ACADEMIC SUPPORT RESOURCES
Office of Undergraduate Education

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Registrar's Advisory Committee

Monday, March 4
Presentations
Minutes prepared by Kate Sophia

Approval of the February minutes

The February minutes were approved without changes.

Announcements

Change in threshold for late fees/holds

Tina Falkner said that starting July 1, 2019, the threshold for unpaid balances on student accounts to trigger late fees and holds related to registration and transcripts will be increased to $200 (from $100). One reason for this is that students may use $200 from current financial aid to pay for past expenses. Additionally, analysis showed this change would not significantly change the amount of bad debt.

Negotiated Rulemaking update

Tina Falkner provided an update from the most recent round of negotiated rulemaking with the U.S. Department of Education (ED). More detail available in the presentation.

This session included report-outs from three sub-committees, but there wasn't much more clarity in understanding what it is the ED is trying to fix. When asked questions along these lines, ED representatives provided anecdotes, but could not provide data. As before, redlined documents were provided on the day of the discussion, leaving little-to-no time to read and reflect on the contents. Directed questions were offered to set the tone of the discussion.

Accreditation reform

There was a 50-page document of redlines, but they only got through about 10 pages. The proposal included biased language such as "end the monopoly of the current regional accreditation system." Without offering proof, the ED asserted that the current regulations stifle innovation. They want to reduce the threshold for becoming an accreditor and drive transfer of credit. Also discussed under which conditions a school could gain access to Title IV funds without full accreditation.

Summary of sub-committee report-outs:

Faith based entities subcommittee

A quote from a negotiating member:

> *"To be clear, religious freedom, both the freedom to believe as we choose, and to build robust religious communities around those beliefs, is fundamental to our democracy. But this freedom is not unlimited. And it does not include the automatic right to special treatment, in the absence of a claim that the government is substantially burdening religious exercise… Granting broad religious exemptions without appropriate justification undermines the integrity of genuine claims and leads some to even question appropriately tailored exemption. The proposed rules being considered by the subcommittee are, by and large, unnecessary and unwarranted. These issues are highly complex… Making sweeping changes in this area will harm, not help, religious freedom."*

Most of the dept's position was based on a 2017 Supreme Court ruling (Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer) where a religious school was denied a grant for playground resurfacing while grants were provided to similar non-religious groups. There is disagreement on the applicability of that case. The concern is that the current regulations are written to force some students to choose between their religion and government services. There was discussion about the balance of constitutional requirements and religious expression and how the proposed language of religious mission could allow schools to discriminate.

TEACH Grant subcommittee

While the changes were good, the proposed remedies aren't enough. What about students whose grants were already erroneously converted to loans (~80,000 people had their loans converted, though not all were by mistake)? There were also questions around what fields (included in statute) will count, as it varies by region.

This seems as this may be the only thing consensus will be reached on.

Distance Learning Submittittee

Some of the original language was based on when the courses were through the mail.

There was a lot of discussion of terms such as "regular and substantive interaction" and "instructor" and "instructional team". There was also discussion on who gets to define these terms (e.g., the schools, agencies, the ED).

There was also discussion of outsourcing of program content to programs eligible for Title IV. Currently, eligible programs must deliver at least 50% of the program. Department is suggesting eliminating that requirement, opening the door for 100% of content being outsourced to a non-accredited agency. The rationale provided was that fields change quickly and innovation is being suppressed.

<u>Public commentary</u>

Each day of negotiations ended with an hour of public commentary. This round included:

- Argosy students in limbo after the school was purchased by a faith-based entity and students did not get their aid disbursed to them. The new ownership laid off staff and closed offices. Students came to tell their stories. The students believed that the participation in Title IV meant that Argosy was a reputable institution. [Note: the University of Minnesota does accept some undergraduate credits from Argosy, but not all.]
- A teacher from Oregon who had her TEACH grant converted to a loan shared her story.
- Military veterans who were lured into for-profit schools.
- Many people concerned about the weakening of protections for students.

As mentioned last month, if you have concerns about what is being discussed, you can share your concerns with Tina (rovic001@umn.edu). You can comment this summer when the regulatory language is made public. You can also contact your representatives in the House and Senate.

