

RAC

December 5, 2011

Present: Gary Andersen, Bonnie Anderson, Kristeen Anderson, Maureen Andrew, Mary Beard, Rockne Bergman, Rhonda Bjurlin, Frank Blalark, Robert Bode, Caitlin Boley, Sheryl Bolstad, Danielle Bordeleau, Raechel Bosch, Angela Bowlus, Earlene Bronson, Lynn Burchett, Sara Cannon, Laurel Carroll, Lolita Davis Carter, Amber Cellotti, Agnes Chagani, Carla Claussen, Merin Coats, Pam Cook, Jennifer Decker, Tim Dicks, Molly Diethelm, Sandra Ecklein, Laura Ericksen, Tina Falkner, Renae Faunce, Vicki Field, Tracy Fischer, Carol Francis, Jennifer Franko, Wendy Friedmeyer, Teresa Fruen, Kate Gallagher, Laurie Gardner, Liz Goebel, Amanda Grimm, Amy Gunter, Ann Hagen, Kevin Havard, Lucy Hartel, Jeremy Hernandez, Constance Hessburg-Odland, Kim Hindbjorgen, Chris Holland, Emily Holt, Lisa Hubinger, Sarah Ihrig, Jill Johnson, Sue Johnson, Rachel Jorgenson, Bri Keeney, Kara Kersteter, Aileen Lively, Carla Mantel, Heather McLaughlin, Heidi Meyer, Emily Mraz, Margo Mueller, Katherine Murphy, Nan Nelson, Mary Ellen Nerney, Khosi Nkosi, Ingrid Nuttall, Matt Nuttall, Margie O'Neill, Laurie Pape Hadley, Cathy Parlin, Cindy Pavlowski, Heather Peterson, Ann Rausch, Lonna Riedinger, Mary Ellen Shaw, Kate Sophia, Karen Starry, Susan Suchy, Nathan Tesch, Danielle Tisinger, Georganne Tolaas, Travis Trautman, Sue Van Voorhis, Kathy Walter, Susan Westacott, Ellyn Woo

Undergraduate education (9:30-10:30 a.m.)

November minutes

There were no changes to the November minutes.

Announcements

eTextbook pilot

Sandra Ecklein announced a pilot project for eTextbooks. Indiana University (IU) has been piloting this project since 2009 and just made it available to the rest of the CIC. This has the endorsement of both the current and incoming provosts, who have provided the financial support for the University to participate in the pilot. Participating will provide the University with an opportunity to use eTextbooks in a coordinated method and take advantage of the contracts and agreements that IU has already worked out with vendors.

This pilot is moving on a very fast timeline in order to be ready for spring semester. Ten course sections, up to 1,000 students, can participate. Instead of a regular textbook, students will use an eTextbook provided to them free of charge. The eTextbook allows annotation, highlighting, sharing, and will be integrated with Moodle. Indiana has negotiated deals with several publishers but only McGraw Hill is participating in the pilot.

The next step is identifying the sections that will participate. A letter went to faculty last week. McGraw Hill has also provided a list of faculty already using McGraw Hill textbooks.

Selection of sections will be made by the end of the week [Dec. 9, 2011] based on:

- Current use of McGraw Hill text (and McGraw Hill's ability to convert to electronic format)
- Instructor willingness to meet rapid timelines
- Interest in eTextbook and advanced features (annotation, highlighting, sharing)
- Enrollment size (with the hope of reaching the 1,000 student maximum)

Selection will be made by the project team comprised of representatives from DEIT, Undergraduate Education, Faculty Affairs, Student Affairs, Disability Services, OIT, Libraries, Bookstore. Billie Wahlstrom and Bob McMaster are the project sponsors.

After section selections are made, students will be notified by letter.

Ingrid Nuttall asked if this pilot was for undergraduate courses only. Sandra Ecklein said that it was for both undergraduate and graduate courses on the Twin Cities campus.

Questions about this pilot should be sent to Suzanne Bardouche at bardouch@umn.edu.

ASR Limited Services

Heather Peterson announced limited services in ASR in December. Details on this can be found at : <http://blog.lib.umn.edu/asrweb/theledger/2011/12/academic-support-resources-limited-service-on-december-15-and-december-21.html>

Academic policy petitions

Heather Peterson said that students can print their academic policy petitions forms online. There is not a need to come to One Stop in person to get the form. Students do need to come to One Stop to process the form.

