MINUTES
MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT PEMBROKE

TUESDAY, October 14, 2014 @ 3:30 P.M.
Livermore Library – Room 212

Robert Arndt, ARTS (Chair)          Nancy Crouch, AVC for Technology Resources and Chief Information Officer
Marian Wooten, EDUC                Susan Whitt, Interim Dean Library Services
Robin Snead LETT                   Nicolette Campos, Accessibility Resource Center
Rita Hagevik, NS&M                 TBA, SGA Senator
Melanie Hoy, S&BS                  Bessie Barnes, Graduate Student
Jesse Rouse, at-large (secretary)  
Laura Staal, at-large              
Melissa Schaub, AVC Enrollment    

In attendance: 
Robert Arndt, ARTS (Chair) 
Robin Snead, LETT 
Rita Hagevik, NS&M 
Melanie Hoy, S&BS 
Jesse Rouse, at-large (Secretary) 
Laura Staal, at-large 
Melissa Schaub, AVC Enrollment 
Nancy Crouch, AVC Technology Resources 
Susan Whitt, Interim Dean Library Services 
Nicolette Campos, Accessibility Resource Center 
Bessie Barnes, Graduate Student 
Jim Kessler

Members not present: 
Marian Wooten, EDUC 
TBA, SGA Senator

1. Meeting called to order at 3:30PM
2. Minutes of the September 9, 2014 meeting approved
3. Agenda for October 14, 2014 meeting approved
4. Reports 
   a) Enrollment (Writing Center/Academic Support Center) (Appendix A)
   b) Mary Livermore Library (Appendix B)
   c) Division of Information Technology (Appendix C)
d) Accessibility Resource Center (Appendix D)

5. Old Business
   a) No old business

6. New Business
   a) Jim Kessler, ADA Coordinator
      i. Brought attention to the TEACH Act currently in the House which will likely impact the use of technologies. The focus of the information presented was on the potential to get ahead of any legislation by creating voluntary guidelines for UNCP.
      ii. Relevant documents
          1. AHEAD email (Appendix E)
          2. Accessible Instructional Materials document
          3. House Bill 3505 (TEACH Act)
      iii. Questions included:
           1. Whether there is likely to be a UNC system level response.
           2. What the timeline for implementation might be.
              a. Probably three years.

7. Announcements
   a) No announcements

8. With no further business, meeting adjourned at 4:19pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jesse Rouse, 10/21/2014

Appendix A

Academic Support Center
October 8, 2014

Tutoring Program

Currently there are 33 tutors who can tutor 107 courses from 17 academic departments. The tutoring staff consists of 32 peer tutors, 1 volunteer peer tutor, 1 volunteer staff tutor, and 1 professional tutor (graduate student).

- 254 unique students were scheduled for tutoring as of 10/2/14.
- 211 unique students attended tutoring between 8/25/14 and 10/2/14 and 10 did not show.
- 66 of those students (27.0%) are attending tutoring for MAT 1070 – College Algebra.
- Breakdown by major - Pre-Nursing 19.3%; Biology 14.6%; Chemistry 12.5%; Undecided 8.2%; Computer Science 6.9%; Business 6.2%; all other majors under 5%.
Breakdown by class - Freshmen 115; Sophomores 42; Juniors 34; Seniors 19; Graduate 1.
Breakdown by gender – 159 female (77.6%); 52 male (22.3%).
Breakdown by ethnicity – Black/African American 113 (49.4%); White/Caucasian 55 (29.5%); American Indian/Alaskan Native 23 (10.5%); Other/Not Disclosed 19 (9.0%); Asian 1 (1.5%).
Attendance data: Of the 779 appointments scheduled between these dates - 532 hours attended, 148 hours missed/no show, 71 excused absences, and 28 cancelled/rescheduled by tutors.
As of October 3, there are 60 unfulfilled tutoring requests – either no tutor is available or the student cannot attend when a tutor is available.
Scheduled tutoring appointments for students who submitted the online request form. Of the 293 requests received and processed:
  o 197 have been scheduled for an appointment
  o 14 have been contacted for more information
  o 60 have no tutor available
  o 10 were referred to attend SI sessions
  o 4 were referred to the Writing Center
  o 5 dropped the course
  o 3 cancelled the request before it was scheduled
101 tutoring request forms have not yet been processed.

