RAC minutes

January 7, 2011

Present: Bonnie Anderson, Maureen Andrew, Rockne Bergman, Rhonda Bjorklund, Frank Blalark, Sheryl Bolstad, Danielle Bordeleau, Brad Bostrom, Angela Bowlus, Amy Brewster, Courtney Carlson, Steve Carnes, Agnes Chagani, Kelly Condit Shrestha, Pam Cook, Gary Cooper, Jane Delehanty, Dan Delaney, Molly Diethelm, Tina Falkner, Kate Gallagher, Santiago Fernandez-Gimenez, Tracy Fischer, Carol Francis, Jennifer Franko, Wendy Friedmeyer, Teresa Fruen, Bill Ganzlin, Laurie Gardner, Kit Gordon, Stacey Grimes, Amanda Grimm, Amy Gunter, Ann Hagen, Kevin Havard, Jeremy Hernandez, Kim Hindbjorgen, Jason Holscher, Lisa Hubinger, Barb Jensen, Jill Johnson, Sue Johnson, Nancy Killian, Char Klarquist, Jennifer Koontz, Nathan Kopka, Mary Koskan, Sarah Kussow, Linda Lindholm, Aileen Lively, Jo Ellen Lundblad, Gayla Marty, Margo Mueller, Kathy Murphy, Nan Nelson, Mary Ellen Nerney, Anya Norton, Ingrid Nuttall, Matt Nuttall, Laurie Pape Hedley, Cathy Parlin, Cindy Pavlowski, Heather Peterson, Barbara Pilling, Sarah Ihrig, Ann Rausch, Lonna Riedinger, Genny Rosing, Cindy Salyers, Jody Seiler-Peterson, Mary Ellen Shaw, Deanne Silvera, Karen Starry, Nathan Tesch, Georganne Tolaos, Terri Tuzinski, Fran VanSlyke-Zaslofsky, John Vollum, Kathy Walter, Emily Wood, Stephanie Wiesneski, Kris Wright

Undergraduate education

Announcements

Sue Van Voorhis announced that there will be an ImageNow upgrade in March.

Tina Falkner asked the members of the group who work in college advising officers whether or not they supplied physical handouts that outline degree requirements. She also asked if such a handout was available, do the requirements match the information on collegiate websites and/or the catalog.

Laurie Gardner said the information for CDES is provided on their website in the form on a PDF.

Sheryl Bolstad said the information for CCE is different than what's in the catalog but is the same as what is on the website.

Amy Gunter said CSE has the same information in a PDF on the web.

Molly Diethelm said mortuary science students receive information that is tailored to them, so it is similar as that provided on the web and in the catalog, but it is not identical.

Minutes

There were no changes to the December 2010 minutes.

GradUate Minnesota

Amanda Rondeau updated the group on a targeted effort from the University of Minnesota's Digital Campus and MnSCU to encourage degree completion for students with 90 or more credits who left higher education without finishing an undergraduate degree. The initiative involves a dual approach: partnering with colleges to identify and contact former students through targeted communication; and creating an awareness campaign that involves media and other external contacts.

Regarding outreach to former students, the Digital Campus worked with CFANS to target students directly. The criteria for which students would be contacted are as follows:

- Enrolled as degree-seeking undergraduate
- Attained a minimum of 30 credits at the University
- Left the University after having completed at least 90 credits
- Did not leave on academic suspension or probation
- Not listed on the national registry as having completed a four-year degree elsewhere
- Student "stopped out" between 2003-2005

Because the students stopped attending a number of years ago, it was hard to find good contact information from them. A few student contacts were made after about 30 contacts total. The process will be continually refined as more colleges are targeted and deans contacted.

Regarding the external awareness campaign, MnSCU received a grant from the Lumina Foundation to raise awareness in the general public about options for completing an undergraduate degree. The University is partnering with MnSCU to send this message. Information is being shared between the Digital Campus and MNOnline call center staff. Collegiate staff and others might receive a contact from a former student who is interested in returning after hearing a message on the radio about GradUate. There is no way to systematically measure the effectiveness of the awareness campaign because of the diffuseness of the referrals, but colleges may receive calls.

Heather Peterson asked where students should be referred if they have heard about GradUate. If the student is interested in reenrolling, they should contact their college. If they don't know where to start, they should be referred to the Digital Campus.

Pam Cook asked if any students were contacted who had stopped out as a result of the closing of the General College; yes, this has happened.

