RAC
October 3, 2011

Present: Gary Andersen, Kristeen Anderson, Suzanne Bardouche, Mary Beard, Rockne Bergman, Rhonda Bjurlin, Frank Blalark, Sheryl Bolstad, Danielle Bordeleau, Brad Bostrom, Cortney Carlson, Laurel Carroll, Gary Cooper, David Crane, Jennifer Decker, Dan Delaney, Tim Dicks, Molly Diethelm, Clare Dingley, Kim Doberstein, Jessie Eastman, Eric Eklund, Tina Falkner, Vicki Field, Tracy Fischer, Bonny Fleming, Carol Francis, Alison Frank-Quick, Wendy Friedmeyer, Teresa Fruen, Laurie Gardner, Amanda Grimm, Ann Hagen, Kevin Havard, Constance Hessburg-Odland, Kim Hindbjorgen, Emily Holt, Lisa Hubinger, Sarah Ihrig, Barbara Jensen, Jill Johnson, Sue Johnson, Bri Keeney, Jennifer Koontz, Nathan Kopka, Sarah Kussow, Stephanie Lawson, Aileen Lively, Jo Ellen Lundblad, Stacia Madsen, Katie MacDonald, Emily Mraz, Margo Mueller, Katherine Murphy, Mary Ellen Nerney, Ingrid Nuttall, Matt Nuttall, Margie O'Neill, Lonna Riedinger, Genny Rosing, Cindy Salyers, Jody Seiler-Peterson, Gale Shea, Deanne Silvera, Kate Sophia, Susan Suchy, Nathan Tesch, Travis Trautman, Terri Tuzinski, Sue Van Voorhis, John Vollum, Susan Westacott, Ellyn Woo

Undergraduate education (10-11 a.m.)

September minutes
A representative from the Learning Abroad Center (LAC) wanted to clarify an item from the September minutes. In it, a question was posed asking if the LAC would be able to use the new learning management system. The LAC does not have an interest in perusing that possibility.

There were no other comments or changes to the September minutes.

Announcements:
Tracy Fischer followed up on a question from an advising town hall meeting regarding advisers working with students and seeing things that do not look correct in Grad Planner. She advised those encountering that issue to run an APAS report. APAS allows for text that can clarify the situation. Contact Tracy at asrathl@umn.edu if you see issues. She cannot fix the problem, but can help figure it out.

Sue Van Voorhis provided an update regarding the split of lectures and labs for four chemistry courses. Effective fall 2012, four chemistry courses (CHEM 1021, 1022, 1031H, and 1032H) will each be split into two separate courses, a lecture course and a lab course each with its own course number and credit value. Additional details about this change are available on ASR's website. Students wishing to repeat are strongly encouraged to do so before this change takes effect. Students who want to repeat the lecture after this change takes effect must register for and complete both the lecture and the lab courses. A follow-up communication to departments affected by this change will be sent ASAP.

Meeting time discussion – Sue Van Voorhis

Sue Van Voorhis explained that the graduate education section requires more time as the graduate education transition progresses. In order to accommodate this, she proposed moving the start time of the undergraduate education meeting to 9:30 a.m.. The length would remain one hour, ending at 10:30 a.m.. The graduate education meeting would then start at 10:30 a.m. and end at 12 noon. The proposal was favorably received so Sue Van Voorhis said that the November 7 meeting would start this new pattern.

ASR-IT project update – Jody Seiler-Peterson

Registration transactions at start of fall term

Between August 23 and September 19, ASR processed nearly 179,000 registration transactions across all campuses. More than 173,500 (97% of all transactions) were completed in less than five seconds. The highest single registration day was Tuesday, September 6, when more than 17,600 transactions were processed.

Fee request system replacement

The fee request and approval system is used to collect student fee information, which is used to prepare the annual Regents Budget Report and provides most of the data used to enter fees into the PeopleSoft student system. The current fee request system needs to be replaced because it is based on old technology and runs on an old server operating system that is being retired. This project is currently in the development phase. Developers and analysts will use information/requirements gathered from users in the past year to make the fee request and approval process more efficient and the information more available for analysis and reporting.

