**RAC**
May 7, 2012

**Attending:** Gary Andersen, Bonnie Anderson, Maureen Andrew, Richard Archer, Rockne Bergman, Rhonda Bjurlin, Frank Blalark, Robert Bode, Sheryl Bolstad, Brad Bostrom, Angela Bowlus, Earlene Bronson, Jeremy Burke, Laurel Carroll, Lolita Davis Carter, Amber Cellotti, Agnes Chagani, Pam Cook, Jennifer Dalton, Damian Damiani, Jennifer Decker, Dan Delaney, Molly Diethelm, Eric Eklund, Tina Falkner, Renae Faunce, Vicki Field, Tracy Fischer, Bonny Fleming, Carol Francis, Jennifer Franko, Teresa Fruen, Laurie Gardner, Liz Goebel, Lois Graham, Amanda Grimm, Ann Hagen, Jeremy Hernandez, Connie Hessburg-Odland, Christina Holdvogt, Emily Holt, Jill Johnson, Bri Keeney, Jennifer Koontz, Sharon Kressler, Mandee Kuglin, Sarah Kussow, Aileen Lively, Elyse Lucas, Jo Ellen Lundblad, Stacia Madsen, Heather McLaughlin, Heidi Meyer, Alexandra Miesen, Emily Mraz, Margo Mueller, Katherine Murphy, Nan Nelson, Mary Ellen Nerney, Ingrid Nuttall, Matt Nuttall, Margie O'Neill, Laurie Pape Hadley, Cathy Parlin, Cindy Pavlowski, Heather Peterson, Robin Peterson, Guy Piotrowski, Julie Prince, Rebecca Rassier, Kim Reno, Lonna Riedinger, Genny Rosing, Rebekah Saunders, Mary Ellen Shaw, Susan Suchy, Ali Suehle, Nathan Tesch, Georganne Tolaas, Travis Trautman, John Vollum, Kathy Walter, Susan Westacott

**Minutes**
There were no changes to the March 2012 minutes (the undergraduate group did not convene in April).

**Announcements**
*Meeting in the summer*
Sue Van Voorhis asked the group if they would like to continue to meet this summer. The undergraduate group decided that they will recess for the summer and meet again in August.

*One Stop limited hours May 16*
Heather Peterson announced that all ASR units will be attending a staff meeting from 8 a.m. to 12 (noon) on Wednesday, May 16. This includes the Office of the Registrar, Office of Student Finance, One Stop Student Services, and the Office of Classroom Management (OCM). Some staff members will remain in ASR offices; however, some services may be limited. From 8 a.m. to 12 (noon), messages may be left on the OCM Support Hotline voicemail. These messages will be monitored and responded to as necessary. The One Stop Student Service center located in Science Teaching & Student Services will have limited service and the St. Paul and West Bank One Stop centers will be closed 8 a.m. - 1 p.m. The Student Records Training and Support Team will be answering their helpline during this time.

*APLUS demo*
Ingrid Nuttall announced that the APLUS demo that was shared at the January RAC meeting is now available on the staff One Stop page under "Training." Please share this information with faculty advisers and others as you see fit. If there are any issues with the demo, please contact Ingrid Nuttall (ingridn@umn.edu).

**ASR-IT update**
Laurie Pape-Hadley provided the ASR-IT update.
*Organizational changes in ASR-IT.* Carolee Cohen is Interim Associate Director responsible for the OSF group of business analysts. WIlliam Dana is the ASR Project Director for the

PeopleSoft 9.0 upgrade. He will eventually transition to the project full-time. Kristeen Anderson is the Lead for the ASR Business Intelligence (BI) initiative and will divide her time between the BI project and the graduate education project.

*PeopleSoft 9.0 upgrade.* We will select an implementation partner in June and the upgrade will begin in earnest in late summer/early fall. Virtually all of the analysts in ASR as well as many in the user community will be working on this project that is projected to take up to 2 years.

Summer tuition calculation has started so students can view their new charges for that term.

Financial aid has begun awarding aid for summer and also started disbursing aid to professional careers.

**Policy discussion**

***High School Preps follow-up***
Tina Falkner announced that the elimination of high school preps as a graduation requirement is now in effect and the requirement has been removed from the students' view of the APAS. The student group will still be used to benefit advising. ASR also ran a list of all currently active students who have active high school preps on their degree audits and lists of student names have been sent to the colleges so they can reach out to students. A brief announcement about this change was also included in the *Undergrad Update*. Tina noted that ASR is also looking at students who are not currently active to see where they are at in their programs with the goal of doing some outreach where appropriate. As with the change to the liberal education requirements, students who are currently registered for a course that fulfills their high school prep will not be granted a refund. ASR will be removing this information from the One Stop website as well.