Sheryl Bolstad noted that she did receive phone calls from students directly who had heard about GradUate and noted that the Digital Campus would not have been able to track that call back to their efforts.

Linda Lindholm asked to what extent these students are receiving information about how to receive financial support for returning to school; Amanda Rondeau answered that there is no specific financial support that accompanies GradUate. The student would need to file a FAFSA to see what aid options are possible.

IT projects update

Jody Seiler-Peterson provided the group an update on systems and technology projects.

Grade submission: Grade submission statistics for undergraduate courses improved for fall 2010 for the Twin Cities campus; over 96 percent of grades for undergraduates were turned in by the January 4 deadline. Submission statistics for all campuses were as follows:

> Twin Cities: 96.4%
>
> Crookston: 98.5%
>
> Morris: 97.7%
>
> Duluth: 97%

Scholarship Funds Management database: ASR continues to support the University Foundation in development of a database to summarize and store scholarship funds information, interfaces to keep the information current, and reports. The project team is planning to have these fully developed and available for departmental use later in the spring.

APLUS expansion: Tina Falkner informed the group that CSE went live with APLUS in December and everything seems to have gone very well. The project team is working with CEHD on their roll out, and will be meeting with CCE in February to do a demo of the system and figure out how to map it to their CRM. The team is also working on revising the comments guidelines to make them more broadly comprehensive of student services in general. A new programmer has been hired and will start working on the backlog of updates, including the Google API. Regarding the expansion to career services centers, CAPE and Bridge are currently in sandbox mode.

Data Governance Working Team: A Data Governance Working Team has been meeting since late November 2010 to create a working definition of data governance for the University, consider best practices, map roles and responsibilities, and create a communications roadmap/plan. The current working definition is, "Strengthen and formalize how the U of MN defines, produces, and uses data to make informed decisions." This is a small group, working with a consultant, which has been tasked with gathering feedback from their home departments on existing Data Governance practices and challenges. This feedback will support the proposed definition of Data Governance and its best practices. The work this team is doing will help inform the Business Intelligence project, which has a goal to facilitate data-driven decision-making.

Testing of PeopleTools 8.5: ASR-IT and other units around the University will be testing the new PeopleTools functionality between now and mid-March in preparation for the upgrade in mid-April. The Student Records Training and Support Team will provide documentation and resources on the web and also most likely will offer optional in-person and ITV demo sessions right around the time of the upgrade.

Pillar upgrade and redesign banners on applications: The remaining student-facing apps are still scheduled to be moved to the new Pillar system by the end of February; testing for Official Transcript is scheduled to begin in January and Education Abroad in early February.

Sue Van Voorhis noted that there are more credit balances being given this term, which suggests that more students are borrowing more money.

Degree Progress project

Sue Van Voorhis reminded the group that Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education Bob McMaster has formed a team to look at the feasibility of automatically graduating students when they have completed their degree requirements. That team's findings have been forwarded to Dean McMaster, and he has presented them to the associate deans; any future action will be shared at a future RAC meeting

Sue stated that she has also begun a project to ensure the systems ASR supports that inform degree progress contain the most accurate, in-sync information possible. The first step is to ensure that the information in APAS matches program degree requirements. ASR will be hiring students to do the comparison of the information between APAS and the information in PCAS. There will need to be a contact for each college that ASR can work with throughout the duration of this project.

Winter closure lessons learned

Tina Falkner opened the floor for discussion on lessons learned from the first University winter closure. Tina noted that it has been her impression that, overall, everything seemed to go well.

Sue Van Voorhis noted that in Coffey Hall, there was an issue with the mail not being delivered the last day the University was open prior to the closure (December 23). No other offices reported a similar issue with mail delivery.

Nathan Tesch stated that in Rochester, there was a lot less email and contact than was expected. Nathan received two messages that were important and needed a quick resolution, and felt it was good someone was monitoring emails and responding to issues.

Someone noted that just prior to the closure a lot of faculty were scrambling to get their VPN access set up. More information about how to do this and having this information pushed to the colleges would have been useful.

Amy Gunter noted that CSE had been clear with students that they would not be around to assist them, and students were okay with this. It was important to set the expectation up front. The real area of confusion seemed to be with staff regarding who was working and who was not.

Sheryl Bolstad noted that she had received a major concern from student about a possible suspension, with the student being concerned that she wouldn't get the notice until it was too late because of the late grades due date. Laurie Gardner agreed that this was the biggest concern in CDES. Sue Van Voorhis noted that the grading policy allows for three business days, which is why the due date had to be moved. Tina Falkner noted that perhaps the policy language should be reviewed again.