Constituent relationship management (CRM)

Admissions went live in September. They are working on a few “clean-up” issues, but overall have been very pleased with the rollout and the system. The team is now moving into the implementation phase for the next set of “early adopters”: One Stop, Public Health, Equity and Diversity, and e-learning. The target go-live for this set is late December 2011. There are an estimated 40 more entities who want to use CRM. Planning for those implementations will most likely begin in 2012.

Scholarship tracking and reporting

The system is live for College of Liberal Arts; College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Sciences; and the Law School. The plan is to have it rolled out to all departments by the end of October. As colleges and departments are trained, they get access to the spending reports.

PeopleSoft 9.0 upgrade planning

Analysts continue reviewing the preliminary fit/gap documents the Oracle consultants provided this summer. Analysts are also working on the prototype in a test version of 9.0 to help determine if there are relevant changes to the academic structure. Finally, the University is starting to prepare the request for proposal (RFP) that is required to find an implementation partner to help with the actual upgrade.

Online exit interviews for student loan borrowers
ASR is currently testing the set-up pages and finalizing the design of the online exit interview application for students with the Office of Information Technology.
Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) changes
This is the project to change the way we review for satisfactory academic progress that Deb Pusari talked about last month. ASR is currently working with the Office of Information Technology on functional designs for the changes. The plan is to have these changes in place by mid-November.

Questions can be sent to Jody Seiler-Peterson seile003@umn.edu.

Scheduling update – Sarah Kussow
Sarah Kussow reported that all courses for fall 2011 were accommodated with classroom space. She also noted a couple of trends the scheduling team is seeing with course scheduling. First, sections are increasing enrollment limits to the point of reaching room capacity. Second, there is an increase in the use of the 10 a.m.-2 p.m. time slots. Fall 2011 classrooms are completely full during this time. This means that if there is a problem with a classroom (e.g., technology, facilities), there is no place for displaced classes to go.

Sarah also noted that spring 2012 courses are still being placed. About 200 sections still need to be placed and this is being done manually. Many new sections are being added every day and that is expected to continue.

A new class scheduling policy goes into effect for fall 2012 classes. The peak time rule (that no more than 60% of classes be scheduled between 10 a.m. and 2 p.m.) has been removed entirely. The new rules were created in an effort to encourage departments to spread out their classes throughout the day and the week. The new policy includes a maximum of 3% of course demand scheduled in any one standard time block and a maximum of 50% of course demand on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The new policy has a lot of flexibility because 3% multiplied over all standard time blocks is 135% and there is a new standard meeting pattern ("C Times" that meet Monday/Wednesday, Wednesday/Friday, or Monday/Friday). At the November RAC meeting, the scheduling team will demonstrate the tool that allows schedulers to see how they are adhering to policy.

Sarah Kussow also announced that Scheduling U will be held daily from October 17 through November 4. The schedule of workshops is posted on Office of Classroom Management website.

Questions can be sent to the scheduling team at ocmsched@umn.edu.

Student study space update – David Crane & Katie MacDonald
David Crane and Katie MacDonald presented a follow-up to the presentation given in April regarding study space inventory and the new branding effort to promote the space. David said

the goals of their project were to improve student experience, keep students on campus, and allow students to have a sense of ownership of the study spaces.

Katie MacDonald said the goal of the promotion is so that students walking around will be able to easily identify a study space. Some recent promotions included Welcome Week activities and a note in the Undergrad Update.

David noted that the Undergrad Update drove a lot of traffic to the study space site and was the top link visited in that Update by three-fold.

Katie explained the name is “GPS Waypoints” because GPS stands for general purpose space and connotes maps and locations. A waypoint is a place you stop on your way from one place to another. The symbol for the GPS Waypoints is a gold pushpin. Large two dimensional gold pushpins are installed to identify the spaces and a gold pushpin icon indicates the locations on the interactive campus maps.