Sheryl Bolstad asked if the change had been made to all students' APAS reports; yes, all Twin Cities students have had this requirement removed.

***Campus-specific credit requirements***
Tina Falkner informed the group that a question has arisen in the advising group regarding language in this policy that currently says students must complete at least half of their upper-division *major work*. The group would like to propose that the language to be changed to say, "students must complete at least half of the *upper-division requirements for the major*." There were no concerns about this change.

Tina also asked the group to think about which policies they would like to see revisited over the next year. Tina will be bringing forward the repeat and withdrawal policy, as well as the probation/suspension policy.

**Business Intelligence (BI) update**
Sue Van Voorhis reminded the group that discussion about BI has been ongoing for two years. 18 months ago, the University purchased BI software that has been piloted with the Financials

unit (EFS). BI has often been confused with the University's overall reporting strategy which is also called Business Intelligence. Sue specifically addressed the reporting strategy.

As the PeopleSoft upgrade nears, Human Resources (HR), Academics, and EFS have been looking at their overall reporting strategies individually to see what is needed. The academic side requires reports for compliance, decision-making, and ad-hoc reports. HR is still determining their strategy but it will likely be mostly operational or ad hoc. EFS has not determined its reporting strategy. These three areas are going to look at creating a University-wide strategy and see how reporting fits into the upgrade; from the first day after the upgrade is complete, reports will be needed. There cannot be any lag time. As was mentioned in the ASR-IT update Laurie mentioned Kristeen Anderson has been put in charge of this for the academic side.

Frank Blalark provided an update regarding the software component of BI. The software side is a reporting solution that is designed to do a couple of things. First, BI can allow us to model data differently. Second, an application can be used to point to different types of databases to create a report. A new publisher tool will allow us (ASR) to create reports ourselves based on your business requirements. Security will need to be considered as will change management (e.g., where one goes to access reports). There is not a time line for when this software will go live.

**PeopleSoft upgrade and Fit/Gap update**

Sue Van Voorhis provided a presentation on the PeopleSoft upgrade, including the project vision, purpose, governance structure, and proposed timeline.

There have not been significant changes to our major processes since PeopleSoft was first implemented in 1997. During upgrades, we have not taken the time to review our processes and change them to take advantage of system functionality. An important goal of this project is to take advantage of PeopleSoft delivered functionality. This is a key goal of the executive group overseeing the upgrade. Of course, we still have to be able to do our business, but we must also adjust our processes where possible.

This is the last big upgrade we will be doing. After this, upgrades will be replaced with the implementation of "feature packs." During this upgrade, there will also be a split between Human Resources (HR) and Student in the system, which will also make feature pack implementations a smoother process.

Sue Van Voorhis stressed that as the representative for academics, she will be taking information back from RAC and sharing it with the larger decision-making group. She will also seek CSAA and adviser assistance to ensure the needs of affected parties are understood and met. Sue noted that recommendations that will be a significant change will have to be approved by the executive oversight committee.

Going through the organization of the project. All large changes will have to be presented to the executive oversight committee and approved by them.

In terms of timeline, right now the fit/gap analyses are being reviewed. This process will ramp up in July and last through December. The upgrade will begin in earnest in January 2013.

Sue provided more information on some specific functionality that is being investigated. PeopleSoft does deliver an academic advisement (AA) degree audit that is similar to APAS.

However, we will not adopt AA during this upgrade. We would lose some critical functionality if we were to move at this point so more analysis is required.

Part of the upgrade will be to adopt a new portal strategy and software. Julie Selander has kicked-off this project. We will be bringing in a company to help us figure out a portal strategy for the institution. This will include HR and Finance. An RFP has gone out for an implementation partner to help us with this effort.

Sue reviewed some of the fit/gap analysis and recommendations with the group. One of the items already discussed has been the Course Guide. At this point, we will be moving forward with a Course Guide solution for (at least) the Twin Cities campus.

The section status report will be retired and the information made available through a different format.

Regarding enrollment appointments (i.e., queue time) the current recommendation is to use PeopleSoft delivered functionality to provide a truly random queue. It will still be broken out by seniors, juniors, etc. Though unlikely, the only potential negative issue with using a truly random queue is that there is a chance that certain students might feel they are always last (or near last) to register.

