients. Includes all types of clinical courses: on-campus, off-campus elective and required.</p> <p>CON: Conjoint –</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <p>(1) The definitions as have been commonly used within SIS should be reviewed and revised by the various academic councils.</p> <p>(2) Consideration should be given to creating additional activity codes for: (a) online courses; (b) private instruction as in music; (c) computer assisted learning, and others that reflect changes in pedagogical approaches.</p> <p>(3) Courses should be coded as to the percent of each activity type contained within each</p>

<p>COP: Co-op –</p> <p>DIS: Discussion - A course that encourages interaction between students and faculty through oral and written communication about various aspects of a subject. Includes courses that might be designated as recitation.</p> <p>EXP: Experiential - An elective internship or cooperative education course where the student earns academic credit by working in business, agencies or other settings pertinent to their academic majors or career goals.</p> <p>HPR: Physical Education Performance – A physical education (HPR) course involving physical performance and activities.</p> <p>IND: Independent Study – An individualized course, in which the student proceeds independently in his or her study and meeting with a faculty member to report progress and to receive suggestions. Intended to provide students the opportunity to study materials not normally covered in a regular curriculum, or with a different range of subject matter not found in regular course offerings, or with material more advanced than that normally offered.</p> <p>LAB: Laboratory – A course designed for students to test, analyze or demonstrate the applicability of ideas, theories, techniques, and/or methods.</p> <p>LEC: Lecture – A course in which the principal method of teaching is a series of lectures.</p> <p>PRA: Practicum – A course designed to integrate classroom learning with experience emphasizing the practical applications of theory. Includes non-clinical internship and externship courses that are required; specifically includes student teaching.</p> <p>QUZ: Quiz –</p> <p>REC: Recitation –</p> <p>RES: Research – A course in which the principal student activity is to conduct independent research.</p> <p>RSD: Residency – A course offered exclusively to provide residence credit for a graduate or professional degree.</p> <p>SEM: Seminar – An intensive study and discussion of a selected topic(s) in small groups.</p> <p>STU: Studio – Normally associated with the visual and creative arts,</p>	<p>course.</p> <p>(4) Definitions should be adopted for codes that have been suggested but not approved.</p> <p>(5) Needed multiple changes programming changes should be made to overcome that is now a default “LEC” code.</p>
---	--

	requiring specialized facilities, beyond those of the normal classroom/lab, emphasizing individual development through expressive media.	
7/24/02	(Currently under review by Senate Council) Departments are given only two options, LEC or LAB, and asked to give the ratio between the two on the form used to create a new course. Usually the ratio is 2 contact hours to 1 hour LAB. Part of the problem is that departments are not given the categories they need to work with, and these offerings should be expanded to include Discussion, Team, Seminar, etc.	
Response: 27	Background: The current coding approach does not permit the institution to capture information regarding courses employing multi-methods or activities. This information would appear to be important if capacity planning were to be implemented to support changes in instructional approaches. For example the increased use of web-based instruction as part of the course is not currently tracked. This and other technology applications have implications for developing and scheduling “smart classrooms,” acquiring and using course management system software, etc. Also see Response # 26.	Recommendation(s): (1) New Course and Course Change Forms should facilitate identification of the various types of activities designed into the course on a percentage basis. (2) There needs to be adjustments for reporting purposes since codes are used to create rations and in turn hours that are reported on an hourly basis to CPE.
7/24/02	How should courses taught off-campus or in leased facilities be handled in institutional reporting? Patrick indicated that they have received mixed messages from CPE in the past. For instance, a building owned by Morehead State University, but we use it for scheduling a course.	
Response: 28	Background: The SIS system does not know whether a facility is leased or not at the time the room is built into the schedule. It must be remembered that the room file in SIS is designed to provide the student with information on where their class is meeting. It was never intended for other types of reporting. SIS can track off-campus offering by their section number.	Recommendation(s): (1) There needs to be articulation between the facilities reporting and SIS. It would appear that it is incumbent on the facilities reporting process to identify locations not in the UK inventory of facilities and track them separately for reporting to the CPE. (2) When a UK course is offered on another campus, the hosting campus should report the room as being utilized.
7/24/02	Recommend that the Chancellor Review of Activity Type be reactivated and put on a yearly schedule.	