QUESTION: When consensus is not reached, the ED can do what they want?
Tina: Correct. The stated goal is that consensus is achieved, but the practice of how this is happening doesn't seem like that is said in good faith.
QUESTION: Is "consensus" a new standard?
Tina: That has always been the standard.

Certificate of attendance update

Adrienne Bricker provided the group with information on a new "certificate of attendance" meant for the families of students who have died while enrolled in a degree-seeking program, but who do not qualify for a posthumous degree. More detail available in the presentation.

The certificate was developed in collaboration with the Office of Student Affairs and is based on a template from the Duluth campus. The certificate template was approved by collegiate leadership and the certificates will be presented at the annual Northern Stars Remembrance Ceremony (though the first one was mailed in February 2019).

The certificate looks significantly different than a diploma. It uses a different font, doesn't list a college, and has signatures of the University president and provost (this makes it appropriate for any student in any career and any campus).

QUESTION: If we know of a situation where a certificate should be created, should we just contact OTR?
Adrienne: You should continue to use the normal procedure for reporting deceased students. The list is maintained as part of that process.

QUESTION: The certificate can be awarded so long as the student was degree seeking? It doesn't matter how long?
Adrienne: Correct.
Tina Falkner: Keep in mind, if they have completed a significant portion of their program, they may qualify for a posthumous degree.

Extending the auto-enroll from waitlist process

Adrienne Bricker led a discussion about an inquiry from the Rochester campus regarding extending how long the auto-enroll from waitlist process runs. More detail available in the presentation.

Currently, the last time the process is run is the evening of the first day of classes. This matches first day of attendance policy. The question is if we can extend through the last day to add a class without approval.

QUESTION: What are some of the pros/cons?
Adrienne: If we stop the process on the first day of class as we do now, it allows a little more flexibility for the department to decide who should have permission from the waitlist. Extending it might allow for more students to have access to the classes they say they want to be in through an automatic process.

COMMENT: I think this would be a terrible idea. It would make it next to impossible for faculty/instructors to know what size class they are going to end up with. Additionally, students usually commit to the classes they got by that first day. They might have a surprise that they are in a new class at the end of the first week.

COMMENT: Based on class set-up, including reserved seats, certain populations of students wanting to take a closed class in our college are told to attend the first day of class and get permission from the instructor. If the auto-enroll process is still running, that would make these situations far more complicated.

COMMENT: I think there can be confusion on both ends. Currently students and faculty do not know the process ends. It's messy either way, even though some students might like this to automatically happen in the first week.

Additional feedback can be provided to Adrienne (abricker@umn.edu).

PeopleTools Update demonstration

Marc Keaveny previewed changes coming as a result of an upcoming PeopleTools Update. Jenn Selander provided an overview of associated training and communications. More detail available in the presentation.

Marc said that PeopleTools is a development platform within PeopleSoft and it is what the "applications" of Campus Solutions, HRMS, and Finance run on. This needs to be updated by July 2019 as Oracle will stop releasing critical patches for the version we're on. At the same time that we do this work, we'll be introducing new features, such as unified navigation. The timing of this is currently under discussion. The initial target date was April 6-7, but currently looking at contingency dates in May and June.

Marc then offered a preview using screenshots. Some highlights:

- After signing in, you will be brought to a default homepage. That homepage will be set, based on security roles, for the primary PeopleSoft application you have access to. You can change your default homepage to any homepage you have access to (including a customizable "My Homepage") and you can navigate between applications in the same window.
- There are no changes to security based on this update. You will have access to the same thing you have access to now.
- The homepage looks significantly different. Instead of links, you will see "tiles." The tiles represent custom collections of highly-used pages. You will see tiles based on your page-level access.
- Search is still available.
- "Actions List" (looks like a vertical ellipsis) allows you to manage favorites and set your default home page.
- "Nav Bar" is accessed through the compass icon and is how you access favorites as well as the Navigator.
    - Favorites will come forward. They will be appended with a two-letter designator indicating which application it is for. Example: favorites in Campus Solution will have "CS" added to the name.
    - The Navigator how to access classic navigation pathways. Every single page is included (as not all pages are in a collection using a tile). Navigating to the page through the navigator is the recommended way to add a page as a favorite.
    - The Classic Home is available, but will not be supported by Oracle in the future. We do not recommend using it.
- Clicking on a tile from a home page brings you to a page that has the page collection on the left (in a left navigation). Pages with "related content" will open in a new page, though it may not be clear initially that you are in a new window. One example of such a page is Program Plan.
- There is a back button within the header to bring you to the page you were last on. You should use this and not your browser back button.