Policy Discussion – Tina Falkner

Repeats

Tina Falkner opened the discussion with five options that are being proposed as possible options to deal with students repeating courses more than allowed under policy (note: there are some courses that repeat, such as band, and those courses are not a part of this discussion):

1. Change policy language that says students can repeat once and that only the second grade counts (instead of “the last grade counts”).
2. Every completion counts and the grades are averaged and only given credit once. (Except courses that repeat like band, those are off the table.) Currently there doesn't seem to be any penalty for choosing to repeat something even if a student has received a passing grade. If all grades are averaged, students may think twice.

3. Students who receive C- or better cannot repeat unless there is space available in the class during open enrollment (Morris does this and some departments do it). This is a very labor-intensive option.
4. A combination of one and three
5. For students who got C- or better, their only option would be to take it as an audit (based on feedback that students wanted an opportunity to learn the material better, not just to improve a grade).

Someone asked how this would work with bracketing. Tina said depending on which option is chosen, we wouldn't bracket at least not as is practiced now. Margo Mueller then asked if a student took a course three times, if all of the grades would be averaged. Frank Blalark said that if the policy doesn't allow the credits to count more than once, there will have to be some sort of bracketing to handle the credit portion. Tina Falkner said that the student would get the credit once and the GPA points would be averaged.

Someone asked how many times a student with an F could repeat a course with option five. Tina Falkner said as many times as they need it because they would not have received a C- or better (i.e., it would not apply to their situation).

Mary Ellen Shaw favored the first option because it maintains the intention of the policy by eliminating the advantage of taking a course more than once. She asked if it would be relatively easy to do or if it would be labor intensive to know if it was the 2nd or 3rd time the course was completed. Frank Blalark said it would be labor intensive. Emily Holt added that it would essentially be the same process of what is done now, but involve more intensive scrutiny of the record.

There was some discussion about students needing to repeat a course in order to meet a requirement for their major or for graduation. There are extreme cases where students repeating a course multiple times need to have a conversation with their advisor about the feasibility of being successful with that major. Danielle Bordeleau suggested that if students register for a class more than once, that it sets a warning or alert in APLUS for the advisor to talk to the student. This might be less labor intensive than handling everything in PeopleSoft.

Amy Gunter prefers option two because it's a more accurate record of what happened. She noted that students might have the false impression that other institutions/programs would not consider the previous grades for the course. She also asked what other peer institutions do—do they bracket? Tina Falkner said that this information can be gathered, but her recollection was that some do and some do not.

Someone mentioned that having every completion count would help eliminate students repeating the course to manipulate their GPA. Tina Falkner mentioned that some students

will repeat a lower level course after completing more advanced coursework for this reason. Angela Bowlus asked if it would be possible to set the system to not allow a repeat of a course that is a prerequisite for a course that was already completed.

Amy Gunter said there should be forgiveness for students returning after a period.

High School Preps

Tina Falkner opened the discussion with four options for changing the current practice of translating missing high school preparation requirements into graduation requirements (there doesn't seem to be any actual policy language that mandates this practice):

1. Eliminate the practice. If a student is admitted without a requirement, he/she is admitted. This is not to suggest that admissions requirements/expectations are to be changed, just that students aren't required to make up deficiencies in order to graduate.
2. Require that only the language requirement be made up (note: CLA has voiced concern with this because of seat availability). If a college believes a second language is imperative, then it should be an admissions requirement or a degree requirement. The institution could also explore making it a Liberal Education requirement.
3. Require that all high school transcripts (especially those of transfer students) be delivered to admissions with adequate time to put the missing high school preparation requirements on the student's record prior to orientation so advisers can talk with the student about how to best make up the missing requirement.
4. If students are admitted without meeting admissions requirements, they must address them before or during the first term.

Cindy Pavlowski said that it only seems fair that there shouldn't be contingencies to admission. If they are admitted, they are admitted. Angela Bowlus agreed adding that if Admissions determined that the student will be successful on campus, it would be with the understanding that the requirement was missing.

Mary Ellen Shaw favored eliminating the practice noting that the policy language doesn't stipulate that the college make it a requirement, but what happened is that they all became conditional. Laurel Carroll added that a lot of colleges don't realize that the while admissions does the coding, but the college can waive or enforce any/all of it. Amy Gunter said there is a lot of confusion because each college interpreted it differently. Laurel Carroll said that it's incredibly inconsistent across the University. Tina Falkner asked why have requirements if they can just be waived. Heidi Meyer said that admissions does a holistic review, but once the student is admitted, it's up to the college to decide what do to with the information. She added that option one seems most logical.

Someone had a commented that with option four, it could be difficult to make the student complete the requirements in the first term, particularly if he/she is missing more than one.

