

**Campus Solutions
Campus Community FUG Minutes
Wednesday, June 10, 2009
2:00 p.m.**

Present:

Admissions & Recruitment

Lacey Madison (WSC)

Student Records

Mona Breuer (NDSCS)

Rhonda Kitch (NDSU)

Financial Aid

Rohit Kulkarni (UND)

Laurie Weber (MiSU)

Student Finance

Janet Reisenauer (DSU)

Campus Solutions

Mary Bergstrom

Sheri Gilbertson

Gar Narum

Absent:

Student Finance

LaDonna Malachowski (MiSU)

Human Resources

Ann McGray (NDSCS)

Financials

Allison Peyton (UND)

Board of Higher Ed

Julie Schepp

Admissions & Recruitment

Karla Gabriel (BSC)

Guests:

Chelsey Larson (UND Student Finance) and Deb Ott (Campus Solutions)

Old Business

Guest role- Mary Bergstrom reported that there is no new development on this topic. This issue is still with Mick Pytlik and the CAC. Mary suggested that interested campus representatives may want to contact the CAC to move this forward.

Photo access-As of this time, no request has come forward from Student Records to develop a separate role for photo access. Mona Breuer will follow up with Suzanne from the Records FUG to see what the status is on that request.

Reduction of race ethnicity categories to the reporting categories-Student Records has not submitted a formal request or DR for the race ethnicity categories be changed to only allow only the 7 or 8 choices now listed on the Common Application. Lacey asked that Mona speak to the Records FUG about adding this item to their agenda for the June meeting.

Open self service for students to re-identify race/ethnicity- Gar Narum said Bundle 13 which will be installed at the end of June/early July will include an update to the race ethnicity fields to allow students to be able to re-identify themselves. The timing of the update will give us a chance to review and test this option before we open it up for student use. We control when the option to re-identify is turned on or off and it has been proposed that schools may want to turn this option on for a few weeks in the fall after bundle 13 is loaded. This is occurring due to changes to the IPEDs definition race/ethnicity questions.

New Business

Home Address not automatically populating when students apply online- This issue was brought forward from Student Finance. Janet Reisenauer clarified that many campuses tell students that home addresses are used for things like 1098Ts and other things related to billing. If the address isn't populated, this creates some confusion for students in regard to where the statements are sent.

Chelsey Larson from UND clarified that UND relies heavily on home address and they communicate that home address is used for most mailings. Mary Bergstrom said the Complexity Group will be meeting June 11 to consider redefining the address types. Lacey asked that this issue be tabled until after the Complexity Group discusses the address usage.

Request to have the Student Center be the default page for students after login- Gar Narum reminded the group that announcements are currently posted on the first page after login. Gar indicated that it may be possible to revise the Student Center page to include a link to announcements that currently are placed on the page that appears immediately after login. Gar suggested that we may want to gather students together to ask them for input on this subject to determine if we really have a problem with students finding the Student Center. Lacey asked if the various module reps would bring this issue back to the user groups for more input in regard to whether other modules feel that we have an issue.

Updating preferred email to Campus Email Address-Lacey received a DR request from the Records Group that would update the campus email as the preferred email. During the admissions process, admissions currently chooses a preferred email, but there is concern that those emails become obsolete after the student enrolls and many campuses are requiring Campus Email as their official means of communication.

Gar provided explanation and clarification of the current DR that has been submitted and a similar one that was proposed previously, along with a summary of some of the pros and cons of approving this request:

It appears that the difference between the DR dated 8/22/08 'Mod to Campus Email Load Process' and the DR dated 1/21/09 'Process to make Campus Email Preferred' is a change to create a process to make the Campus Email address type preferred, regardless of any other selection. This process could be run at anytime, at the discretion of the institution.

While this process would solve the problem of the proper addresses being selected during the 'Notify' process, there are some concerns with this approach.

A student can't change their Campus type email address or anything associated with it, including making it preferred. However, they can add other addresses, and mark them as preferred. For example, a student has two email addresses, Campus (marked as preferred) and Other. If they choose to update Other, and mark Other as preferred, the Campus email address would have the preferred tag removed. While the user hasn't directly updated the Campus address, indirectly, it has been updated.

When the preferred process runs, then tag would then switch from Other back to Campus. At this time, the preferred tag then becomes 'our' preferred tag, not the users.

It may be advantageous to change the necessary processes that use the Notify button (Class Roster, Advisee List and Grade Roster, in particular) to select the Campus email address type, regardless of the preferred tag. If the Campus email address type is that mission critical, then the application would be guaranteed to select the proper address.

This does cause a problem, in that some campuses may not be moving to make the Campus email address type the official notification email address.

Having a consistent method of selecting correct email addresses for notification is a good policy to have, and either DR is a step in the right direction. It may be worthwhile to have a discussion on the direction of Campus email address/preferred address and how it fits in with not only the Notify process, but also with the place that official notifications should be sent, in terms of email addresses.

Mary expressed a concern in regard to students who are at more than one campus. Lacey asked whether the modules need to have input into this topic. Janet asked whether this decision may need to be made at a higher level such as at the CAC to avoid unintentional consequences for other campuses. Mona expressed concern that it may need to be decided by the modules anyway. Lacey asked that each of the committee members discuss this proposal with members of their campus and their module and report back at the next meeting.

Next meeting is scheduled for July 15 at 1pm.

Meeting adjourned at 3pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Weber