David and Katie also provided an update on renovations to several spaces. They aim to customize the spaces to cater to students typically in the area. Such as the surfaces on the tables in the McNeal Hall study space are designed to be good for cutting presentation boards.

The new spaces in Folwell Hall and Keller Hall are highly used (it was not possible to take pictures of the spaces without students in them). Benches were added to the hallways of Blegan so students would have a better option than the floor.

David Crane noted that Facilities Management had been responsible for all public space whether or not they were funded or engaged with students. This student study space initiative has been good for building relationships. They are currently looking for partnerships. If there are spaces in you building that you would like to see developed, let them know.

Ingrid Nuttall asked if they could talk more about QR codes and reserving these spaces. Katie MacDonald said that the QR codes (square, scan-able images) are outside all classrooms and study spaces. Students can take a picture of it with their phone and be directed to more information. The QR codes by the study spaces take students to the “find a study space” website. The QR code outside classrooms takes students to the building’s schedule page so they can see who are in which rooms or if rooms are available. Sue Van Voorhis noted that if a classroom is not in use, students can use it for study space.

Regarding reserving spaces, Katie MacDonald said that not all spaces can be reserved. The ones that can are in R-25. Contact the Office of Classroom Management to reserve. This is free for University departments and there is a fee for non-University. The spaces are also not available for reservation during finals week and a few other times when it is important that they be open and available for student use.

Policy update and discussion– Tina Falkner

Tina Falkner led a discussion about strategies for reducing course withdrawals. Is there a way to systematically encourage students to not drop classes? A few people saw a proposal last spring: that a W counts as a course-taking. When presented at the RAC meeting, it did not receive wide support as a strategy for reducing course withdrawals. The following options were discussed: (The ultimate solution could be any or all or some combination of them or possibly none of them.)

Option 1: Establish a set of high-demand courses and set them up as a special session in PeopleSoft. The result would be that a student would not be able to drop the course once the semester started without approval (from a higher level than the instructor).

Somebody asked if this meant the first five days of classes. Tina Falkner said no, the student would not be able to drop without permission after the semester begins. Sue Van Voorhis said that this was the date that SCEP liked.

Somebody voiced a concern that this would discourage students from dropping classes when there was a legitimate need to drop the class.

Laurel Carroll asked how students would know that the class was in this special category. Tina Falkner said that there would be a huge communications campaign around it. She also noted that this option is not unusual across the country.

Ingrid Nuttall asked how the permission to drop would work. Tina Falkner said those details hadn't been worked out yet, but the approval would not come from the instructor because they have traditionally been lenient.

Somebody from the math department asked if the student would be able to swap to another section (this is a huge issue in their department). Tina Falkner said that hadn't been considered, but they would make sure it could be accommodated.

Somebody asked if there would be guidelines for when to approve or deny the drop request. Tina Falkner said that would be important to have, but ASR would not develop them because that decision resides with the college.

Jennifer Koontz asked if there was a potential impact on the "No Pay" policy for non-degree students. Tina Falkner said that these students would need to be dealt with in a different manner.

Gary Anderson asked if there would also need to be a permission to add these courses after the semester started. Tina Falkner said that hadn't been discussed.

Ingrid Nuttall asked if there would be a policy about how classes would get this designation. Tina Falkner said yes, the instructor couldn't just decide.

Kristeen Anderson asked about making sure that students who needed the course stayed in the course Sue Van Voorhis said that there would definitely be a transition to address such concerns.

Option 2: Reduce the registration credit maximum to 18.

Somebody from the College of Biological Sciences likes this idea because the college sees a lot of students thinking they can take on more than they can. This limitation would force the students to talk to somebody in the college to register for more than 18 credits. ISSS is also in favor of this change. Sue Van Voorhis noted that tuition is separate from this potential policy.