Sheryl Bolstad asked how this could be removed from the APAS report since there doesn't seem to be a policy; it can be removed from the APAS quite easily (according to the APAS team). Tina Falkner said it would need to go to the undergraduate deans and then SCEP for information and then figure out when it would be applied. It's not all mapped out, but it's different than the process requiring full senate approval.

Sheryl Bolstad asked if the change would be retroactive. Sue Van Voorhis said she would push for that.

Withdrawals

This was a continuation of a discussion in October. There were no additional thoughts or comments on this policy.

Demo of new transcript ordering system – Frank Blalark

A new online ordering system for official transcripts is anticipated to go live early in the spring semester. The vendor for this system is Avow Systems, Inc. Many institutions, including many in the Big Ten, are using this vendor for at least some of their transcript processing (full list at <http://www.avowsystems.com/clients.php>).

Benefits of the new system include:

- Online transcript ordering for any student (past or present) with an email address and a credit card.
- The option of ordering a secure electronic (PDF) transcript, which can be sent to recipients within minutes.
- Centralized processing (at the Twin Cities campus) of all online transcript requests for all campuses.

What is changing:

- Internet ID (x.500)/password *not* required; all current and past students can order online
- Regular (1-3 days) and rush (1 day) options are being combined into one option with a turnaround time of 1 day
- Transcript charges will be a flat fee of \$12.00
- All payments will be made by credit card (eliminating student account charges)
- Eliminating fax option

What is staying the same:

- Same service for transcript orders by paper
- Rush delivery option via Fed Ex (with extra fee) for U.S. and international destinations
- Current UofM students will authenticate with Internet ID (x.500)/password
- Tracking of holds on student records

Sheryl Bolstad asked if a student could order a PDF transcript sent to themselves and then

resend it. Frank Blalark said this is possible and reiterated that the official status will remain so long as the document was not altered in any way.

Mary Ellen Shaw asked how the University of Minnesota is handling electronic transcripts as an institution. Heidi Meyer said that admissions receives a lot of electronic transcripts. There is a separate email address to receiving them. They can be easily uploaded to Image Now. Admissions prefers electronic transcripts.

Someone asked how a student would be identified in the system if they didn't authenticate with Internet ID (x.500) and password. Frank Blalark replied that there are several pieces of demographic data that are collected in the ordering process. If a positive match cannot be found automatically, a staff person will investigate further, including possibly contacting the student.

Posting degrees for students who complete work after their last term of enrollment– Tina Falkner

Tina Falkner announced that ASR will begin posting degrees to the last date of enrollment for students who complete work for an incomplete after their last term of enrollment. This is in line with how grades are posted when work is completed after receiving a grade of incomplete for courses prior to graduation. That is, the grade is posted for the semester when the class was registered, not the semester when the work was completed.

Molly Diethelm said that one requirement for Mortuary Science that might not fit this process is their students completing a national board exam. All coursework would be complete, but some don't take the exam until much later. Would this change affect students in those programs? Tina Falkner said that that type of requirement is different than completing a course.

Laurie Gardner asked what would happen if the student had an Incomplete for an extended period of time (e.g., 20 years). Sue Van Voorhis indicated that in those situations, the college should contact ASR to discuss the situation.

Someone asked if this is effective immediately. Tina Falkner indicated that it is and ASR is interested in hearing about any cases that might be affected in the immediate term.

Amy Gunter asked for clarification on if this was just for finishing work on Incomplete grades or if it would affect ODL classes. Tina Falkner said that it is for finishing Incompletes. After further discussion, ODL completions will be treated similarly to finishing incompletes. Sue Van Voorhis said they look to see when work was finished for ODL classes.

Departmental and collegiate use of the section status report discussion – Sue Van Voorhis

Sue Van Voorhis said that as the PeopleSoft upgrade approaches, ASR would like to ask questions of RAC to determine what tools are useful and what information could be provided in a different way. The question at this meeting was regarding the section status report. At this point, ASR would prefer to eliminate the report and provide the information differently. Many people said that this report was used a lot and would prefer to have it remain as it is. Sheryl Bolstad said that this report is so useful because you can see it immediately without having to run a UMReport.

Graduate education (10:30 a.m.-noon)

Announcements

Heather Peterson repeated her announcements regarding limited service in December and students printing out academic policy petitions forms from online.

Updates

Adviser workflow

Robert Bode reported that the work in Workflow Gen and writing procedures has started.

Committee workflow

Heather McLaughlin reported that an advisory group had been formed and they had started work on putting together requirements for the process.