<p>Response: 29</p>	<p>Background: This appears to be referring to a legacy approach for reviewing how instruction is being delivered. Since the purposes fulfilled by this review are unclear, the subcommittee is unable to speak specifically to the issue. It is the committee's understanding that a process of annual validation by deans or other senior administrators is not occurring.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s): (1) It is believed the review and revision of activity types (see Responses 26 and 27) should be accessible through a query to the system, and conducted annually.</p>
<p>7/24/02</p>	<p>Need to look at the room number standard to see if it needs revision. Jayna indicates that there could be one in existence but it is not followed or enforced. Facilities Management maintains the official record, but does not accommodate the Medical Center room numbers.</p>	
<p>Response: 30</p>	<p>Background: The subcommittee understands that other groups are also investigating this matter and defers to those findings at this time.</p>	<p>Recommendations: (1) Each room should have a uniquely identifying room number and building code that is understandable to students, faculty and others responsible for way finding, etc. (2) Users should be oriented to the new system of identification. (3) All campus maps, and other publications should be required to use only the agreed upon coding to maintain consistency. (4) Many conference rooms are used more for instruction, particularly seminars, than for meetings and should be coded as instructional space.</p>
<p>7/24/02</p>	<p>Meeting patterns in Schedule 25 for Medical Center courses are not the same in SIS.</p>	
<p>Response: 31</p>	<p>Background: The Medical Center lists blocks of instruction as separate events in Event 25 since block instruction is not predictable from semester to semester and year to year.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s): (1) Reports should be written out of Event25 to get this information – this is where it is stored.</p>
<p>7/24/02</p>	<p>Need to examine setting a standard on how instructors, percent, and activity type are assigned to sections. Getting departments to correctly label Activity Type on courses and meeting patterns.</p>	

Response: 32	Background: The issue of percent of faculty effort related to a course or instruction is a matter for the Provost and Deans to address. It seems that before activity type listing per course can be improved, a review and clean up of the activity types needs to occur, as well as additional activity codes adopted. There will also need to a removal of default codes that seem to only reflect LEC or LAB. Then it becomes a matter of monitoring the system at the departmental and college levels and developing the habit of entering the correct percentages for activities.	Recommendation(s): (1) Define activity types and add new ones as appropriate. (2) Remove the default coding of LEC & LAB so that the actual activity is consciously identified and entered. (3) The relationship between activity type and percent of faculty effort should be referred to the Provost and Deans for resolution. (4) Monitor the accuracy of code entry at the departmental and college level.
7/31/02	Is there an official University Rule on how instructor percentages are assigned?	
Response: 33	Background: According to AR II-1.0-1, Page XVI-2: the standard for teaching only refers to working assignments for regular-title appointment faculty members is twelve undergraduate credit hours per semester, or the equivalent effort in teaching-related responsibilities. The workload standard for research- or service-only assignments would be equivalent in time and effort to the teaching-only assignment. Most University System faculty members will not have such singular focus assignments but will divide their time among teaching, research, and service responsibilities. Specific guidelines for determining credit hour workload equivalents should be developed at the educational unit level and should recognize the variability of teaching assignments, such as class size and level; research involvement; and service responsibilities. Given the AR statements, there is no "University Rule" for assignment.	Recommendation(s): (1) Some more specific guidelines should be adopted that would contribute to greater standardization across campus.
8/7/02	What are the definitions for student contact hours, faculty contact hours, credit hours, and percent effort? (Should we go with the definitions in "Contact Hours Definitions, Procedures and Reporting Guidelines" developed by the Contact Hours task Force in 1994 and 1995?	
Response: 34	Background: Task Force 1994/1995 Definition: "Contact Hours (SB109): The number of hours per week spent by faculty in the conduct of formally scheduled courses, laboratories, and other educational activities as listed on the semester course schedule of the	Recommendation(s): (1) Accept the Task Force Report on Credit hour and Contact hour delineation. (2) Refer to the Provosts and Deans the issue

