Registrar's Advisory Committee
Monday, November 2, 2015
Walter Library, room 402
9:30 a.m.-12 p.m.
Prepared by: Julia Marshall

Undergraduate education agenda items

Education Advisory Board (EAB) update
Doneka Scott said the group has hit a major milestone: successfully transferred data to EAB. Key issues from the survey included: What courses drive student to transfer out of their majors? Are there any certain courses? Can there be an approach that will identify bottleneck courses that impact degree progress? How does student year affect performance at graduation time? How can we predict performance? The survey will remain open for feedback. The group will receive recommendations from EAB about where people can participate in pilot program.

Student degree progress
Rachel McKessock said the four year graduation rate is anticipated to go up from last year, and the five year rate also went up a bit from last year. The six year rate fell from last year. The focus will now turn to retention rates and hitting the goal of 80%. First year retention rates are looking positive, and will continue to look at 2nd and 3rd year retention rates as currently we do not have enough students enrolled to reach 6 year rates set forth by the Regents.

Change of college workflow demo
Emily Holt said the Change of College online workflow is officially going live this afternoon. Stakeholders who have access to workflow will be getting an email with further information. With the addition of a new landing page, students will have a better sense of where they should go (e.g., change of college, change of campus, add second degree program). Currently, some students fill out change of college form when they actually want to add degree program.

The website gives students five steps for what they should be doing to change their college:
1. Contact adviser
2. Encourage them to go to department they want to transfer to + link to high-demand majors
3. Point them to college application deadlines
4. List all colleges that currently have supplemental applications
5. Change of college application form (within workflow gen)

View for student
- Date and time of when student visited the page
- Total past, in-progress, transfer credits and cumulative GPA (if a student has taken classes at other colleges, they must submit a transcript for transfer credit review)

- Will list the college the student is currently active in, their current second majors or minors (if any; the student can continue in those plans and can be added in the program plan)
- Will ask which college the student wants to transfer to (first choice; second choice major)
- A statement will be added to notify students that they can keep previous majors
- Link that shows all degree plans a college offers
- Student selects term in which they want to transfer
- Submit their form and receive an email receipt with relevant information

View for college staff

- Tasks they have to do listed by student, college, and major
- Most is the same information the student sees, but also shows everything the student selected (lists out academic program and plan student is pursuing)
- College staff have the option to approve the student now or save for later; staff can admit student to first choice, second choice, deny, or save for later
- Staff have the option to enter comments; OTR staff are the only people who have access to view it; the comment option is not meant for details comments used in advising notes
- OTR staff are also getting the application information

One request came from CLA, who wanted the ability to see whether a student had other pending change of college requests. The ultimate goal is to use this workflow for students who want to change campuses. The group will rejoin and continue asking for feedback over the coming months.

Colleges and departments have been asked to update their websites to reflect the new One Stop change of college landing page. Some sites may have their own copy of a PDF that may not be recent, and these need to be updated to the One Stop site. While we will no longer be promoting the paper application, OTR will still process them if they receive them/

College review schedule to SCEP

Stacey Tidball said the Office of Undergraduate Education, ASR & SCEP put together schedule to review policies to catch up on comprehensive review (should be reviewed every three years). As other agenda requests come into SCEP, things can get moved around. Many of the policies to be reviewed are fairly stable and we do not anticipate major changes.

- Changes to the Makeup Work for Legitimate Absence policy: Added additional language regarding bereavement leave, FAQs added to address absences for weddings and family vacations. The policy will go back to SCEP in November. This policy is frequently discussed and generates lots of questions from staff .
- December: Kicking off comprehensive review for three policies that relate to scheduling: Academic Calendars policy, Intercollegiate Athletic Events policy, and the Scheduling Exams and Study Days policy.

- January: Comprehensive review of three more policies: Awarding Posthumous Degrees; Educational Materials Conflict; Enrolling in Overlapping or Back-to-Back Classes [project for workflow is happening related to this policy as well]
- February: Maintaining Course Records and Undergraduate Degrees with Distinction and Honors

Common session agenda items

Approval of October minutes

There were no changes to the October minutes.

Announcements

Registration: Richard Campo reminded the group of the registration training sessions starting this Thursday. One Stop is partnering with ASR Training Team to host these sessions. RSVP link was included in email. Topics include: permission numbers, waitlist, class search tools, schedule builder, registration functions (swaps, adds, drops), and resource guides.