Academic Resource Mentoring/Probation & Suspension/Appeals

328 students being recruited based on academic standing data
  • 225 students enrolled in mentoring  (199 face to face/26 online)
    o 170 are students who already have success contracts
    o 49 are students who did not have success contracts
    o 6 are students who are on good standing and enrolled on their own
  • 103 students not enrolled in mentoring
    o 66 students who have success contracts that have not enrolled in the program
    o 30 students who are not contracted who have not enrolled in the program
    o 7 opted out of participation following discussion with coordinator (decided mentoring was not the best option for their needs)

Supplemental Instruction

  • 30 total SI courses (82 sections) spanning across 13 academic disciplines
  • 440 students (871.81 hours, 840 visits) have attended SI sessions as of 10/2/14
    o Classification Breakdown
      ▪ Freshman - 255 students /490 visits/ 511.11 hours
      ▪ Sophomore - 111 students/226 Visits/ 233 hours
      ▪ Junior - 39 students/ 66 Visits/ 68.5 hours
      ▪ Senior - 35 Students/ 58 Visits/ 59.2 Hours
    o Major Breakdown
      ▪ PREN—88 Students/ 176 Visits/ 182.7 Hours
      ▪ BIO---62 Students/ 119 Visits/ 125 Hours
      ▪ UND—39 Students/ 73 Visits/ 74.2 Hours
      ▪ CHM—37 Students/ 83 Visits/ 87.5 Hours
      ▪ BUS—31 Students/ 66 Visits/ 63.7 Hours
      ▪ CRJ—23 Students/ 33 Visits/ 33.2 Hours
Test Performance and Class Attendance continue to dominate student performance issues, resulting in high Tutoring Recommendations. Faculty are also using Current Grade to help better understand student performance. We currently have one open Intervention Referral. We are currently training 4 temporary employees: Two from the Social Work Department and two from Accessibility Resource Center. We are currently targeting the completion of their training at the end of Fall Break.
**KUDOS**
148 referrals, 62 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons:</th>
<th>Referrals</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Score on Exam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A on Test</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Quiz Performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors List</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's List</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Participation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Lab Results</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect Attendance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary Student</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Team Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Project Completion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently has a course grade of B or higher</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits completed satisfactory assignment/homework in a timely manner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiz/Test performance meets a satisfactory level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively participates in class discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect attendance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory writing skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a good understanding of concepts introduced in class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts or submits BlackBoard or online assignments in a timely manner</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intervention Referral**
1 referrals, 1 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons: Referrals Students</th>
<th>Recommendations: Referrals Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*As of 10/6/2014*

**Resource Learning Lab**

As of 10/6/14, 208 students have signed into to use the Resource Learning Lab. International Programs will begin to use the RLL for their students after midterm grades have posted. Currently researching Merit as an online student software for open access to students via BraveWeb.

University Writing Center Report
Submitted by Dr. Teagan Decker, Director of the University Writing Center
October 2014
Time period: September-October 2014
Activities and Projects

- Tutoring students
- Speaking to classes about the Writing Center
- Training two new tutors.
- Offering workshops about effective use of sources (MLA format—APA coming next). Workshops were held October 8th and 9th.
- Preparing for presentation at the International Writing Center Association conference on Nov. 1.

Usage Information

- 398 total tutorial sessions
- 217 unique clients
- 99 online writing tutorials
- 60% of unique clients visited one time
- 40% of unique clients visited more than one time.