Suzanne Bardouche asked if this option would need to to go SCEP for approval. Tina Falkner said that it would be presented to SCEP for information. This is a policy, but not a policy within the administration policy structure so it would not need their approval to be implemented.

Option 3: Include a penalty for Ws in reviews for probation/suspension
This option is modeled after the rules for SAP. Students know about the 2.0 GPA requirement for SAP, but also know that a W doesn't count toward anything, so they just withdraw from courses they are doing poorly in.

Clare Dingley said this sounded like a clever solution. Molly Diethelm agreed, saying it would force students to think through their decisions and the implications of their actions. Tina Falkner said that was the goal. Ws are currently a "get out of jail free" card.

Tracy Fischer asked about missing grades. Tina Falkner said they would think about it in the same way as they do SAP, even though it punishes students. Suzanne Bardouche commented that the probation/suspension report talks about ODL and missing grades.

Ingrid Nuttall asked if the snapshot of what the student was registered for (and therefore what would count) would happen after the first two weeks. Tina Falkner said yes.

Somebody asked why the coefficient of completion was dropped. Sue Van Voorhis said because it was inconsistent across the colleges. Clare Dingley added that it was really complicated and nobody could figure it out. Students couldn't self-monitor. It was also a huge double standard for financial aid and academic probation.

Someone commented that there is a potential conflict of interest between option 1 and option 2.

Suzanne Bardouche said it is important to talk about wise use of resources (e.g.classrooms, adding STEM students). Every one of these three options would allow us to make the best use of our resources. They would give us something to talk about making better use of all resources (instructional, space). We just have to be careful and do it in a way that encourages student success.

Someone asked about what happens if a student gets a D in an elective course. Would the D credit count in the "progress toward degree" equation since the D is acceptable for courses outside the major? Tina Falkner said they didn't get into that level of granularity yet, but that would have to be figured out. There was also concern voice about the current probation/suspension reports in UMReports and that they would need to be re-written.

Clare Dingley suggested another option should be related to money—that there would be a financial consequence for the choice of dropping. She said people are more invested with they are paying for something. Sue Van Voorhis said that there are schools that do similar things; students are charged any time they drop a class. We can look at that as an option.

Somebody asked if there had been any discussion about what would happen to those who were on waitlists and how that would be handled. Tina Falkner said that there hadn't been a discussion about that.

Sue Van Voorhis invited others to email other ideas. Tina Falkner said that the November discussion will be about repeats. Questions and ideas can be sent to Tina at rovic001@umn.edu.

Graduate education agenda items

Introductions and announcements

Frank Blalark provided an advance notice to the group about an issue that requires input from RAC members. Moving forward with digitizing forms as part of the graduate education transition, it is important to understand how the forms are used in practice. Frank would like to have a discussion about how departments/colleges are using two specific forms: 1) The reviewer's report form for masters plan a students and 2) the final report form for masters plan c students.

Ingrid Nuttall announced that ASR is exploring the possibility of helping coordinate a graduate student publication similar to Undergrad Update. She will host a discussion about the needs related to communicating non-program specific information to graduate students and if this kind of publication would fulfill those needs. An invitation to this discussion will be sent to the RAC listserv.

Meeting time discussion – Sue Van Voorhis

Sue Van Voorhis noted that the graduate education section requires more time as the transition progresses. In order to accommodate this, she proposed moving the start time of the undergraduate education meeting to 9:30 a.m.. Those present at today's undergraduate session approved this change so that the graduate section could start at 10:30 a.m. and still end at 12 noon. The proposal was favorably received, so Sue Van Voorhis said that the November 7 meeting would start this new pattern.

Updates

PCAS – Travis Trautman

Graduate forms are live in production and 36 entries of graduate education are entered. The online catalog is being modified. The project is targeted to end in October.

Question: Will there be an opportunity to make changes before it goes live?
Travis Trautman said yes, there will be a 1-2 month vetting period before it goes live.