Almost everyone agreed that there were lots of emails and contact the first day back from the closure but staff were prepared for this.

Pam Cook stated that there had been an issue with data warehouse information not being loaded. There were a handful of tables that were not refreshed properly. Sue Van Voorhis said ASR would look into why this was the case.

It was noted that it should be stressed that upon returning from the closure, it is critical to promptly update email and phone away messages.

It was agreed that the pop-up message on the home page of the One Stop website was helpful and should be repeated in the future in the event of another winter closure.

Probation/suspension report

Tina Falkner referred to the report that was sent to the RAC listserv the week of January 3, which had also been sent to Dean McMaster regarding the findings of the probation/suspension process review committee. She noted that some of the recommendations in that report are dependent on OIT resources; she asked the group for their feedback on the recommendations.

Kit Gordon stated that CLA Honors was happy with the recommendations.

Pam Cook noted that in 543-49, it states that there are no procedures or forms associated with the process; she asked if colleges should submit information regarding the forms they use. Tina Falkner requested that this information be forwarded to her.

Molly Diethelm noted that in mortuary science, the department is looking into implementing SAP as part of its degree program policy and appreciated its reference in the recommendations.

Cindy Saylers noted that how SAP would be calculated is a difficult task if one wants to avoid disadvantaging the student. For example, calculating blank grades or grades that are not yet due would seem to be unfair. Cindy asked if it seemed reasonable to penalize the student if an instructor is late submitting his or her grades. Someone noted that this issue is more serious when considering suspension. Sue Van Voorhis noted that the University has to comply with federal guidelines for financial aid and those guidelines do not have special exceptions for grades that are not turned in on time. Students should work with their instructor if grades are late and probation or suspension is a possibility.

Tina Falkner asked the group specifically for their thoughts on the recommendations regarding summer term. Specifically, that a student should not be allowed to register for summer courses if it is mathematically impossible for the student to raise his or her GPA enough to avoid suspension. Amy Gunter noted that the way the policy is worded now works for CSE. It was noted that a standard regarding summer coursework would also help clarify the policy and process for international students. Tina Falkner noted that probation/suspension issues particular to international students could also be looked at more closely.

U Promise update

Kris Wright updated the group on significant changes to the U Promise Scholarship for 2011-12. A significant number of students have already been helped by this program; 12,000 students every year receive U Promise funds and over $30 million is spent assisting the neediest students.

Costs have been increasing and this has had an impact on the program. The ACG and SMART programs have figured into the calculation of U Promise and these funds will no longer be available. Tuition has continued to increase and the new higher education bill has broadened the Pell pool, thus increasing the number of students eligible for the U Promise program. There are also possible changes to the state grant program. All of these issues made it imperative that the U Promise program be reevaluated to ensure its stability and predictability so families can create better budgets and the University can continue to support the neediest students.

Moving forward, there will no longer be free tuition associated with U Promise. The following changes to the scholarship will apply for students:

- Award amounts for new incoming students will be based on their Expected Family Contribution (EFC) as determined by their Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), to ensure the neediest students receive the highest award amounts.

- New Minnesota resident undergraduates with a family income of up to $100,000 will receive a guaranteed, four-year U Promise scholarship ranging from $500 to $3500.

- New transfer students with a family income of up to $100,000 will receive a guaranteed, two-year U Promise Scholarship ranging from $500 to $1500.

- Current students receiving the U Promise Scholarship will receive as much or more from the University going forward, for the one to three years remaining in their U Promise eligibility. We will compare the amount they received for 2010-2011 under the former program rules with the amount that would result from the new program rules, and provide a guaranteed scholarship award at the greater of these amounts.

Communications will be sent to current students about the change to the program and a broader communication plan is in place for prospective students.

Emergency Contact update

Matt Nuttall updated the group on the emergency contact verification project. The goal of this project was to improve the accuracy of contact information for all students, staff, and faculty, as well as make the TXT-U option more broadly available. The contact verification page is live for every campus except Morris and is currently in front of the student account, unofficial transcript request, view grades, and the MyU Portal. As of the date of this meeting, more than 60,000 students have responded to the prompt to verify their information and about 43 percent of these have opted into TXT-U. 60 percent have actually updated their contact information. The next phase of this project is to put the page in front of more staff-facing applications, such as the pay

statement and benefits enrollment. Human Resources is taking the lead on that phase of the project.