QUESTION: Will there be changes to APLUS?
Marc: No. It's just the navigation within PeopleSoft.

Jenn Selander provided an overview of the training and communications. Materials and communications are being created centrally for all PeopleSoft users on all campuses. There will be one short overview demo video and six job aids. The job aids will be housed on the PeopleSoft landing page in MyU.

OIT will send emails to all PeopleSoft users on all campuses using a system-wide email template. Messages will start one month prior to go live date (once determined) and sent weekly.

Additional communications include attending standing meetings to provide demonstrations and including information in regular emails.

Undergraduate education agenda items

ICT Committee Recommendations

Sarah Ihrig provided an overview of key issues and recommendations from the work of the Inter-College Transfer Committee. More detail is available in the presentation and handout.

The ICT Committee was charged by the Advising Steering Committee to recommend improvements to the ICT process on the Twin Cities campus to ensure a seamless and effective process that promotes student success. The committee met from November 2017 to May 2018 and developed recommendations based on a review of current processes and policies.

The specific charge of the committee included:
- Reviewing the current ICT process and identifying existing gaps and/or barriers
- Identifying improvements to current processes, resources, communications, and timely handoffs
- Identifying common standards across campus that help to streamline the ICT process where possible
- Recommending strategies and processes to support students denied second-tier admission to ensure their success in an alternative major

The issues and recommendations are divided into three categories that match the student experience: pre-admission, admission, post-admission/decision notification.

Pre-admission

Students need clear, easy to find information about the change of college (ICT) process, admission requirements, degree requirements and time to degree completion for their prospective majors. This information and the terminology used can vary from college to college.

The committee recommendation is around using consistent terminology and having clear contacts for students within the college (e.g., improvements in making the information available). Also having information about deadlines and timeline as well as data on the number of students who apply and who are admitted (such as what is available through CAPE). The information on CAPE is good, but not necessarily where students would go to find the information, particularly if they already know which program they want to transfer to.

Admission process

There are several identified issues.

- There are differences in process (e.g., some colleges require an application supplement). This can be remedied with clear communications as well as internal processes within each college (e.g., if a supplement was received, lack of the Change of College form shouldn't be a barrier).
- There is a lot of different terminology (i.e., "change of college," "adding a major," "adding an additional degree program") and there are different forms for each one. This could be remedied by having one form that allows the student to describe what they want to do and then have it route appropriately.
- There is no consistent process for working with students who are transferring within the University and have a probation or suspension hold on their record.

Post-admission/decision notification

The onboarding process for new ICT students varies among colleges. This creates a difference in the services and assistance that incoming ICT students receive (it is very different from the robust orientation process for students new to campus). This can make it difficult for incoming students to know what to expect from the transition and how they access advising in their new college.

There is also an issue communicating with students who are denied admission. There is the possibility of adding a note in APLUS so their current advisor can work with them. Additionally, including information about CAPE in the denial notification could be helpful so that they have a resource for next steps.

Future direction

The committee recommends student involvement as websites, forms, and other communications are updated.

Future work is also needed on larger issues related to the differences in admission criteria among the Twin Cities colleges and how that access can affect student retention and graduation rates. The committee did not address these issues.

Next steps

Sarah will be working with college representatives to revisit recommendations related to college communications and processes. The Advising Steering Committee will get a "to do" list for their units. ASR will be involved in working on central processes and forms. Work with ASR regarding the central processes and forms.