	<p>institution. In many cases, contact hours are equivalent to the credit hours available from the course. In other cases, the formally scheduled contact hours may be greater than the credit hours. An example occurs when a science course meets weekly for three hours of lecture and two hours of laboratory experience. While such a course might grant four credit hours, it constitutes five contact hours.”</p> <p>As mentioned previously in this report, equating faculty percentage of effort to credit hour and contact hours is a matter for the Provosts and Deans to address.</p>	<p>of equating these concepts to a standardized approach to calculating faculty percent of effort.</p>
8/7/02	Need to examine the current and proposed activity type codes and definitions, and their relationships to specific delivery modes, and ratios for calculation of credit and contact hours.	
Response: 35	Background: The committee agrees. See Responses 26 and 27.	Recommendation(s):
8/7/02	How do we define full-time and part-time enrollment status? Should it always be what we report to the Clearing House and/or the CPE and/or INS?	
Response: 36	Background: Full and part time student definitions are provided in Response 25. As discussed in Responses 39 and 40, the issue emerges when you cover the variability of part-time students to full-time equivalency. The capacity should exist to aggregate actual part-time credit hours so as to divide them by 9 or 12 depending on graduate or undergraduate status. It is recognized that there may be advantages to using a “cruder” estimate where three part-time students are deemed the equivalent of one full time student, particularly when funding is involved. The committee believes one formula would be beneficial and used for all purposes, but it is recognized that such an approach might have financial consequences.	Recommendation(s): (1) <i>Full-time students</i> are undergraduate students enrolled for 12 or more credit hours per semester and graduate students enrolled for 9 or more credit hours per semester. This definition is adhered to when enrollment data is reported to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). (Source: National Center for Education Statistics)
8/8/02	The faculty data is not kept current in HRS, so we need to at least increase the frequency of the uploads of the faculty data and/or require the Provost’s departments not using the MC Faculty Database to enter the data directly into HRS on a timely basis.	

<p>Response: 37</p>	<p>Background: This will be a significant change that needs to be discussed with Connie Ray, as Gary Lindale's office currently receives the paper documentation and does the subsequent data entry of the information for this group. (Connie Ray has a committee working on the issues concerning collection of faculty data).</p>	<p>Recommendation(s): (1) Ideally, faculty data entry should be at one point and all related data changes without additional entries.</p>
<p>8/23/02</p>	<p>How do we handle SIS departments, courses, majors, degrees, etc. shared between two or more FRS/HRS/FES department numbers? If there is a percent allocation for the faculty, do we use their prime department in HRS? Do we need to build a cross-reference table for the CMDM that identifies all of the "jointly" owned departments, courses, etc. and how should their course enrollment counts, etc. be made for summary reports? (Meeting with Lu Wang on College Profile Report).</p>	
<p>Response: 38</p>	<p>Background: In SIS, a degree program, course and major can only belong to one department. When courses are cross-listed to more than one department, they appear separately under in each department in the schedule book; however, it does not facilitate the tracking of which department(s) is actually providing the instruction.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s): (1) Only one department should be sufficient. (2) Consideration should be given to tracking faculty efforts by SS# or Faculty ID. Course numbers and department identifiers may obscure which faculty member in a particular department is actually providing the instruction.</p>
<p>8/23/02</p>	<p>What business rules are we going to use to calculate the statistics fore the College Profile Report and/or the CMDM? Do we defer to CPE, IPEDS, other? (Meeting with Lu Wang on College Profile Report).</p>	
<p>Response: 39</p>	<p>Background: This is not a matter of choice. We have to respond to multiple surveys using differing formulas. For example, the formulas to calculate the faculty and student FTEs for IPEDS, CPE and Budget Office differ.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s): (1) The Data Mart should calculate the values for each of these statistics based on each of the formulas, and the metadata should clearly define the difference between the calculated fields for users (2) University administrators should decide which of these statistics should be used for internal reporting.</p>
<p>8/23/02</p>	<p>What meeting pattern types do we want to calculate statistics on (i.e. MWF, TR, etc.)? (Meeting with Lu Wang on College Profile Report).</p>	