UM Reports – Kristeen Anderson

Kristeen Anderson updated the group on the 12 reports that needed to be updated for this fall. They are all live except for GO42, but that *may* go into production this week. Cindy Salyers indicated that a developer is still working on it. Kristeen Anderson said that if you need GO42 before it goes live, to contact the Student Records Training and Support Team. She also reported that there are two reports (GE Faculty Role Detail and GE Faculty Appointment Record) experiencing a problem with name search.

Sue Van Voorhis thanked OIT for hiring additional consultants to come in in August to get this project done.

Imaging – Robert Bode

There will be another training on October 18 in St. Paul. Requests for hands-on training should be made to Dale Schneidmiller.

Question: what is the turnaround time for documents being imaged?
Stacia Madsen said that as soon as something has approval, it is imaged within a day of getting to the imaging area. Approval can sometimes take 2-3 weeks depending on what it is. Degree clearance takes the most time.

Registration Exceptions – Eric Eklund

The process was live on September 6. As of October 3, there were a total of 117 requests from 105 unique requesters. Most of those requests were just awaiting imaging (a small issue stalled this step, a resolution is being worked on).

There was a question about feedback to the approver once their step was completed. They currently are only directed to the next screen in WorkFlow Gen and there is no positive feedback that the task was complete/recorded.
Eric Eklund said that he would investigate whether a message could be displayed instead of the next WorkFlow Gen screen.

Somebody commented that there was not an “NG” option in the grading drop down.
Eric Eklund said that the team will have to look at which classes can have which grading options.

Sharing best practices – John Vollum

John Vollum told the group that he will be sending out a survey to DGS assistants (and possibly DGSs, associate deans, and college-level administrators) regarding best practices in graduate education processes. What he is most interested in learning is what people are interested in learning about and who has a successful practice they can share with others. Depending on the results, this information can be shared at future RAC meetings, in other meetings, or possibly a mini conference.

Adviser workflow discussion – Robert Bode and Heather McLaughlin

Heather McLaughlin said that assigning an adviser is the first component of the degree program form to be automated.

Robert Bode explained that because this workflow is smaller in scope than registration exceptions, the process of automating it should move faster. The team working on this workflow includes web development and communications staff, as well as an advisory group. The advisory group will provide initial input for the design. The project charter was approved and basic requirements have been collected from the user group. The process mapping will begin shortly and will likely be shared at the November meeting. The team is also reviewing the connections between advisers and committees as the next workflow will be assigning committee members.

Heather and Robert then asked several questions to those in attendance.

Q: How many programs initially report adviser assignments to the graduate school using Apply Yourself?
A: Less than half

Q: What are other ways you report adviser assignments to the graduate school?
A: The adviser is simply the DGS. Any other assignment is done with the degree program form.
A: Email Genny with the initial assignment and submit changes with the degree program form.
A: The School of Public Health emails Genny.

Q: Who initiates a change of adviser? The student? The department?
A: Most responded that students initiate a change in adviser. Just a few responded that the department initiates the process.

Q: If we could change just one part of the process to make your lives easier, what would it be?
A: Danielle Tsinger said nothing is easier than simply emailing Genny, but as part of automating the process, she would like to be able to submit a cohort all at once.

Q: How many departments have a cohort program with a list?
A: Several in the room.

Q: How many departments have the DGS as the initial/default adviser?
A: At least half.

Comment: In our department, the DGS has to approve all adviser assignments and change of adviser. We would like this workflow to have approvals built-in similar to the registration exceptions workflow.
Comment: In our department, the DGS doesn’t have to approve this process.
Heather McLaughlin said they would look at different solutions.

Q: Is it common that students come to the department and say they are unhappy with their adviser?
A: No. The situation is usually that the student has decided on their field and found a faculty member they would like to work with.

Ingrid Nuttall asked if the DGS is always initially assigned as an adviser for those programs that use degree program form to update the adviser.
A: No

Sue Van Voorhis asked that the people who are selected to be in the small advisory group think broadly about all of these issues and not just think about their own programs as there are many different scenarios.