Update on usage of the common incomplete contract

Katie Russell provided an update on the common electronic incomplete contract that was launched last spring. More detail is available in the presentation.

The Workflow Gen form was launched before the spring 2018 grading period and was available for spring, summer, and fall in 2018. In that time, the University system had 3,064 "I" grades assigned. There were 676 approved incomplete contracts. The Twin Cities accounted for 2,277 of the "I" grades and 633 approved contracts. (Note: this includes duplicates when a student submits the form more than once for the same class.)

A total of 40 contracts were denied. The top reason was discussion with the instructor needed to happen first. Six contracts were denied for students who were able to complete the course within the term. One contract was denied in favor of using a departmental paper contract.

So far, questions to the Office of the Registrar have not been overwhelming and have largely been around deadlines and if this was a required process or if another could be used.

Feedback received indicated it is confusing for the instructor when a student submits multiple contracts for the same class. This is currently being addressed by adding student-facing language to the Workflow Gen.

Other feedback included suggesting allowing the student to enter the requirements for course completion so that the instructor could modify them (rather than requiring that information of the instructor). There is no planned action as a result of this feedback right now.

QUESTION: When the instructor adds what is required, does the student see that?
Katie: Yes. They are told it has been added and that they need to accept the contract before it is final.

QUESTION: With departments having different ways of storing contracts, is there is anything the faculty member needs to do with the department?
Katie: The completed contracts are stored in perceptive content and that fulfills the policy requirement (as the department has access to that content).

QUESTION: Will we be tracking the completed contracts vs. those who don't to see if there are better outcomes for the students who complete them?
Katie: Would need to work with ASR to look at the data.
Adrienne Bricker: Need to be cautious in assuming that another form of contract wasn't completed due to a lack of Workflow Gen contract.

QUESTION: Have there been issues with the breakdown of the WFG process (e.g., the student not clicking the button to agree to the contract)?

Katie: Not that we have heard questions about, there are non-completed contracts, but it is unclear why.
Adrienne Bricker: It would be interesting to see where they stop.
QUESTION: What happens to those contracts in limbo?
Katie: They will just sit there as WFG doesn't get cleared out.
QUESTION: Do the students get a communication that indicates that it isn't completed until they agree?
Katie: They do get an email after the faculty complete the requirements telling them they need to agree.

Transfer Articulation & Degree Audit project update

Santiago Fernández-Giménez provided an update on the TADA project. More detail is available in the presentation.

Since the last update, testing is complete on the audit engine and has started on self-service. Self-service has gotten to a point where they have been able to demonstrate it to various audiences. A proof-of-concept for audit display best practices is complete. Work on displaying course descriptions within APAS self-service has started and is being tested.

Upcoming work includes ongoing work with vendor to resolve defects; making decisions on best practices for navigation, language, and design; design and prototype options for transfer detail (part of phase 2); and prepare recommendations for audit data retention.

Santiago then showed the group visual examples of the type of changes that would be happening to APAS as a result of the project. This included a new tab within self-service to display the course history.

QUESTION: Does the course history show all of the courses in one view?
Santiago: Yes. And you can choose to filter.

QUESTION: Will we still refer to it as APAS report?
Santiago: Yes. We did a terminology study with students and the overwhelming response was to refer to it as APAS.

QUESTION: What is the timeline for training?
Santiago: We're still making our training plan because we're still determining what we need to train on. We know that those performing exceptions will need training. We will present at the advisor orientation training and are planning on visiting each college.

QUESTION: Is the graduation date on the display the EGT?
Santiago: Yes. If you have questions on what is displayed and new data coming in from PeopleSoft, can email tada@umn.edu and we can provide that detail.

Financial Aid & Degree Completion Project Update

Michelle Curtis provided an update on the project to stop federal financial aid for students who have completed degree requirements. More detail is available in the presentation.

Some details on communications are still to be determined (such as using Marketing Cloud or PeopleSoft communications). Will only message students with a loaded ISIR (FAFSA results sent to the University) for the current year. Currently planning on taking a snapshot once per term. Will evaluate how this goes the first year to see if more snapshots necessary.

