ACADEMIC SUPPORT RESOURCES
Office of Undergraduate Education

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Registrar's Advisory Committee

Monday, February 4
Prepared by Kate Sophia
Presentations

Updates to APLUS

Gerardo Orellana, a developer who works on APLUS, provided a brief overview and a demonstration of changes to web scheduling system within APLUS. The changes will go in place at the end of the month. (Additional detail in the handout.)

For those unfamiliar, the system allows students to schedule appointments with staff. It is connected with Google calendar, so it creates the appointment within APLUS and also Google calendar. The first version of the web scheduling system was deployed in 2013. The updates fall into three general categories:

- System performance — about 60,000 students schedule appointments online within APLUS, want to make sure the system is working fast enough.
- User experience and usability for both students and staff
- New features — these features were collected from feedback from units across campus

There is a new section added to contain a checklist of what an advisor need to do before they can start using web scheduling. It includes links to resources for completing outstanding steps.

There is the ability to have a student complete a custom intake/survey before they schedule an appointment. It is similar to Qualtrics in the types of questions that can be added and the logic of skipping questions based on responses. It also includes the option for file upload (e.g., for career services who would like the student to upload a resume before their appointment). There is the added ability to send something like a point of service questionnaire after the appointment is completed (e.g., asking for feedback on how the appointment went).

QUESTION: Will the point of service questionnaire work for other service units (e.g., 13 credit exemption request)?
Gerardo: Yes, so long as it is associated with an email template within APLUS.

Once the student completes intake, they can select from a list of advisors. There is the option to put appointment availability within a departmental calendar so that students won't be scheduling directly on personal calendar.

The calendar view for students is now mobile friendly. There is a small monthly view that indicates which dates have availability (so students don't have to click through each day). There are filters for specific types of appointments (e.g., appointments reserved for students on probation) as well as the option to select the first available appointment.

Whatever is in the google calendar description text for the appointment slot will appear in the appointment confirmation dialog box. Once confirmed, the student can use the same view to cancel or reschedule the appointment.

QUESTION: How does the point of service survey work so that it is automatically sent after the appointment?
Gerardo: It works the same as it does now, except that you can create/change questions on your own instead of asking for technical support to do it. After setting up the survey, it creates a link. Use that link in your email template in the notifications (the option for email student after attending appointment).

Approval of the December minutes

The December minutes were approved without changes.

Announcements

PeopleTools update in April

Kate Sophia announced that there would be an update to a component of PeopleSoft called "PeopleTools" in April. In the past, these updates brought fairly minor changes, but this one will bring significant changes to the navigation. Resources are being created and communications to various groups will start soon. A demonstration at the March RAC meeting is planned.

NameCoach update

Julie Selander provided an update on the NameCoach project. The project is on track and focused on Canvas integration and commencement activities. This should be implemented in spring term in time for commencement. Current activity includes usability testing and commencement coordinators across all campuses meeting.

Earlier summer registration

Julie Selander reminded the group that last year the start of the summer registration queue was moved from mid-April to early March. The consensus is that this was a helpful change for students and those who need to plan for staffing resources. It helped to spread out appointments for advisors. We will continue this pattern for the start of the summer registration queue:

- March 7 for degree-seeking students
- March 14 for non-degree/visiting students

University email activation for students

Stacey Tidball announced that the Office of Information Technology is not deactivating student email accounts at the moment. There is the intent to take on a project to discuss the deactivation rules, but it is behind other large projects (such as the current DUO effort).

April RAC meeting schedule - Adrienne Bricker

Adrienne Bricker asked the group about a possible change to the RAC meeting scheduled for April. The first Monday in April is the 1st, which coincides with a major professional conference that many ASR meeting participants will be attending. There was group consensus for moving the meeting to a week later.

The April RAC meeting will be held Monday, April 8. The March meeting will remain on March 4.

Kate Maple retirement

Sue Van Voorhis announced Kate Maple is retiring and then read a poem she wrote highlighting Kate's many contributions and collegial attitude.

Grade change queries for degree clearance and probation/suspension

Adrienne Bricker and Bavi Weston provided an overview and a demonstration of two new queries related to grad changes. (See also the presentation.)