Student-Athlete database demo

Matt Nuttall demonstrated a new student-athlete eligibility system ASR has developed and will launch for certifications beginning March 2010. This system will replace the paper-based process with a new online process. Advisers will now have an online queue to visit that includes those students who need certification. Due to a recent change in Big Ten rules, advisers no longer need to certify that student-athletes will be able to graduate in five years. However, it is still critical that advisers verify that the student's APAS information is accurate and work to correct any discrepancies.

Collegiate advisers who work with student-athletes will receive an email with a link to their queue of students that need review. The adviser should click on the name of each student to bring up a view of the student's APAS. After verifying the information is correct, the adviser will need to check a box indicating they have reviewed and verified the APAS. The APAS that advisers verify will be "frozen," so it is captured for compliance purposes. This system will integrate with the APLUS system, so advising comments from MAC and OTR staff will be visible.

Margo Muller asked how often this process will take place; Tracy Fischer replied that the process remains the same as it always had. The bulk of emails will show up just before spring break for fall certifications, but there will be a few in December. Advisers should only receive one request annually for each student. When the adviser views an APAS in this system, an APAS report is not being run behind the scenes. A batch APAS is run each night for student-athletes and that is the APAS that the adviser will see.

Scheduling update

Anya Norton and Sarah Kussow provided the group with an update from the scheduling unit in the Office of Classroom Management. Currently, there are only five course sections that don't have a classroom. Additional rooms will be added from Cooke Hall, but Akerman Hall classrooms are also being taken offline for work. The automated request (i.e. online form) for non-standard course sections has been completed and launched. The scheduling policy revisions will be brought before the Faculty Consultative Committee this spring.

Nate Meath in the scheduling unit has developed a scheduling budget calculator to assist departments with the transition to the new policy. The calculator is an interactive spreadsheet that provides a snapshot of how courses are distributed across the different meeting patters; there is a view available for both at both the departmental and collegiate level. Users can view a specific time block to see where or if a department or college is over the time budget for a

specific meeting pattern. This tool is currently available to department schedulers and was sent in a recent Scheduler's Update (i.e. scheduling bulletin).

Sue Van Voorhis stated that Classroom Management works with the colleges to find space and asked the group to help instructors understand the space limitations on campus. Sarah Kussow stated that the scheduling unit works to minimize mis-fits of courses to rooms and does work to accommodate special request; however, special requests will not be able to be accommodated this semester due to a significant staffing shortage.

Credit by special examination policy

Ingrid Nuttall provided an update on revisions to the revisions to the departmental examination for credit and proficiency policy and the nationally-recognized exams policy. There is still some discussion of a procedural nature regarding the review of nationally-recognized exams, but the revisions are almost complete. These policies will go before SCEP in the spring. Ingrid asked that coordinate campus representatives forward any related links for these policies to her so they can be included in the final drafts.

CRM project

Jody Seiler-Peterson provided an update regarding the Constituent Relationship Management project. There are four prongs to this project:

Vendor: RFPs have been evaluated and a single vendor is being recommended to the project sponsors. Once the vendor is selected, the contract specifics must be negotiated. Once the contract is final, the vendor will be announced.

Funding: The project team is currently analyzing potential funding models.

Governance: In early 2011, a governance committee will be established. This group will determine guidelines for use, access rights, and how to set up guidelines for use and access rights.

Implementation: The project team needs to determine which departments will be the first to use the CRM. There are a number of candidates, including One Stop Student Services, Admissions, some collegiate units, and the Office for Equity and Diversity. No decisions have been made at this point.

Mary Ellen Shaw asked if how APLUS is being considered as part of CRM; Tina Falkner replied that currently, the plan is for APLUS to be a component of the CRM strategy.

PeopleSoft 9.0 upgrade

Jody Seiler-Peterson provided an update on planning for the future upgrade to PeopleSoft 9.0. Andy Hill in OIT has been assigned as project manager for the upgrade project.
Two collaborative governance and planning committees have been formed to make decisions and provide direction for the project. The committees have put out a call, through an RFP, for help in analyzing what the University is going to do for the upgrade. This "analysis engagement"

will result in a specific plan for how we will implement the next version and what it will look like. This phase will not include development or implementation, which are separate, future phases of the upgrade. The planning committee is currently reviewing proposals and service offerings from 3 finalists. The goal is to try to select the vendor in the next 6 weeks. No date for the upgrade has been established. Sue Van Voorhis noted that version 9.0 offers some significant new features.