Student Survey Response (27 responses)

- Did a great job!
- Did not help at all
- [The tutor] was very patient with me. I was having trouble with my computer, and she reached out to me through email until we found a solution to my problem. She also provided me with help with organizing my paper. I feel confident about starting my paper now.
• I am able to mark strongly agree toward the staff since it was done online. The error is on my part. The session would have been more beneficial if I had made an appointment to meet with [the tutor] in person. I will not make the error again. [The tutor] was very helpful during my session with her.

• I didn’t get a chance to catch her name but, mine is James Jones. So whoever helped me thank you and I will be back.

• I felt that the online version of this wouldn't be as helpful as if I would have went to the actual writing center on be much more helpful. I found the online version of this to be very helpful, but feel that it would’ve have been more engaging had I actually have went to the center.

• I worked with [the tutor] on Sunday and followed up again with her on Tuesday to go over the recommended changes. This is my first semester in the MPA program and the first time I've had to write a paper in 18 years. The writing center has provided a huge comfort to me. Thank you!!!!

• She was great to work with!
• Thanks so much:)

• The tutor is very helpful. She honestly told me what needs to be done in order for my paper to be great.

• Whoever created this program is a genius. It really helps. I visit all the time. At first my pride kept me from getting the help that i needed. But now, I am happy I visited.

Fall 2014 Staff

• Janae Aiken, Undergraduate Tutor (English Education)
• Haley Bean, Undergraduate Tutor (Social Work)
• Teagan Decker, Director (English)
• Mari DeRuntz, Undergraduate Tutor (English Education)
• Kelli Jacobs, Undergraduate Tutor (English Education)
• Zachary Lunn, Undergraduate Tutor (Biology)
• Cheron McMullen, Undergraduate Tutor (Criminal Justice)
• Kenley Patanella, Undergraduate Tutor (Biology)
• Meghan Taylor, Undergraduate Tutor (English Education)
• Heather Wade, Undergraduate Tutor (English)
Appendix B

Mary Livermore Library
October 2014 Report
Academic Support Committee

We continued to see heavy use of the library for study and research during the month of September. This was a particularly demanding month for instruction classes and we are glad to be fully staffed in this area once again. We offered four sections of LIB 1000, due to the response of our initial offering of three sections in academic year 2013-2014. The Library held its annual liaison luncheon on September 25, during which time we discussed our materials budget and the process of purchasing for academic departments. We are very pleased with the turnout and appreciate the involvement of the faculty in our acquisitions processes.

We also focused on our institutional repository, BraveDocks. Publicity was sent out to the campus community about this resource and the benefits of putting their scholarly communication into this depository.

The library staff assisted in various campus events such as: providing research and writing information at the Graduate Research and Writing Academy; preparing and manning a table at Pembroke Day; staffing a table at the Social Justice Symposium; co-chairing the campus-wide State Employees Giving Campaign; and participating in the Social Justice Advocacy training.

Library Reference Stats:
Directional 635
Technical 40
Instructional 28
Research 372
Accounts 5
Distance Education 34
Federal/State Documents 3

Instructional Statistics:
60 Classes
1,034 Students

Monthly Attendance:
18,662
Division of Information Technology

Academic Support Services Subcommittee Report for September 2014

Division Level:

Preliminary goals for this year are drafted. These focus on organizational effectiveness, operational efficiency and key campus initiatives. Hiring for key open positions is underway. Core competencies for DoIT staff are identified and professional development planning is underway. The projected key initiatives DoIT plans to undertake with our campus colleagues include the initiation of a paperless initiative, an upgrade or replacement of faculty/staff email, and the planning of a campus client computing initiative including the refresh of faculty, staff and laboratory computers. Planning is underway to identify current work underway and ensure future success in planning and implementing projects on behalf of our campus.