Someone asked how this would affect students who are readmitted; when would they register? Aileen Lively answered that this process hasn't been analyzed to that level of detail at this point.

Mary Ellen Shaw asked if a student believes he or she has had a string of bad luck with registration times, would there be a chance for an adjustment; this should be possible.

Matt Nuttall noted that there has been some research regarding when students register and there is only a small number of students who actually register when their queue time begins.

Aileen Lively presented the pros and cons regarding registering for classes using PeopleSoft self-service rather than our current pillar application. With self-service, students would be able to complete multiple registrations at one time. Right now, students process one registration at a time; anything that is a co-rec has to be completed as a separate transaction. This issue would be resolved. Also, as soon as a class is added to the system, it would be available for students to register for it. With pillar, the Class Schedule is an extract of PeopleSoft information so there is a delay in when the information becomes available to students.

On the downside, our current registration system is very user-friendly; self-service looks a lot like existing PeopleSoft pages (they would not be maroon and gold). Also, for courses with variable credits, self-service automatically fills in the least number of credits. This would likely need to be modified.

Angela Bowles asked if there would be any possibility we could connect the registration system to APAS. Angela noted that one of the things advisers are trying to do is get students to check their APAS reports when they register. Sue Van Voorhis replied that this would be a reason to eventually move to AA. Until that happens, this linking would be difficult. Aileen Lively noted that new portal functionality might make it easier for students to make those connections. Matt Nuttall noted that ASR is working on integrating APAS with APLUS. The plan is to have APAS ready shortly after changes are made to the student record.

Regarding end of term processing, sub-group of RAC who looked more closely at the fit-gap agreed that it would be good to look into what PeopleSoft can provide for these processes. Aileen Lively clarified that this would include Honors and probation/suspension. PeopleSoft has the ability to calculate academic standing and automatically update a student's record to prevent him or her from registering. .

Regarding mid-term grade process, Oracle recommends that we keep our current process. Sue Van Voorhis noted that ASR will investigate what the CRM can offer is regarding this process.

Oracle recommends we keep our current e-degree pillar application for undergraduates and look at how PeopleSoft can provide the same functionality for graduate and professional students.

**<u>Graduate education</u>**

**Announcements**
There were no announcements from the group

**Updates**

*Meeting in the summer*
Sue Van Voorhis asked the group if they would like to meet throughout the summer. The group felt meeting is still needed. Meetings will continue in June and July (first Monday) from 10:30 a.m. until 12 noon in 402 Walter Library.

*Limited Service on May 16*
Heather Peterson announced that all ASR units will be attending a staff meeting from 8 a.m. to 12 (noon) on Wednesday, May 16. This includes the Office of the Registrar, Office of Student Finance, One Stop Student Services, and the Office of Classroom Management (OCM). Some staff members will remain in ASR offices; however, some services may be limited. From 8 a.m. to 12 (noon), messages may be left on the OCM Support Hotline voicemail. These messages will be monitored and responded to as necessary. The One Stop Student Service center located in Science Teaching & Student Services will have limited service and the St. Paul and West Bank One Stop centers will be closed 8 a.m. - 1 p.m. The Student Records Training and Support Team will be answering their helpline during this time. The Graduate Student Service and Progress office will also be closed during this time.

*PCAS*
Travis Trautman (ASR-IT) provided an update on the progress of this effort. As part of the PCAS project, the team has been looking at what programs people thought were active versus what is active in PeopleSoft. There are about 30 programs that will be deactivated. For the ones

for which questions remain, placeholder information will be put in temporarily until they can be formally discontinued.

***Graduate and professional student central communication***
Ingrid Nuttall announced that the first *Graduate and Professional Student Update* was sent on April 30. The next will be sent on May 14. Staff can now opt-in to receive these communications by emailing gpu@umn.edu.

***Graduate School website redesign***
Amber Cellotti informed the group that the Graduate School is embarking on a site-wide web redesign project. The current server the website is on will no longer supported (necessitating this change). This will affect the group in a few ways. First, there will be a new look to the site; the content will remain the same but there will be some reorganization of pages and shuffling of content. The biggest impact will be that the URLs will be changing. The Graduate School will disseminate a spreadsheet that will have the current URLs mapped to the new URLs to assist with updates to websites and materials. There will be redirects in place for a lot of the pages until December, but not all. The transition itself will take place overnight on June 18 with the new site live on June 19. More information will be shared as this date nears. Amber asked the group to send which pages are most critical to programs and colleges (essentially, a top 10 list). This information should be sent to the Graduate School dean’s office at gsdean@umn.edu. There will be a demo of the new site at the June RAC meeting.