<u>Policy clarifications/discussions</u>

Leave of Absence – Tina Falkner

Tina Falkner said that the because of the intentionally-vague wording of “extenuating circumstances” in the policy, it would be good to develop a best practice about when to approve a leave of absence. ASR should not dictate the criteria. She asked the group what they have seen since the policy went into effect a month ago and if there was anything that could be added to the policy FAQ.

A few people indicated their departments have not directly communicated the option to their students as they are still developing their process, but that if students approached them about it, the students would need to discuss it with their advisers and the DGS.

One person said that there is a steep learning curve on how to enter them into PeopleSoft and understanding how it affects things such as financial aid. Tina Falkner said that while it is not appropriate to attach that information to the policy itself, it would be possible to create a job aid to provide information about what to do when a decision has been made. Gary Anderson said that there is a “cheat sheet” for this on the undergraduate level. Sue Van Voorhis suggested that it could be adopted at the graduate level.

One department is still discussing internally what to do because a lot of students are currently discontinued due to non-enrollment and many of them didn’t know that they could take a leave of absence. In the future, they would want to get the students thinking in advance and when to plan for this. Tina Falkner suggested a discussion at the December meeting to discuss how the Leave of Absence is being applied, what situations are being approved, and how departments are informing their students about this option (i.e., a discussion about best practices regarding graduate leave of absence).

There was some discussion about confusion between a leave of absence and Grad 999. In the past—when a leave of absence wasn’t an option—Grad 999 was used for that purpose. Tina said that they are two different things and that the leave of absence is the student stepping away from all studies with the intension of returning. She suggested another discussion about

Grad 999 and when that is appropriate versus a leave of absence (this could be part of the December best practices discussion).

There was also discussion about how to handle situations in this term. Many students were not aware of the option for a leave of absence and were discontinued. Vicki Field said that normally a student would have to be active to enter a leave of absence, but because of the challenges of communicating the policy to students this fall, it would be reasonable to allow leaves of absence for students who are non-active this fall. Gary Anderson said that the student records training team can reactivate students to allow this entry.

There was a question about starting a leave of absence in the middle of the semester. Tina said that yes, this is allowed. Sometimes a student will know that they will be doing something to take them away from their studies in advance and sometimes something comes up. The student records training team knows how to handle this in the system.

Tina Falkner wanted to gauge how much ASR should communicate with RAC on policy changes. She asked how many people got the email from Henning Schroeder about the DGS policy. Because there were only a few people who had, Tina concluded that ASR will continue to send communications on to RAC.

Vicki Field explained that the new DGS policy requires the dean (or the dean's designee) to appoint a DGS. There is a fair degree of latitude for how to assign DGS, but doesn't say anything specific for the reporting line. The expectation is that the DGS will report to the college dean, but if some other scheme makes sense in your organization, there is that flexibility. Tina Falkner further clarified that there is no set mechanism or structure for who a DGS reports to.

Thesis credits registration – Stacia and Vicki Field

Vicki Field said that doctoral students can now register for thesis credits before passing the preliminary oral exam. Individual programs have to make the decision about whether to extend this option to students. If this option doesn't make sense for a particular program, that needs to be communicated to program students. If a program decides to extend this option to students, 8888 needs to be changed in ECAS, and the prerequisite of having passed the preliminary oral exam needs to be removed. A prerequisite of advisor or program approval can be added in lieu of the preliminary oral exam flag, which would require the student to obtain a permission number. If permission numbers are used, then they would be needed for all doctoral students in the program because the system would not be able to check for two different prerequisites (advisor/program consent or passage of the preliminary oral exam).

One thing to consider is that early registration of thesis credits may affect tuition revenue at the end of a program.

Stacia Madsen said that in order to receive in-state tuition rates, the student must be past preliminary oral exams. She also indicated that this policy change is not retroactive; it is from fall 2011 onward and that 8666 cannot be used for degree completion.