Office of the Registrar office move: Amber Cellotti said that Office of the Registrar staff will be moving from their St. Paul location to Williamson Hall, November 19 and 20. During the transition, staff will still be available via phone and email, but there may be delays. If there are emergencies and you can't reach a staff member, you can contact One Stop office. Forms will be updated with the new address. One Stop staff in St. Paul will remain in Coffey Hall and will make sure any forms sent to Coffey get routed to Williamson.

Schedule Builder demo

Travis Trautman and Colin DeLong said that since the launch of the system last Sunday, things have gone smoothly. Various emails have pointed students to Schedule Builder. So far, there have 8,200 semester plans created, saving 3,900+ schedules and Schedule Builder has been holding up well.

Demo: After student logs in, Schedule Builder adds in all of the previously taken courses and will exclude those courses from the search. Students explore courses, have a plan, then they build schedules based off plan. Students can search for individual course or full-text course search and can do wildcard searches (e.g., 1xxx writing intensive English courses). After selecting a course, it goes to the preferred bucket (courses student would like to take) by default, but can be put in the required bucket (courses student needs to take). The top 15 schedules are included in the results, and any courses not included in schedule show at bottom. Students can add block time sections for student group meetings, etc., to the calendar feature. If student is using exploration instead of search, he/she can go to subject list or educational requirement. Students can save their schedule to be accessed later if they are logged in.

There have only been five tickets total relating to Schedule Builder in ServiceNow. The team is working through lib ed requirement bug on PeopleSoft/Oracle side of things. Search results page needs to be improved, and although it's pretty easy to print schedules out on Chrome it could be more elegant. Schedule Builder works well in mobile landscape mode but not portrait. It is not accessible through APLUS yet. A how-to guide is currently being developed and will be shared with the group once available.

<u>Questions</u>
Q: Does it just search for open sections or all sections?

> All sections. If students know they can get into a class if they've talked to the instructor, that class can still be included. Student can specifically say "hold this one for me and schedule around it."

Advising task force recommendations
LeeAnn Melin came to discuss the advising task force recommendations. This task force was created to ensure excellent advising across campus. The initial recommendations for task force is 80% complete. High-level overview of recommendations:

1. Create a common framework for advising:
    - Common advising framework that describes excellent advising
    - Propose advising structure (colleges will have variation) - ideally one student has one adviser through the 4 years
    - Major advising - faculty advisers, faculty mentors
    - Didn't look as much at targeted advising (for athletes, honors students)
    - Didn't work much with CAPE
    - Advising service standards - what types of interactions can students expect per year? Highlight specific populations of transfer students, early alert indicators, students on probation
2. Ensure students have access to timely and proactive advising:
    - Units should have enough capacity to connect with students
        i. Recommended ratio of 250 students per collegiate adviser
        ii. Standards for email response time
        iii. Time and space to implement proactive strategies for graduation and retention
3. Invest in technological tools to encourage data-driven advising:
    - Streamline those services and support them - should use APLUS to document students' interactions
    - Variation of types, flags, and measures to create a baseline, then customize beyond that
    - Invest in APLUS, advance model
    - Ensure curricular transparency in PCAS and APAS
4. Coordinate the many groups working with graduate retention:
    - Establish working group to ensure consistency with direction and connection among groups

    - Make sure roles and responsibilities are clear
    - Ensure data dissemination process is clear
5. Invest in advisers in order to retain them
    - Advising experience is not the same in all colleges and that's okay, but sometimes advisers move between colleges
    - Recruitment and retention plan to make sure adviser understands student needs, have adviser pool that looks like student pool
6. Adviser training and development
    - Greater central coordination
    - Onboarding happens in college - what could core curriculum be?
    - Leverage technology to provide on-demand training tools
    - Prioritize training to ensure training/development supports all students here
    - Ensure targeted advising curriculum

Next steps: Continue to do listening sessions, review online feedback form, wrap up final report at beginning of December, advising town hall meeting on December 15.

<u>Questions/feedback:</u>

Q: As you work through recommendations, do you have a priority or do you want to simultaneously address them?

> We're in both an aspirational and realistic phase in that we want them all. The first few focus on the advising model and students. If we don't have resources to invest in all students, we'll look at targeted groups of students.

Q: Is there way to measure these goals and outcomes?

> That was part of our goal for having an advisory leadership group, in the hope that they could continue discussion around assessment. Asked members of CAA to do analysis for what it means for their units - some just need some tweaks.

Q: What kind of considerations have been taken into account for support staff of advising (e.g., cultural competency training for support staff)?

> We've heard that you'd like to make sure there are resources and training for support staff (e.g., supporting student records, need to keep up with just as much as academic advisers do, make sure everyone has that info and training).