***Automation of process for Preliminary Written Exam***
Heather McLaughlin announced that the advisory group for this process has been reconvened to review the requirements and incorporate learning from over the past year into the revised process. Heather informed the group that they can expect to see a survey next week to gather more information; the consultative process will be followed for the automation of this workflow.

**PeopleSoft upgrade and Fit/Gap update**
Sue Van Voorhis repeated the presentation given during the undergraduate portion of the meeting and reviewed some additional fit/gaps related to graduate education.

Aileen Lively spoke about the fit/gap of the process to schedule instructors and adjust class associations. The purpose of this table is to allow us to use it as an edit when we are assigning advisers to students. Faculty with GRD responsibilities could be assigned through this table. The purpose of this is to help identify the different roles in workflow so we have clean data at the plan level. Aileen, this shouldn’t limit faculty teaching information.

Sue Van Voorhis repeated the information provided in the undergraduate portion of the meeting about the enrollment time. Graduate students would still maintain their queue time order with the new process. Georgeanne Tolaas asked what the benefit was to moving to a new system for enrollment appointments. Currently, enrollment appointments are processed with a standalone system that requires one FTE. Taking advantage of the PeopleSoft functionality would be a cost savings and a process improvement. The current system is also fragile because it uses old technology; the new system would also allow for a truly random queue.

Regarding milestones, Aileen Lively reported that ASR is looking at them in terms of using the template version which basically says if someone is in a particular program/plan combination, a template of milestones can be used for all students matching that combination. Milestones provide students with a path so they know what steps they need to complete for their program. Oracle has questioned we have a career number so ASR will analyze whether or not this information is still needed. ASR is also investigating a possible integration of milestone information into the checklists available in PeopleSoft.

Sue Van Voorhis informed the group that Oracle recommends using their system for the graduate and professional degree application. A subcommittee of RAC will be formed to further analyze this process when the upgrade begins in earnest.

**Policy discussion**
Tina Falkner informed the group that the policy subcommittee is nearing the end its work. Regarding the degree progress and degree completion policies, they are near the end of the approval cycle. They are scheduled to be reviewed by the President's Policy Committee on May 17 and after that, they will enter the 30-day review period. The fellowships policy went to the Senate last week and was approved, so now that policy ventures to the Policy Advisory Committee, the PPC, and finally the 30-day review.

Tina asked the group for their feedback on a proposed substantive change to degree completion policy. The proposed change is that for students who fail to turn in their completed project within six months of its approval, there would be some type of consequence (TBD). This change is being proposed to reduce the number of issues with student and faculty who for a variety of reasons delay turning in the project.

Most of the group felt this would be a good idea and noted that it is an issue that comes up with some frequency.

Mary Ellen Shaw noted that if a student is doing everything that they can to turn in the project and it's a faculty member holding them up, the penalty would still fall to the student which doesn't seem fair.

Amber Cellotti asked who would be monitoring compliance of this if it does go into effect. This is something that has not been decided.

Someone asked with the "Six month clock" would start? This would need to be determined for all of the different programs. There would also be a petition process for students who had a valid reason for going past the six month deadline.

Stacia Madsen noted that some faculty education about time-to-degree might also be useful. They may think that the time-to-degree stops when the student has defended rather than when the student graduates.

Tina Falkner thanked the group for their input. She also asked them to think about what changes to the existing policies might be useful to begin discussing. Or, what policies did the sub-committee not address that perhaps they should have. Tina will be asking the group for their feedback on this question at a future meeting.

Mary Ellen Shaw asked if there must be a two year waiting period in-between when the policies are approved and when they can be reviewed; no, there is not a waiting period.

**Update on adviser and committee assignment workflows**
Heather McLaughlin began by asking the group how effective they felt the consultative model has been in keeping them engaged and determining requirements; the group indicated they feel the process has been working.

Heather shared a process map with the group to reflect changes to the committee workflow process to include the college coordinator as the final approval step. The student will initiate the form; the plan level coordinator (PLC) will receive a notification when the form is submitted so he or she can see who will be reviewing the form. As it is routed, the college coordinator and the DGS have the option to select additional notification to the PLC upon final approval of the committee assignment. Heather asked the group if they felt their feedback had been represented in the updated process map.