Communications

Ingrid Nuttall followed up from the November meeting on the discussion about communication channels. There were two new channels created as a result of that discussion:

- Post-baccalaureate education listserv (pbed-list). All PLCS and selected others from the RAC listserv were already added to this list. There will be some overlap of information sent to the PBED list and the RAC list (e.g., RAC minutes and agenda). If anybody needs to be added to the list, contact Kate Sophia (ksophia@umn.edu).
- A news blog: *The Ledger*. This will be updated regularly and will include updates on transitioning processes. There will be more than just graduate education information. All entries will be categorized and tagged. Every two weeks, a digest of post-baccalaureate education information published to *The Ledger* will be sent to the PBED listserv

Formal email that can be forwarded (e.g., to faculty, students), will still be sent to PLCs when appropriate.

Best practices: Leave of absence – Tina Falkner

Tina Falkner opened the discussion by asking what issues people had encountered and what circumstances have resulted in a leave of absence being granted or not.

Katherine Murphy said that the Humphrey School hasn't yet written a formal definition on what would warrant a leave of absence, but so far have used it for situations such as a car accident or family illness. One student was approved for a leave of absence because they were taking courses at another institution and none at the University of Minnesota.

Katherine Murphy also noted that the process of entering the leave of absence isn't as simple as the directions make it seem. Gary Anderson (of the Student Records Training & Support Team) had to provide extensive help to complete them in PeopleSoft. Katherine said that if it will only be easy to enter a leave of absence before the start of the semester, it isn't good enough because they don't always find out until the semester is underway. Gary Anderson noted that the process might vary from student to student because of various things related to the student's status. Katherine said that that's why the directions aren't helpful because all of the ins and outs of this process aren't known at the graduate level. Tina Falkner said a review of the directions can be done and expanded in some areas as the current directions made some assumptions of what people already knew.

Wendy Friedmeyer said that more direction on PeopleSoft is needed (e.g., what access is needed, what training to take).

Carol Francis asked if anything is needed from the Graduate School to enter a leave of absence for an MS student. Tina Falkner said no.

Someone asked if a return date has to be specified. Katherine Murphy said yes, it's required. Gary Anderson said that the return date entry allows the student to be re-activated for the semester they are returning and will then get all communications about registering. Katherine Murphy noted that if a return date is set and the student returns early, it goes into correction mode and assistance is needed.

Someone asked if anybody had experience with international students and how a leave of absence affects their funding package. Sue Van Voorhis said that it depends on their visa, but most international students cannot use a leave of absence. Katherine Murphy noted that in most cases, the student would have to leave the country. Tina Falkner said there is a line in the policy that states that there needs to be discussion with the DGS to make sure there aren't other consequences for the student. This situation can be added to the FAQ. Ingrid Nuttall asked if the default action for international students should be to use Grad 999 and Tina Falkner said that the default action should be to talk to ISSS.

Someone asked about how other handle students who work full- or part-time. Some

students will have a time when a project at work makes them so busy so that they cannot take classes. In the past, they have used Grad 999 for this, but is a leave of absence appropriate? Katherine Murphy said yes and that is what they do with their mid-career masters students. She also noted that Grad 999 causes the college to be assessed \$3500. The leave of absence means that the student doesn't have to reapply and that saves time and money, so the leave of absence can be a real advantage. Tina Falkner said that students also get the benefit of having "the clock stopped."

Demo of new transcript ordering system – Frank Blalark

Frank Blalark repeated his presentation

Katherine Murphy asked if a student sends a PDF transcript from another institution, would it be considered official. Frank Blalark said that as long as the PDF was still certified, it would be.

Matt Nuttall asked what happens if the PDF is opened without an Adobe product. Kate Sophia said that the document will open, but will display completely blank/white.

Someone from the School of Public Health indicated that they had received PDF transcripts from students and it looks official.

Someone asked if the \$12 fee is each time the transcript is opened or per order. Frank Blalark said per order. Ingrid Nuttall asked for confirmation that the transcript fee change would be when the system goes live and Frank confirmed this was the case.

There was some discussion about whether institutions, including the UofM, would accept a transcript from a student. Sue Van Voorhis said we would need to refer to Dean Tsantir on this and other electronic application issues in general.

Best practices: Annual written feedback – John Vollum, Connie Hessburg, Kara Kerstetter, Georganne Tolaas

Kara Kerstetter (Economics), Connie Hessburg-Odland (MLS and MBS), and Georganne Tolaas (Computer Science) presented their practice for providing annual written feedback to their graduate students. The presentation and example documents can be found at <http://blog.lib.umn.edu/asrweb/theledger/2011/12/best-practice-annual-written-feedback.html>.

Ingrid Nuttall asked if they put a comment in the student's record when the annual written feedback is completed. All three responded that they do not.

