Undergraduate Working Group Meeting Minutes
November 24, 2015 - 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Student Commons Building – SC1401

Attendees:
Shana Bergen, Linda Brooker, Ashby Butnor, Sarah Carr, Kim Clark, Maryam Darbeheshti, Hailey DeMarr, Camden Farmer, Jeff Franklin (chair), Nimol Hen, Genia Herndon, Karin Hunter-Byrd, Martina Juarez-Lopez, Sam Kim, Marisa Ligons, Patty McKissock, Kate Miller, Sandy Mondragon, Gwen Persons, Florian Pfender, Scarlett Ponton, Nora Scanlon, Kate Seppala, Megan Steelman, Angela Vandijk, Mary Baitinger (recorder)

1. Consultative Item – Karin Hunter-Byrd and Nimol Hen: Implementation and usage of Starfish

Introduction: What is the University’s vision and mission statement for the campus? Who determines the business practices and policies? How will departments and resources be involved?

Background: Starfish will potentially replace the Early Alert system that is currently in place. Jeff Franklin asked how many attendees have participated in the Starfish demos recently held. SF has the ability to unite the campus under a single tool and could be used to share communications, advising, financial aid, and Canvas-generated programs. Upper administration will be buying two modules, and it has been endorsed by Raul Cardenas. The timeline currently in place is to implement SF is in the fall of 2015.

Discussion: Numerous conversations about Starfish and questions (with some answers) were generated during the discussion. Topics included: Demos very effective; who is making the decisions to implement (answer: top down); does SF tie into CU-SIS; Dorothy Horrell (incoming chancellor) will address concerns about the tool itself, once she has previewed it and is on board; Ashley and Chad are resources for SF and the data analytics team; SF will have a two year initial commitment; implementation will occur slowly and a pilot group formed; what kind of modules will be available for use (answer: scheduling, communications, and tracking analytics light); levels of user access; FERPA issues need to be addressed (answer: SF used by over 300 universities, and the company is continually fine-tuning FERPA and accessibility); comparability with the CU Boulder system; Boulder is launching their program in February, 2016; UIS is changing vendors for Singularity, which may impact SF; register office concerns; when will there be coordination (answer: directions from Ingrid); migration of current material into SF; and other groups on campus have systems they want to implement (ex. advising offices), but they may wait for SF.

Next Steps: Genia Herndon will take the discussion points and questions back to Raul. Further demos and participating in the pilot group will be updated by Kate Miller (OIT/CU Online). Both will return to the UWG with further details, preferably before Boulder launch.
2. Informational Item – Kim Clark: Follow up to 10/27/15 Consultative item – Uniform, campus-wide student withdrawal policy and procedures

Introduction: Technical, anecdotal information, and data about the volume of drops that are done.

Background: “Dropping” and “Withdrawing” from courses has two different meanings in departments and across campus—needs clarification and common usage. Students also need to better understand receiving a “W” on a transcript and the reimbursement policy. In play also is withdrawing due to academic dishonesty. There is a lack of consistency with multiple drop dates, the declared or undeclared major, and what signatures (or not) are required. Kim Clark brings to the group data she has collected regarding this topic.

Discussion: Kim handed out packets she generated regarding semesters 2151 and 2157. Kim emphasized that a drop of any course after the census date will place a “W” on students’ transcripts and they will be financially responsible. These are entered manually, with an average of 1,300-1,700 per semester. The dean’s signature will still be a requirement after the 10th week, even though signatures cannot be verified. At Boulder, dropping a course does not need instructor approval. Anecdotally, Boulder has had no problems, and the number of drops did not increase significantly. Dropping classes through the portal is an ongoing discussion at the CU Denver campus. If implemented, an idea would be for students to either take a tutorial or click extra buttons to verify the consequences of doing so. Permission numbers to drop might also be used, in the same way to add a course. The 10th week cutoff rules and who can drop has been a challenge for students, as the booklet provided for them is complicated and each major has its own deadlines/required signatures. Jeff Franklin suggested a smaller working group to address and design a campus-wide policy and report back to the UWG with their results.

Next Steps: Kim will consult the message calendar at CU Boulder and determine the type of wording that is being used for dropping courses. Jeff Franklin will have Mary Baitinger solicit names from the UWG and pass them on to anyone interested in chairing the subcommittee.


General Announcements None.

Next UWG Meeting: Tuesday, December 22, 2015 – 8:30-10:00 a.m. – SC 1401
1. Is the issue you bring (please circle/highlight one number): 1) consultative; 2) informational.

2. If consultative, could you please state the issue as a question to the group (or as a decision under deliberation that would benefit from consultation)?

3. If informational, could you please state the issue in 3-10 words? Could this be delivered via 1) e-mail or 2) as a printed announcement at the end of the UWG agenda?

4. To which people, units, or offices does this issue most pertain (who should we especially invite to attend the meeting where this issue is discussed)?

5. What’s the immediacy factor on this? (circle/highlight one number): 1) high priority and/or short deadline; 2) medium priority and/or medium deadline; 3) low priority and/or no big hurry.