Feedback: I had a lot of technology training, but there's no real training for advising aspect (rules, policies). Having better training would be helpful.

Q: Will you come up with ratios for departmental or faculty advisers, or will there be another team looking at that?

> We didn't talk about that specifically and I'm not sure if we'll talk about any more recommendations in that area.

(Response from person who asked question) For larger departments, I think it's necessary.

Q: Have you had these types of listening sessions with faculty advisers? If so, what has been their reaction?

We had two faculty on the committee (one adviser, one associate dean). Initial concern: holding faculty accountable to entering in APLUS - if you can't meet these standards, maybe you shouldn't be advising students. We presented to SCEP who talked about APLUS piece. We've heard that we want people to do what they do best. Faculty are saying they're good at major and discipline advising, but they may not know policy pieces. Advisers should be experts in things closer to curriculum. See if we can move up review of advising policy to reflect new approach or framework; creating capacity is important.

Q: I'd like to reinforce what Tina said. Many students are told one thing by faculty and another thing by advisers. Faculty often don't have training. I do think there's a loop there that needs to be closed.

We have heard a bit from students about multiple perspectives about their experience, but their frustration lies in conflicting advice that leads them down wrong path.

Q: Who makes the decision for the timeline and process for implementation?

These recommendations will go to Provost. Depending on where units are at, the cost for each will be different. Low-hanging fruit will be able to be implemented faster than others, through coordinated efforts. Some of them are more aspirational; it might take a while to get there.

Q: Did you talk about how to encourage students to come in for advising? We sometimes have no ability to make them come in.

Not explicitly. What we put forth in the framework is a way to support students. One of the challenges is knowing advising is decentralized. Resources are different in capacity to implement things. Both advisers and students have responsibility in this (both should get back to each other within two days). A common framework could embed communication and expectations about advising across campus. There's a desire for students to be more proactive and have a role in initiating good advising. Students didn't know they could go to advisers to certain things (e.g., research, mental health issues). Traditional freshmen come from high school counselor mentality.

Feedback: We could see notes in APLUS and encourage students to go to advisers.

Feedback: Having worked in a department, I didn't understand what collegiate advisers did and I worked there. I could've connected students with resources, but I didn't know exactly what to do.

Registration contingency plan
Jenni Peterson announced there is a contingency plan in place in case things go awry with spring registration. While there are no anticipated issues, it is important to have established and documented processes and have communications ready to go (e.g., issues with auto-enroll process or permission numbers). This is the first time the new system is going through a full registration cycle. The University is trying to be proactive with this contingency plan.

Time conflict workflow gen analysis
Julie Selander said there are many different forms or processes to streamline to an online workflow - next up is the Class Time Conflict Approval form. Currently, students download and complete their sections of the form; then, students go to each instructor to get the time conflict form signed. Once that is completed, the student takes the form to One Stop for processing. In the future, the students would log in to the workflow gen and the form would pre-populate with information that is already known about the student. The student would send the form (electronically) off to the instructors for approval, then it would be sent on to One Stop for processing. The student would know from instructors whether they have been approved or denied and when One Stop completes processing.

Questions:
Q: What about full classes? Could instructor's override that?

> We can’t process it. We’d have to figure out where it belongs in the process. We wouldn’t want to waste instructors’ time with that.

Q: I’m concerned about instructors responding. What happens if they don’t?

> We’re reaching out to colleges to get their thoughts. Colleges might have to send repeat messages or intervene manually. There could be a communication process to inform those who might not have used the workflow gen previously. The undergrad committee preferred that the field for instructor be left open. Trying to get instructors on board with process so it’s streamlined.

Feedback: Problem would arise for adjunct instructors who don’t have University email account.

Q: I currently have access to process time conflict in our college. With this new process, would that go away [for department staff]?

> We’ll let you know.

Q: Will TAs be approvers on the time conflict workflow?

> We’ll let you know.

Q: One confusing thing on the form is that there’s no place to indicate which class the student will be missing. Have to have separate email exchange with faculty to explain who will be affected.

It's not always clear what the agreement or arrangement is. Some students might switch off, be late to one, see what's going on in class to determine where they should be. *(Response)* Comment area would be nice.