Process for reviewing graduate curriculum in PCAS – Travis Trautman

Travis Trautman presented the [Google site](#) that will guide colleges through the process of

reviewing graduate program data for PCAS. All editing of the data will be done within PCAS. The Google site has checklist of what to do. The deadline for colleges is February 1. After that, University Relations will do a final review and then the migration of data will occur.

Sue Van Voorhis asked what the timeline for the catalog production schedule is. Travis Trautman said that there is an interim catalog, but there is a process for a rapid PDF creation once the migration is complete. Sue asked if colleges would see it again. When Travis said no, she encouraged college representatives to ensure they did their due diligence before February 1.

ASR consultative model for transforming administrative processes – Robert Bode & Matt Nuttall

Robert Bode and Matt Nuttall presented ASR's model for consulting with constituents when transforming processes. The document can be found at <http://blog.lib.umn.edu/asrweb/theledger/2011/12/how-asr-consults-constituents-when-transforming-administrative-processes.html>.

Robert Bode said that it is important to talk to constituents and to set out a formal model for doing so.

Working with the degree program form as processes are automated – Robert Bode

Robert Bode led a discussion about the future of the degree program form as part of it are automated. The question is how to phase out those sections as work progresses on automating the processes. Does it make sense to eliminate the top form (advisor, committee), and leave things like coursework and language declaration once those processes are automated?

Someone said it is important to retain the student signature on the remaining form.

Katherine Murphy asked if the coursework section would remain a hard copy. Robert Bode said that is the plan for the moment based on the desire of the DGSs and that it is still the most efficient way of completing that task.

Someone said she was glad to see the form separated in this way and asked if the advisor and committee assignment would be separate processes. Robert Bode said they would be. Georganne Tolaas asked if it was possible to separate the two if the committee hadn't yet been appointed. How could they verify that there is an advisor and a committee? Robert Bode said that it will be in UMReports. If there is not an assignment in UMReports, it could then be submitted in the workflow. Georganne Tolaas said that it seems there will be extra steps to verify the items not on the form. Also wondered if the Graduate School would accept the form if a committee had not been set. Robert Bode said that it depends on where

the form is being routed. It could just be going to data entry.

Connie Hessburg-Odland said that she looks for an advisor sign-off on coursework. The new form needs to have some indication that the advisor saw the coursework plan. The key is that a committee has been appointed and the student worked with his/her advisor on the coursework.

Danielle Bordeleau said the advisor has to sign the form now, so would like something on the new form stating that the advisor needs to be assigned before submitting it. Matt Nuttall asked if it would sufficient to have the advisor sign the form to indicate an advisor was assigned. Katherine Murphy said that if the form is signed and there isn't an advisor assigned, one could make the assignment then. Danielle Bordeleau pointed out that the person signing may not meet the requirements for being an advisor.

Carol Francis mentioned an un-discussed item on the form is minor. Robert Bode said that process will be automated

Someone asked if the team was thinking of retiring the form piece by piece. Robert Bode said that was under consideration, but not decided.

Ingrid Nuttall wanted to clarify that regardless of what is on the form, once a process is automated, the proper way to accomplish that task is to use the appropriate workflow and not the form.

Policy discussion: Readmission – Tina Falkner

Tina Falkner opened the discussion by saying that the intent was to get away from using language such as “change in status” and that readmission is a discrete policy . If a student has lapsed, then he/she would have to be readmitted at the program level. The current plan is to create a grid that deals with different scenarios for the procedure of readmission.

Someone asked if a student is adding or changing a degree in the same college if it's a different application than if the student is adding or changing a degree in a different college. Could it be the same application? Tina Falkner said that often when students are changing colleges, the other college wants a new application because of the difference in requirements. Someone suggested that the application could be the same with the colleges telling students to ignore certain sections on an individual basis. Frank Blalark said there would need to be an investigation on whether or not it is feasible to have required application fields for certain populations. Tina Falkner said that Dean Tsantir indicated that there was the opportunity to make some changes in AY, and that he has been part of this discussion.

Wendy Friedmeyer asked if “program” should be used instead of “field” in section two. Tina Falkner said yes.

Someone asked about a student changing to a lesser degree. For example, they are admitted to a Ph.D. program, but an MA is required and they don’t have an MA. Tina Falkner said this is a reasonable question for the FAQ.

Georganne Tolaas suggested that students always be told to contact their program office as different programs have different requirements for readmission. This can be added to the procedures or responsibilities section of the policy.

Someone asked if PeopleSoft now allows students to pursue multiple degrees. Emily Holt said that nobody is stopped from doing so, but a student cannot be enrolled in both career levels if the degrees are in different careers.