Bavi said that it can be challenging to not know when a grade change happened, particularly related to the degree clearance process. Rather than monitoring students' records and repeatedly checking to see if there was a change, you can save some time by running a query. The query can run by unit or by advisor. It was created as a query rather than a report so that the data is always live.

Adrienne provided the pathway and names of the queries and recommending adding them to your favorites:

Navigation: PeopleSoft > Campus Solutions > Reporting Tools > (Query) > Query Viewer
Query names:

- UMSR_GRADE_CHANGE_BY_EGT_PUB
- UMSR_GRADE_CHANGE_BY_AS_PUS

Bavi said the results of the query are in a spreadsheet automatically downloaded (though it can take a little time to run). Details in the spreadsheet for the first query include the advisor, the class, the grade before the change and the grade after the change, and the date the change was made.

Adrienne said that the second query is designed to be helpful with academic standing in particular and includes service indicators. Under service indicator if the column is blank the student is in good academic standing.

QUESTION: Could this be helpful for tracking when new transfer credit is posted?
Adrienne: This is just reading on the grade table, which doesn't have transfer credit details, but maybe we could look at this after the TADA project
QUESTION: This is another Admissions report that already exists, maybe EGT could be added to that report.

QUESTION: How are the two queries different?
Adrienne: One does not key off of EGT at all, the other requires EGT. One includes academic standing the other does not.
COMMENT: It would still be helpful to have EGT on the report that doesn't require EGT as a datapoint.
Adrienne: We can explore if it makes sense to include discontinued students

Adrienne encouraged the group to keep in mind that public queries related to transactional data can be created if they could be helpful to your work. Contact her (abricker@umn.edu) if you have ideas.

2018 One Stop Student Satisfaction Survey results

Julie Selander presented the results of the latest annual survey of students on their satisfaction of their experience with One Stop Student Services. (See the presentation for more detail.)

This survey is done in the fall each year and is sent to any student who had interaction (email/phone/in person) with One Stop in October. This year, 437 students responded.

Highlights of the results:

- All measures saw a positive increase of 3-10%
- 86% of respondents were satisfied overall with One Stop
- There were similar satisfaction levels in four customer service metrics:
    - Knowledge (85%)
    - Efficiency (86%)
    - Empathy (84%)
    - Welcoming (86%)
- Satisfaction is also measured by how the student interacted with One Stop:
    - In person (92% - usually higher than other modes of interaction)
    - Phone (82% - biggest increase over last year)
    - Email (81%)

Some of the increase in satisfaction may be attributed to work One Stop did in the past year on being more welcoming and focusing on diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts, in addition to being fully staffed and have very few system issues this past fall. One Stop is looking to build upon positive results and find other ways to improve.

Julie said this may be the last time an annual survey is completed like this, looking to get more regular feedback with smaller “pulse” surveys throughout the year.

QUESTION: Has there ever been a survey of staff users of One Stop?
Julie: We have, but it has been a while (maybe eight years) and targeted units such as housing, bookstore, and staff in collegiate units we interacted with more frequently. We can take a look at surveying staff again, but please do not wait to provide any feedback you have about your experiences. Julie can be contacted at goode021@umn.edu.

Credentialing standards / CEU Update

Sandy Nelson, a business analyst in Academic Support Resources and team lead for the Destiny One registration system, provided information on an effort to review the approval and awarding of Continuing Education Units (CEUs), Certificates and Digital Badges for non-academic programs at the University. (See the presentation for more detail.)

More than a year ago, Provost Hanson asked for a review of CEUs and what standards are in place for non-credit offerings. A working group of 16 volunteers (representing colleges and business units) reviewed current practices to determine if there is a problem and, if so, what should be done about it.

The group discovered that there are different sets of standards and criteria across University departments for the approval and awarding of CEUs, certificates, and digital badges. This inconsistency can result in a lack of confidence by learners and employers in the quality of instruction and learning outcomes.