Financial aid primer

Tina Falkner said the primer tries to present more financial aid information to faculty and advisers so they can understand more. The primer will hopefully launch soon in the adviser toolkit. It should be pertinent to graduate and undergraduate students, but these may need to be separate documents. Topics included are:

- FAFSA: many students will file the FAFSA their first year and forget about it in future years (in particular with graduate students)
- Types of aid: most of the information will pertain to the undergraduate population, but there are some grants and scholarships for graduate students. Additionally, many students don't know the difference between types of loans and accept unsubsidized loans before subsidized loans because PeopleSoft doesn't force them to accept subsidized first.
- Work study: more explaination for students
- Verification: some students get stuck after they get the notification about verification. Their aid doesn't go anywhere until they take action on verification. Verification = cross-check between FAFSA and tax data.
- Calculating financial aid: trying to boil down federal formula into a few words (which is difficult); would you prefer too much information or too little? This section will likely be a work in progress as we learn what types of information resonate with readers.
- Special circumstances appeal: putting in new data so that calculations can be redone.

Prior prior year FAFSA filing

An announcement earlier this fall from the federal government touted the idea that they were making completing the FAFSA easier, but thus far there's been no guidance from the Department of Education on what this actually means. Another item mentioned at the same time was that starting in Fall 2016, students and families can start using prior-prior year tax information for the FAFSA. For some students, family income doesn't change much over the four years, so they can use information from prior prior year when completing their FAFSA. Starting Oct. 1, 2016, students who will start fall 2017 will be able to submit their FAFSA. The hope from the federal government perspective is that allowing the FAFSA to be submitted earlier would automatically allow colleges and universities to create estimated award packages earlier so students could make more informed decisions at an earlier date. Yet the Department of Education said the EFC calculations and Pell chart won't be ready any earlier. Higher Education Department of Minnesota won't have grant calculations early either. If these calculations aren't available, we will have to tell students what they would have received last year. And, tuition and fees will likely not be set any earlier.

Class Search feedback

Ingrid Nuttall said there are some issues with course info and needing timely access. There are plans to create an advisory board for more regular connection about course issues. The group would meet ongoing on a monthly basis and would have start and end dates. It probably won't be kicked off until January.

The class search feedback survey will stay open longer (until the end of November). The team collected feedback emails in spreadsheet and is translating themes into requirements. The team is working with student leadership and groups to get more student involvement regarding feedback.

Class search supplemental tool: Ability to search for LE requirements has been added. Students can select at least one, but can also select multiple. Also, students can now see right away if a class is offered online.

Reporting update

Ingrid Nuttall said a group was formed out of Governance Process and OIT talking to collegiate leaders. There's a desire to shift from operational reports to analytics, including how to make meaning out of raw data, understanding the strategy and having good access to data, and presentation of data from a variety of different systems. Data in PeopleSoft is not the be-all end-all; there are other places where data is kept. APLUS has grown over the years to show lots of different info.

- The goal is improving the University's ability to make data-driven decisions.
- Mission is to make a positive difference in students' lives.
- Fits with data governance strategy in place at University.
- Affinity groups focusing on different pieces: Common use case (i.e., I need data to do "x"). Anyone can get involved by going to the FCOP event at Coffman this week. There will be a panel of University leaders to connect this to things that are happening at different levels across the University.

Policy updates: Makeup Work and Mandatory Attendance

Makeup Work policy: Revisions were requested late last year regarding whether students could be granted excused absences. It was decided that faculty do have discretion and aren't limited to the given list of examples. An FAQ section was added regarding bereavement - it does include travel time. Attending weddings and family vacations are taken on a case-by-case basis. It proceeded from SCEP to PAC and FCC, and it's now going back to SCEP for more language tweaks, especially about bereavement.

Mandatory Attendance policy: Minor language tweaks, no significant changes. Clarified that the policy does apply to online classes. Online classes' first event can be defined as the mandatory first day of attendance.

These policies are for all students and all campuses, excluding Duluth.

Graduate education agenda items

ISSS sponsored student survey
Gabi Schmiegel reminded the group that sponsored students are grad/undergrad/non-degree status funded by U.S. or foreign governments. The landscape of sponsored students is changing - focus on emerging graduate program scholarships. A survey will be sent out to people knowledgeable on this subject. Answers will hopefully be targeted to individual programs (e.g., Is the program open to more international students?). Currently, there are 300 international sponsored students, two-thirds of which is undergrad; there are about 110 graduate students.

GPAS kick-off and PCAS minor sub-plan information
Stacia Madsen reminded the group of the November 10 Graduate Planning & Audit System (GPAS) kick-off, which marks the beginning of the next phase of implementation. CEHD has been using GPAS since April, and is currently working with CFANS getting them into GPAS. Work will be structured until March; there will be a push for every college that isn't in GPAS to get its PCAS information updated. This push for PCAS coincides with the graduate education catalogue due out for 2016. In order to support GPAS with minors, sub-plans need to be created. Sub-plans of doctoral and masters will allow GPAS to know which requirements the students have to fulfill.