Graduate education transformation

Project plan update

Frank Blalark announced that two new business analysts have been hired to work on the process documentation for the graduate education project. Frank showed the group a document that categorizes the processes being reviewed into larger topics to make it easier to navigate. This information will be distributed to the group shortly so departments and colleges can plan efficiently for process distribution. The project team will be asking for contacts for each topic area in the college so specific information can be distributed to the right people.

John Vollum provided an executive summary of various topics related to the transformation.

Admissions: Colleges will continue to answer applicant inquiries and the Graduate School will answer general questions and refer students when appropriate. Apply Yourself is being modified and a pilot project is underway to create custom admissions acceptance and rejection letters. Graduate Admissions will continue to do credential evaluation and receive and image transcripts and college admission committees will continue applicant review. Graduate Admissions will monitor English language best practices and graduate programs will be free to set their own requirements. Graduate Admissions will no longer assist programs or applicants with appeals requests.

Student funding and support: Documentation of the tuition waiver process has begun for international and US Students, as well as the health care benefit procedures, graduate assistantships, and tuition benefits processes. Fellowship funding for 2011-12 has been determined. The ongoing process for fellowships is being discussed by the colleges and the Graduate School.

Orientation: Orientation and First-Year Programs (OFYP) is currently leading a stakeholder needs analysis for orientation. Changes to orientation procedures will be driven by this analysis and OFYP.

PCAS: A PCAS template form has been drafted and is being reviewed. The revised form will be used to capture graduate program information for the catalog. Colleges will be asked to make edits and additions to program information. PCAS assists with standardization of graduate, professional and certificate program proposals. Technical modifications to PCAS are scheduled for completion by March 31, 2011. Data entry of graduate program content will begin in April 2011. More information will be provided further in this meeting.

ECAS: The goal is to provide collegiate units with the ability to review and approve 8xxx-level courses--and select 5xxx-level courses in several interdisciplinary graduate programs. ASR will be documenting the approval processes for 8XXX-level courses and selected 5xxx-level courses and clarifying practices between now and fall 2011. Until ECAS is modified to remove the Graduate School, ASR will create a work-around to allow colleges to do the approval. ECAS technical modifications will be addressed in fall 2011 and ECAS data security and training will be completed December 2011.

Degree progress: Systems are being evaluated that can assist with degree progress tracking. Stakeholder requirements for degree progress tracking will be gathered. The documentation and analysis phases will likely go to late 2011 or early 2012.The initial analysis revealed that APAS likely does not meet everyone's needs, so more information about what is truly required is needed. Dean Henning Schroder and the Graduate School will also need to be engaged further in this analysis.

Placement and career advising: The Graduate School is clarifying how these activities will be funded. ASR will assist with keeping the student and graduate GoldPass can serve as a career resource system running as records are shifted. This activity will need to be done in coordination with the student record conversion by fall 2011.

Data management: Currently, there are 16 planned OIT projects related to data conversion that will take place between February and the end of June. Regarding the Portal, ownership of the admitted student view will remain with the Graduate School. Ownership of the enrolled student view is to be determined. A strategy for ownership and maintenance of college views will be needed and some work will need to be done on the affinity strings.

President's Emerging Leaders project

Gayla Marty provided the group with an update of a current project related to the graduate education transformation that involves the President's Emerging Leaders (PEL) program. Communications surrounding the Graduate School's restructuring has been challenging. The project team received an offer of help from the PEL program in the fall and identified communication as an area to focus on. A quick-response team was assigned to address the issue.

After some meetings and discussion (including a meeting with the college representatives for graduate education), a charter was drafted that lays out a plan for a stakeholder analysis with results to be available by March. The project sponsor is Henning Schroeder, vice provost and dean for graduate education. Before the winter break, Dean Schroeder sent an email message to the college deans, copied to their representatives for graduate education, introducing the PEL team and asking them to expect a request to be interviewed as part of the stakeholder analysis.

DGSs and DGS assistants are on the list of stakeholders to be sampled and interviewed or surveyed. Requests to be included in the analysis should be directed to the appropriate college graduate education representative. Questions should be directed to Gayla Marty or one of the following team members:

Erik Dussault, Eric Eklund, Jennifer Germain, Christina Petrsen, and Lisa Rogers.

Sue Van Voorhis asked for the group's assistance in keeping the deans updated with all the information presented at this meeting. There is a lot of information available both on the graduate education transition page as well as the student administrative processes project website.