The group articulated a need to define common standards for CEUs, certificates, digital badges for the University. They also articulated a need to define the assessment of worthiness and a process to validate standards are being adhered to and met. They then drafted standards recommendations for CEUs and certificates, digital badges, and external processional accreditation.

The group had additional recommendations:

- A website to house the standards
- A form to assist with determining if an activity meets standards criteria
- At least one contact in each college and business unit
- A form for the Attestation of Adherence that could be stored centrally and be available for audit
- A plan for creating awareness of the standards and related processes

The benefits of following the recommendations include ensuring confidence and value in the training/offerings for learners, employers, credentialing associations, licensing bodies, and others.

Faculty and Staff will also benefit from having a set of tools and information available to them to determine the creditworthiness of an activity.

Challenges to completing this work include answering the question of if there should be University oversight of the process; website maintenance (content, hosting, responsibility), oversight of the Attestation of Adherence, support for colleges/business units without the personnel to review/approve proposed activity (CCAPS provided this in the past, but is not currently funded to do this work).

Negotiated Rulemaking

Tina Falkner gave an overview of "Negotiated Rulemaking" — a process the U.S. Department of Education (ED) uses to propose new regulations for federal student aid programs authorized under Title IV in the Higher Education Act. Tina is one of the participants in this round of negotiations. (See the presentation for more detail.)

The process is usually very narrow and scope with a goal of reaching consensus by the end of a defined period of meeting. If there is no consensus at the end of the allowed timeframe, ED is empowered to write the regulations. The regulations are then circulated for comment for 90 days (Tina, believes it is 90 days but will confirm). The process this round has been run differently than others in the past, including starting with redlined regulations before discussion and a very restricted list of participants. There is only one representative from a consumer protection perspective and there are no state-level representatives (e.g., state attorneys general).

In this round of negotiation, there are a lot of unrelated topics (full details linked in the presentation).

- Expanding accreditation — looking to decrease the monopoly of regional accreditors. This would increase the pool of accrediting organizations, possibly with differing standards.
- Eliminating the definition of the credit hour — this was defined initially to stop credit creep. The stated purpose of eliminating the definition is to increase innovation in higher ed. It seems to be the first step on the pathway to a mandatory transfer of credits from other institutions.
- Changes to TEACH Grant — addressing some errors that resulted in grants being converted to loans (these are good changes and very welcomed by the higher education community)
- Re-defining "substantial" interaction for distance learning — appears to be looking to decrease the requirements
- Expanding the ability to participate in Title IV financial aid programs by non-accredited entities

Some possible outcomes for this round of negotiations could be weakening accreditation standards, setting a path for mandatory transferring of credits, weakening student protections and exposing students to more "bad actors."

If this concerns you, you can share your concerns with Tina (rovic001@umn.edu), comment this summer when the regulatory language is made public, and/or contact your representative and senator.

QUESTION: Could we write templates for helping people comment when the regulations are available in July?
Tina: Yes. Our representatives pay attention to us when we contact them.

Policy update

Stacey Tidball gave a short update on current policy work. (See the presentation for more detail.)

SCEP has completed its review of the Academic Calendar policy. There were no major changes. One change is that the official end date for fall term was removed from the policy to have it be parallel to spring (which did not have a date listed). This policy will move on to the Policy Advisory Committee.

SCEP is also reviewing the syllabus statements appendix to update the language regarding sexual misconduct policy. There has also been discussion about how to incorporate this information in syllabi (e.g., copy/paste the full appendix vs. a link to the information).

COMMENT: Students don't click on/visit links and don't read language, but there is a value in having the conversation at the start of the semester. Faculty haven't been given good guidance on how to convey those messages at the start of the semester.
Stacey: There has been some conversation about that. One point is that at the start of term, students don't necessarily have the attention for the topics, but having the information in the syllabus provides a reference point of where to look if they end up encountering a problem.

SCEP is considering a resolution to use Canvas to share syllabi with university community (e.g., students who are considering their options for which class to register for). Faculty would not be required to participate, but this would take advantage of the large number of syllabi already in Canvas.

There is an upcoming review on the policies for withholding diplomas and official transcripts and holds on records and registration. If you have thoughts about these policies, Email Stacey (tidball@umn.edu) with your thoughts.