A website and documentation have been created to support this effort (z.umn.edu/gpas). The tentative order and calendar for working with different colleges is included on the website.

Policy update
Amber Cellotti told the group that review of graduate education policies continues, and 13 of them are up for comprehensive review. GEC policy sub-committee has done *Credit Requirements* policy (which establishes maximum and minimum credit requirements for degrees). Changes to this policy include: added language to clarify that the coursework taken needs to be graduate-level coursework; definitions for Plan A, B, and C were removed (those definitions might be better served in a different policy).

GEC sub-committee has resumed work; it will look at policies and push through as many as possible this academic year. The *Application of Credits* policy has been reworked completely: The re-worked policy does not have any defined limits on credits, but is rather focused on defining what should comprise a University of Minnesota degree and is looking at developing a minimum set of "core" credits that are required for a graduate level degree. The credits must be taken at the graduate level and as a degree seeking student. A team is looking into having a core set of credits that would bring together the U of M degree. Doctoral students still have the thesis credits plus the 12 coursework credits that have to be taken as a U of M degree-seeking student. The other credits making up the minimum coursework required for the degree would have to be graduate level but could be transfer, non-degree, or credits applied to another degree. The various plans (Plan A: 12 credits, Plan B & C: 20 credits) are used to define the "core" University credits required for master's students only.

Other policies: DGS Appointments and Appointments to Examination Committees. Not much conversation within policy sub-committee meetings - more a matter of clarifying language.

<u>Questions:</u>

Q: Does credit requirement policy have an impact on the 60-40 piece?

> It does have an impact. The way the language is currently structured, there is no longer a 40 percent transfer rule. There's a core minimum set of credits (e.g., Plan B has minimum of 20 credits taken as a degree-seeking student at the University, the other 10 credits are at discretion of grad program).

Q: Those transfer credits can be core courses?

> The intent with core credits for the degree is that they're taken as degree-seeking students at the U. The other 10 credits could be transfer credits. This spans both the GRD and departmental masters groups.

Q: Implications for masters degrees larger than 30 credits?

> There is some leeway for programs that require more than 30 credits. The "core" establishes the minimum number of credits required to be taken as a University graduate degree seeking student. Grad programs may set higher minimums; a program that requires 40 credits may want more than 20 credits from part of their degree program.

Graduate non-degree registration update

Amber Cellotti said the goal is to streamline this process, especially one particular thing related to students who intentionally or incorrectly register for classes at the undergraduate rather than the graduate level. Within the Office of the Registrar, for students who want to change their registration for the current term (from undergrad to grad), those enrollments will be moved from the undergraduate transcript to the graduate transcript, which has tuition implications. A retroactive change for the previous term or the previous year will involve transferring those credits internally within Office of Registrar - there will be a note on the transcript indicating the class was taken for graduate credit. It will appear in bulk credits, for instance, where transfer credits are listed. Students making this request will use the non-degree registration form and will have to get documentation from the instructor.

The plan is to keep an eye on how this is working. If the student is getting documentation, we want to help him/her, but we need to make sure this is what everyone wants to do. The alternative is not to move the enrollments back in the past.

Grad items at RAC discussion follow-up

Ingrid Nuttall told the group the most useful item of feedback from last month: RAC is a key way to get info, but the content can be too Twin Cities-focused; most of the things discussed in RAC today apply to every campus. Additional feedback included:

- There could be a better sense of community.
- Timely info is necessary - how long is it taking for GDPs to get processed?
- There are opportunities for communication and creating a better network for graduation professionals.
- Standard job description for plan level coordinators is being worked on to help elevate that group. The description belongs to community, can be tweaked.
- There's not an organization at the graduate level doing this work like there is at the undergraduate level.
- Reset this group at the beginning of the year - Graduate School, ASR, and partners will come together to talk about specific info that speaks to those knowledge/skills/abilities (e.g., policies expertise).
- The meeting could be a quick update for some of what was shared earlier - processes around what GSSP deals with. For those who work across undergraduate and graduate, the RAC meeting shouldn't be expanded another hour. Another meeting would be better.

Next steps: Will find time to schedule, put together agenda items based on job description. More info will be forthcoming. Will be all-campus, applicable to all programs. There will be more communication from Provost offices about education structure changes.