Departmental Summaries:

Educational and Client Technologies (Cindy Saylor)

- 1355 Work Orders were completed for the month of September
  - 391 of these Work Orders (28%) were completed by members of our student work programs, demonstrating their value to ongoing operations.
- Support for the Board of Trustees meeting was provided
- Media Services supported Pembroke Day.
- Using repurposed computers, the student computers for ROTC were upgraded.
- Training Provided
  - Wanda Hunt provided a campus technology presentation for the Transfer Seminar class.

Networking and System Administration (Kevin Pait)

- Network Refresh Project
  - Migrated 25% of data center systems onto new Nexus environment
  - Planned migration completion is October 31st.
- Health Sciences Data Center Migration
  - Migration of systems scheduled to be complete by January 15, 2015.
- McAfee Email Gateway Upgrade
  - Upgraded two appliances to the latest version and began filtering outbound mail in response to compromised network accounts.
  - Currently dealing with increased Phishing attempts.
  - Experienced several compromised accounts used to send outbound Spam in September.
- Virtual Server Environment Upgrade Project
Upgrading the 16 host servers that provide the hardware platform for 150+ virtual servers.

Enterprise Applications (Jim Sharp)
- Preliminary review of the T&E module underway with DoIT and the Controller’s Office
- Completed the development of “draft” versions of 3 Project Charters for the Financial Aid Office
  - USR#744 – Financial Aid Self-Service Review
  - USR#742 – Financial Aid Repeat Course Compliance
  - USR#743 – Financial Aid Federal Shopping Sheet
- Setup security structure and user access for Registrar’s Office for custom application in BDM Test.
- Performed Mandatory upgrades for both the Registrar and Financial Aid offices with test packets sent to users for review.
- Testing continues for migration to GA hosting of Banner
- Charter complete for Flex-Banner Interface Project
- Configuration complete for Active Directory authentication and authorization for the Enterprise Applications instance of DocuWiki
- Online Giving Mobile Friendly Form moved from Test to Production

UNCP Virtual Computing Lab Statistics
- During the time period of this report, a total of 120 reservations were made by 26 unique users.
- The most popular applications accessed were MS Office 2010, SPSS and Adobe PhotoShop Elements.

Appendix D

Accessibility Resource Center
Academic Support Services Subcommittee Meeting
October 14th, 2014

September statistics from Titanium database:
- 24 Intake appointments
- 21 accommodations appointments
- Proctored 66 exams for 34 Students with disabilities
- 40 consultations with professors
- Provided 140.75 hours of interpreting services (American Sign Language)
- 2,518 pages converted to alternate format

From our hash mark sheet (numbers are not in Titanium, because they did not require a case note)
243 phone calls
121 Note takers
112 Walk-ins

Other activities:
Was available for informal discussions with faculty regarding accessibility issues: September 10th, 18th and 30th. No faculty attended.

Upcoming dates: October 15th, 23rd, and 28th in UC Annex room 203 at noon
Reviewed 85 applications for Administrative Assistant position
Trained 3 Graduate Assistants in the School of Social Work
Preparing for VSA event on October 22nd for over 1,200 PSRC children with disabilities plus (approximately) 200 volunteers.
Co-coordinate Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) with Career Services. This is a Federal program designed for students with disabilities to apply for internships which may result in full-time employment. Recruiters interview by telephone in November.
Worked with student volunteer from Department of Social Work

_________________________________________________________

Appendix E

Subject: Fwd: AHEAD Responds to Opposition to the Proposed TEACH Act Legislation

Begin forwarded message:

From: AHEAD <ahead@ahead.org>

September 19, 2014

Good Friday to You!

As many of you may be aware, there has recently been much debate about the proposed TEACH Act and how it relates to the adoption and use of Electronic and Information Technology by institutions of higher education. AHEAD has created the following letter in response to some widely circulated opposition to the proposed legislation. The letter, created by the AHEAD Board of Directors, is intended to dispel
misunderstanding of the TEACH Act, it's intentions, and why AHEAD supports the legislation. This letter can be located on AHEAD's website for additional review by visiting:
http://ahead.org/teach_act_clarification_letter. Links to the articles and opinions recently expressed are available below.