Undergraduate education agenda items

Academic Standing - Adrienne Bricker

Adrienne Bricker provided a short update on efforts to ease the burden of staff around this academic standing process. (See also the presentation.)

A number of collegiate representatives have volunteered to work on this effort. Have learned that it is not as simple as turning on the old reports as the tables referenced in those reports were retired as part of the Upgrade several years ago. Currently doing some analysis to see how business needs can be met. If technical work is needed, it will need to be scheduled. When that timing is known, the group will reconvene.

Midterm alerts update

Adrienne Bricker gave an update on efforts to improve midterm grading. (More detail in the presentation.)

There has been some improvement in communications around mid-term grades and that work will continue. Information about mid-term grades was added to a start-of-term email with policy reminders. The intent is to prepare instructors in advance for the reporting requirement. Also improving the email about submitting mid-term grades. Using consistent language around "mid-term grades" as that what it is called in the system, and providing additional context around the purpose of mid-term grades and the implications for students.

The workgroup has also reviewed existing systems and alternatives to PeopleSoft for submitting mid-term grades. The Morris campus is using APLUS ("instructor view") and there is a lot of positive feedback about how that works. It is possible that will be the phase two solution for this project. It allows for multiple reports in a term and provides more information than just the grade. Some wished for a free form area to input information, the option to upload grades from a spreadsheet, and an automatic notification to students.

The Advising Steering Committee provided feedback indicating that a grade is helpful, but timely information is more important as is knowing about student attendance.

Instructors have provided feedback that it is a pain point to submit the information both in PeopleSoft and the Athletic System and that terminology continues to be challenging.

Next steps for this effort include demonstrating the APLUS instructor view for the Advising Steering Committee, reviewing the Athletic system and the CEHD system, and a comprehensive review of training and support materials to ensure they are clearly communicating what they need to. Also hearing from the advising community that having only 1000-level courses isn't as helpful when assisting students, so we may ask SCEP to look at policy regarding this.

Financial Aid & Degree Completion project update

Michelle Curtis and Amber Cellotti provided an update on the Financial Aid and Degree Completion project. (More detail in the presentation.)

Amber said they have received feedback that it is important to communicate to students early enough for them to plan appropriately and be clear on:

- What types of aid are affected,
- The difference between completing requirements and graduating
- The impacts to minors, second majors

Michelle said that communications will start with the student's first financial aid notification (FAAN) so that they start hearing that there are limits to federal financial aid early in their career. Currently working on "point in time" communications. One will be approximately 75% degree progress (including in progress). The other will be when degree requirements are met (100% degree progress, including in progress). This means that something will be going out this semester for some students.

Michelle also said that a service indicator will be used to track students reaching the point of needing federal aid stopped.

Transfer Articulation & Degree Audit project update

Santiago Fernández-Giménez provided an update on the Transfer Articulation and Degree Audit project. (More detail in the presentation.)

A launch date for the first phase of the project has been selected: June 30, 2019. This will be for the implementation of the new platform for APAS.

A development request has also been submitted to allow students to see course descriptions from within APAS. For example, if a course is listed as an option to fulfill a requirement, the student will be able to read the description from within APAS and not need to look it up in the course catalog separately.

System testing progressing. The team is still working with the vendor on a defect related to quarter-to-semester conversion, but that is nearly resolved.

Upcoming work includes ongoing defect resolution with the vendor, completing batch configuration, and working on best practices for language and design of the APAS report. The timing of when that work will be realized will be in two phases. Some will happen right away with the launch on June 30:

- "Look and feel"
  - Background color and font
  - Symbols for status of requirement
- Some changes to how PeopleSoft data is used
  - FT and IP labels will show
  - Grading basis of FT and IP courses will show
  - Service indicators will not show

Other changes will change over time, by program:

- Making text title or sentence case
- Changes to terminology

- Changes made to requirements, language, etc. through APAS encoding

We will be working on communicating these changes, but it is good to have an awareness now that not all of the best practices will be immediately in effect when phase one is complete.