First targeted contact will be approximately a year from graduation when the student is at 75% complete for their degree requirements (including in-progress courses). Currently proposing doing this in Nov/Dec and Apr/May to coincide with open enrollment and to reach them before they leave campus after the term ends. Message will provide students with information about their process and the implication for federal financial aid. They will be directed to contact their advisor to ensure they are on track to graduate.

Second targeted contact will be when the student is at 100% complete for degree requirements (including in-progress courses). This will be sent five days prior to the start of term to provide the student an opportunity to adjust their schedule as needed. The idea is to make sure they can complete minors, second majors, — not to drop a class to avoid degree completion. Message will inform student that they have met all degree requirements and will not be eligible for federal student aid for upcoming terms as undergraduate. A service indicator will go on for the subsequent term.

The are still working on the best way to handle situations where the APAS is wrong. They are also still working on determining appropriate contact for questions.

QUESTION: Are the students receiving 100% communication...is that only students without an EGT?
Michelle: It will be any student who will complete requirements at the end of that term with federal financial aid.
QUESTION: Doesn’t that mean that everybody graduating in that term would receive that email?
Michelle: It’s intended to reach the students completing the degree on an earlier time frame, but we’re running independently of EGT.
COMMENT: All students will be at 100% at some point.
Michelle: We’ll look a little more at that.

COMMENT: There are some departmental scholarships that has a requirement that they be eligible for federal financial aid, so this would affect those scholarships, not just the federal financial aid.
Tina: We would have to take a look at them.

Mid-Term Alerts Wrap Up

Adrienne Bricker shared a final update on the project aimed at improving the mid-term alerts process. There is more detail available in the presentation.

The final recommendations for mid-term alerts improvements fall into four different areas: terminology, communications, policy, and systems.

Terminology

There are several terms in use and that is confusing. Recommend using one term: “academic alerts” to encompass “mid-term grades,” “mid-term alerts,” “in-progress notifications,” and “progress reports.”

Communications

Continue with start of term policy email (to instructors) both fall and spring. Include language about benefits of providing the information and how it is subsequently used. Also continue to send a follow-up communication for those who are required by policy to provide the information, but have not yet.

An additional recommendation is to consider expanding recipient list beyond 1xxx-level. We have heard from advisors that it is important to have this information on how the student is performing across all their classes, not just the 1xxx ones.

Policy

Look at expanding the policy beyond 1xxx-level classes (possibly all) and beyond D, F, and N grades (possibly all). Would need to update the FAQ regarding systems (if not using PeopleSoft). Possibly adopt a provision Crookston added in the last year.

Systems

Recommend transition to using APLUS for academic alerts via either Canvas or “Instructor view” (there are advantages and concerns with each). Continue to require progress reports for student-athletes as this is working well with a high compliance rate.

Expected Graduation Terms and Discontinued students

Adrienne Bricker led a discussion around EGTs. More detail is available in the presentation.

The question: Should we change current practice so that EGTs are removed after the readmission or return from leave (rather than at the point of departure)?

COMMENT: How are we going to know that the college didn’t already update the EGT?
Adrienne: We wouldn’t. We would need to have a process or understanding on when the college could make that update

COMMENT: What about if the student was graduating, but completing their last class off campus (at another college or learning abroad, etc)? We have had students in those situations where the EGT was removed and the student was discontinued as we were waiting for those grades to come in. The EGT being gone slowed us down in clearance process.
COMMENT: I would second that. I had a student with an incomplete and when the grade was entered, I couldn't clear them for a few days instead of that afternoon because the row was gone.

Second question: Should we figure out how students can see their EGTs?

COMMENT: Based on what we saw in TADA, seems like they will see it in APAS.
Adrienne: That will only appear in APAS once they have applied for graduation.

COMMENT: If students can't see their EGT, they won't know they need to change it.
Adrienne: Because we've been relying on "you" to know and change this.
Rachel: Once they've applied, they can see it in MyU.
COMMENT: If the expectation is that students have agency over their EGT, they should be able to see it.
COMMENT: Yes, along with some language about what it is and how to change it.

Meeting Adjourned