Inside Higher Ed Article

Boston Globe Article

Nonprofit Quarterly

The proposed Bill

AHEAD's Letter

The TEACH Act - A need for clarification

Regarding the Opposition to the proposed TEACH Act Legislation

Recently there has been much debate about the proposed TEACH Act and the opposition to it being circulated. As the landscape in higher education has evolved, and most educational opportunities now require interactions with electronic and information technology (EIT), institutions have been left without an effective structure for taking access for all into account. Currently, institutions have only lawsuits and enforcement actions to guide them; the point of the TEACH Act is to pave the way for consistent national guidance in this arena. The Association on Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD) supports the proposed legislation and seeks to clarify a few points.

First, it is important to remember that the TEACH Act comes directly from a recommendation made in the Accessible Instructional Materials (AIM) Commission Report, and second to remember that the AIM Commission was authorized within the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) of 2008 and had representation of AHEAD as well as additional representation from both two-year and four-year colleges, among many stakeholders representing advocacy groups, service providers, and publishers.

In addition, it is helpful to take a close look at the TEACH Act language itself, and compare it to the arguments being raised in articles such as the recent "Good Intentions, Bad Legislation" published by Inside Higher Education. While there are several arguments that were raised within the opinion piece that warrant a closer look, one particular statement claimed:

"Rather than simply providing helpful, voluntary guidelines, the TEACH Act would effectively require colleges to only use technologies that meet guidelines created by a federal agency, or risk being sued."

In reality, voluntary guidelines are precisely what the legislation would authorize the Access Board to establish. While it is conceivable that a federal agency could choose to adopt those guidelines at some point in the future, which would potentially lead to the adoption of standards, this legislation itself is simply outlining a means for guidelines to be established. Guidelines would not require institutions to adopt or not adopt any given technology; they would, however, serve as navigational structures that institutions could use to chart their course.
The bigger point, though, is that Colleges and Universities are already required to honor the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended in 2008 (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504), as well as any relevant state or local statutes. This responsibility is already established, but as court case after compliance review after investigation has proved, institutions are struggling to meet the existing obligations. This legislation does not add new responsibilities or any additional burden, undue or otherwise, to educational institutions, but could, by establishing a common baseline for due diligence, help alleviate some of the existing burden.

In addition, having recognized guidelines allows the commercial publishers, software developers, and others who produce for the educational market to create products that will assist their customers in meeting their current obligations under the law. The TEACH ACT would not change the existing requirements surrounding the adoption of technology, but it would provide guidance for both the producers and consumers of educational products.

Under both the ADA and Section 504, colleges and universities are required to provide equally effective access to students with disabilities. Currently, campuses struggle to meet this obligation when it comes to technology. We know that the individual accommodation process is not an effective way to ensure equal access in regard to information and communication technology related barriers. This legislation expressly allows the individual accommodation process to be utilized where appropriate, and would offer institutions a more effective framework within which to operate to better ensure efficient, proactive accessibility rather than second-class service to some of their students. Currently, most institutions can only "accommodate" inaccessible technology with patches, workarounds, and other local ad hoc approaches that result in not only unequal and less effective access, but are also unsustainable.

The point of the Teach Act, we believe, is to end after-the-fact decision-making processes in how to accommodate technology. The point is not to force certain choices upon the institutions but to ensure that the needs of individuals with disabilities are seriously considered and taken into account at the right point in the acquisition process.

The American people long ago concluded that "separate but equal" was inappropriate treatment of a portion of the population in our country; why do we think it is acceptable now? We support consistency in practices with technology across all college and university campuses to ensure all students with disabilities are afforded the same opportunities as other students. Continuing to operate without national guidelines would not ensure equal access.

Resources


AIM Commission Report: http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/aim/publications.html

"Kindle Letter": http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-20100629.html