Response: 40	Background: In the past, staff have been asked to generate reports on the number of courses, contact hours and credit hours for courses with a MWF and TR meeting pattern. There are other meeting patterns for which statistics should be calculated, e.g. one class session/week of 150 minutes; extended weekend classes, etc. Not to look at other meeting patterns is to miss considerable data. There are as many different patterns as one can imagine.	Recommendation(s): (1) Data are various meeting patterns should be collected and analyzed to determine optimal times for students and to ensure a complete College Profile Report.
8/23/02	How do we calculate what is/is not a standard meeting pattern? (Meeting with Lu Wang on College Profile Report).	
Response: 41	Background: The standard meeting pattern is MWF for 50 minutes beginning on the hour or TR for 75 minutes beginning on the hour or half hour. Every meeting time not in this metric is non-standard.	Recommendation(s): (1) See Response 40.
8/23/02	How do we calculate contact hours for standard/non-standard meeting patterns? (Meeting with Lu Wang on College Profile Report).	
Response: 42	Background: Contact hours are related to credit hours and activity type, not meeting pattern.	Recommendation(s): (1) None
8/23/02	How much time do we “pad” between classes to calculate “hours of usage” for the room, for both standard and non-standard meeting patterns? (Meeting with Lu Wang on College Profile Report).	
Response: 43	Background: A MWF class of 50 minutes is “padded” an additional 10 minutes for students to enter and exit the room. A TR class of 75 minutes is “padded” 15 for students to enter and exit the room. There is no consistency in “padding” non-standard meeting patters.	Recommendation(s): (1) A minimum of 10 minutes should be added to non-standard meeting patterns for student entrance and regress.
8/29/02	Define “room conditions” for classrooms. 4-point scale used previously. Waiting on Excel spreadsheet of previous report (Higdon).	

<p>Response: 44</p>	<p>Background: This query and the next are related. It is assumed that this particular item refers to the physical condition of the room in terms of health and safety issues, general appearance, climate control, functionality, condition of furniture, etc. Currently, a four-point scale is used in the Facilities Report: “New, Good, Fair and Poor.” It is been suggested that “Excellent” be used in place of “New” since it seems to assume new is equal to excellent and may not be. The more important question is what does each of the classifications mean. Excellent – Good – Fair- Poor-</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A committee or task force should be composed of faculty and staff members who can devise a criteria or definitions to the existing criteria that can be used to evaluate each room. Possible membership should include representation from room schedulers, faculty users, Facilities and Planning, AV technical support, etc. Members should evaluate the rooms independently and then compare evaluations to determine the extent of calibration or agreement that the criteria provides, and revise it accordingly so that the criteria can be applied reliably. (2) Room should be assessed once or twice a year by team who can ensure that corrective actions will be implemented. (3) Similarly, an office or academic support unit should be charged to develop criteria as above and conduct routine evaluation visits.
<p>9/11/01</p>	<p>Define calculations for faculty and student (graduate and undergraduate) FTE.</p>	
<p>Response: 45</p>	<p>Background: The requesting authority defines the calculations. It should be anticipated that they would vary from agency to agency. For example, the formulas to calculate the faculty and student FTEs for IPEDS, CPE and Budget Office differ.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) See Response 39.
<p>9/11/01</p>	<p>Define room conditions, equipment conditions, room classifications and equipment classifications.</p>	
<p>Response: 46</p>	<p>Background: This expands on the previous one. Since equipment should be replaced on a three-year cycle, it could be assumed that the equipment is good. However, the committee cannot speak to the condition of labs and other non-lecture rooms. Equipment classification is already addressed if the smart classroom classifications are adopted (See Response 2).</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Room and technology assessment, planned renovation and systematic upgrades of equipment should be embedded in the academic support process.

		<p>process.</p> <p>(2) A “SWAT” team should be available to make on the spot repairs and replace bulbs, etc.</p>
9/11/01	Define regular full-time faculty (instruction, research, etc.)	
Response: 47	<p>Background: According to AR II-1.0-1, Page XVI-2: the standard for teaching only refers to working assignments for regular-title appointment faculty members is twelve undergraduate credit hours per semester, or the equivalent effort in teaching-related responsibilities. The workload standard for research- or service-only assignments would be equivalent in time and effort to the teaching-only assignment. Most University System faculty members will not have such singular focus assignments but will divide their time among teaching, research, and service responsibilities. Specific guidelines for determining credit hour workload equivalents should be developed at the educational unit level and should recognize the variability of teaching assignments, such as class size and level; research involvement; and service responsibilities.</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <p>(1) A full time faculty member is one who has a full time appointment in one of the title series tracks, i.e., regular, special, extension, research, or library series – there may be a few more – and is salaried through a position that receives recurring funding. Full time Lecturers teaching under a multi-year contract could also be counted as full time and when computing student faculty ratios, but they are not tenure track. Full time temporary positions are also used but they are not considered regular.</p>
9/11/01	Define enrollment.	
Response: 48	<p>Background:</p>	<p>Recommendation(s):</p> <p>(1) Enrollment is registration into one or more courses at the University; one who matriculates.</p>