Georgeanne Tolaas noted that her department's current process does not include the DGS and asked if there is going to be an option for skipping approval steps. Heather replied that Matt Nuttall will be covering this to a certain extent in his agenda item, but this would be a process by process decision and would also be subject to policy rules.

Connie Hessberg-Odland noted that sometimes students select faculty who are not appointed to the program yet and asked how this process will be accounted for. Workflow provides a link so the student can see what programs the faculty has graduate education responsibilities (GER) in; everyone has the ability to see this and do a check. Heather McLaughlin noted that external faculty members can also be reported but the departments will need to obtain the Empl ID number in order for these individuals to be recognized in the system.

Someone asked if this form is used to report a change to a committee (sometimes a last minute change); yes, this form is used for changes as well.

**Degree Program form**

Ingrid Nuttall and Renae Faunce presented a draft version of the revised degree program form. The form revisions were required because once the adviser and committee workflows are live, the form will be out of date. The transmittal page of the form has been removed and instructions are now integrated throughout the form; space has also been added for the DMA and EdD thesis credits. The instructor name has been eliminated from the course list section because Graduate School staff had received feedback that the information was not useful. The name of the form has also been changed to "Graduate Degree Plan" in response to feedback from the policy review committee. The information on the form can be saved if an individual opens the form in Acrobat Professional (Acrobat Pro).

Renae Faunce asked the group that when this form is launched to please replace old copies of the degree program form with the new copies. Old forms do not need to be rewritten, but the new form should be used for all new instances.

Someone asked if the instructor name could be left on because in this person's department, the DGS will decide what course is eligible to transfer based on the instructor (i.e., the DGS will transfer the same course taught by some instructors and not others). Sue Van Voorhis replied that selective transfer based on the instructor is not acceptable.

Someone asked if the name of the form can be kept as it is. Renae replied that the change was made to reflect feedback from the policy review committee. The policies on performance standards and progress reference the filing of a 'degree plan' so the name of the form has been changed to reflect policy language. Ingrid Nuttall noted that it might be possible to have some temporary language added to the revised form that says "formerly called the Degree Program Form" so buy everyone some time to update their materials.

Vickie Field expressed concern that the Graduate School would still be involved in reviewing forms for any type of compliance. It was her understanding that this work was to reside completely with the colleges. Renae noted that the form may be changed to include college-level sign off and that Graduate School staff would just be conducting a final review before filing centrally.

Ingrid Nuttall asked the group for their feedback about how to better notify DGSs about changes similar to the new form and other initiatives discussed at RAC meetings. The group agreed that ASR should add all DGSs to the recipient list for the *PBED Digest* and that individuals can opt-out if desired.

**Managing tasks with processes in Workflow Gen**

Matt Nuttall noted that the changes the group has been hearing about for the past three years are now finally starting to happen. There are a lot of changes coming all at once, such as new policies, workflows, and staff changing offices. Matt noted that these changes will likely be stressful and asked the group to consider how that stress can be alleviated. Matt provided the group with a brief overview of one tip to reduce some of the stress associated with the emails people will receive as a result of workflow processes.

Right now, registration exceptions is the only workflow that is live. As more workflows come alive, staff should know that if they go to wf.umn.edu there is a "my actions to-do list." This list will tell you all the things you need to do rather than working from your email. A presentation on filtering email will be done at a future RAC meeting.

Another feature that will become useful is delegation. A user can chose to delegate authority to approve a step to another person for a period of time. Before this functionality can be fully used, the ASR web team wants to ensure that the right emails will still be sent to the right people. More information will be provided at the next RAC meeting.

Georgeanne Tolaas asked if tasks can be deleted if they have either been submitted in error or if there's a duplicate. At this point, only administrators in WorkFlow Gen can do this, but the ASR web team will try to find a way to make this easier.

Jeremy Hernandez asked how delegation would work if a DGS has delegated and then that DGS is replaced, does the process need to be repeated; yes, the new DGS would have to re-authorize the delegation.

Mary Ellen Shaw asked if there is a delegation, does the person who authorized it still receive notification. Matt Nuttall replied that he expects that is true but will need to investigate more.

The group agreed that both the to-do list and delegation will be useful resources for managing workflow.

**Registration exceptions statistics**

Sue Van Voorhis deferred this item until the June RAC meeting.