Registration exceptions

Dan Delaney informed the group that the subcommittee working on registration exceptions continues to work on a form using the WorkflowGen software. Using this software will move the process from paper-based to online with all the appropriate routing. The subcommittee will be meeting with constituents to determine what processes currently exist. There may be changes to the process to ensure the final product works for everyone.

Mary Ellen Shaw asked if the product of this effort might be something that would work for other students; Dan noted this may be possible.

The goal is to have the appropriate process in place for fall 2011 registration, which means that a paper-based process may need to be an intermediate step to the online tool.

PCAS

Laurie Pape Hadley provided a further update on the expansion of PCAS to include graduate education. Requirements for the expansion have been submitted to OIT and ASR has begun discussions with that office. Requirements are being gathered for the catalog piece; the undergraduate process is being used as a model. Testing of the changes should be completed by early summer and the system will be used for 2011-13 catalog data entry. Laurie reminded the group that development and testing are always dependent on resource availability.

Catalog

Gayla Marty provided an update on the graduate catalog project. Meetings with college catalog coordinators have continued and there has been representation from every college, though some of the catalog coordinators are still being named. Gayla thanked those members of the group who had already participated. A toolkit for updating academic programs will be distributed in January. Shortly after the winter break, the coordinators should receive a listing of the programs that now reside in each college, which they will be updating during this process.

Before the break, Gayla sent a copy of the handouts from the meeting to serve as drafts to prompt discussion. Some of the final processes may vary greatly from the drafts.

Two roles have been identified that support this project: (1) college catalog coordinator, (2) college curriculum contact:

COLLEGE CATALOG COORDINATOR:
• Handles logistics of soliciting and tracking updates from departments and distributing to the curriculum contact as that person deems appropriate.
• Ensures that updates are completed by the appropriate deadline.
• Liaison with the UR catalog coordinator.

COLLEGE CURRICULUM CONTACT:
• Likely designated by the dean (may be an associate dean or college representative for graduate education).
• Reviews updates as appropriate, looks at degree program content, and responds to curriculum-related questions from programs.
• Understands the process for approving new or updated academic programs.
• Liaison with the Graduate School curriculum contact and the Provost's office.
• This could be the same person as the catalog coordinator, but it might not be.

Some of the things these individuals have been asked to do is to continue to identify questions and pass them along so they can be discussed with the Provost and information sent through the toolkit.

ImageNow

Brad Bostrom provided an update of providing access to graduate student files through ImageNow. Those who require access should complete an Access Request Form. There will be two phases of granting access: first, view and print access and second, update access. The first phase should be ready by the start of fall term and the second sometime after that. For the first phase, no special equipment or software is needed; the files can be accessed through a web client. For the second phase, scanners would be needed to upload all files that are not already in an electronic format.

Someone asked what files, specifically, will be made available. Everything a student currently submits to the Graduate School is party of the file. Admissions information is not included. Student communications are included.

Mary Ellen Shaw asked if confidential information is included. Confidential information is out of scope for this project.

Someone asked how far back the files go; anyone who was a graduate student 10 years ago or more would likely have their file kept off site. Files are retrieved and scanned as needed.

Graduate policies committee

Tina Falkner updated the group on the graduate education policies effort. A meeting of the large group took place in December and subcommittees are reviewing recommendations. The group is also looking at ten aspirational institutions and their policies as they relate to graduate education. Each institution uses different language so this can be a time consuming process.

Thus far, it does seem as though the committee's recommendations are covered similarly by other institutions.

Someone asked how feedback is being sought on the policy recommendations; the process is similar to how feedback was requested for the policy regarding who can sit on graduate committees. The information goes to the college representatives, SCEP, RAC, PAC, and the PPC. After that, there is a public 30 day review on the policy website.

Vicki Field noted that the degree requirements policy seems to be the focus right now.

Carol Francis asked who the college representatives are; there is a list on the graduate education transition website.

Questions and additional updates

Sue Van Voorhis noted that regarding tuition, Dean Schroeder, Julie Tonneson, and Belinda Cheung are meeting to discuss how tuition might be made more flexible and how it can be implemented. The guidelines likely will not be included in upcoming budget instructions but there will be broader communications as decisions move forward. Frank Blalark stated that a memo will be coming shortly about another proposed tuition tier.

Someone asked if tuition benefits for graduate assistants will likely be tied to the rate; this still needs to be determined.

Someone asked for the status on the policy regarding who can sit on examining committees; this policy is currently in the 30-day review period on the policy website.