SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY EDWARDSVILLE

New REALITY Efficiency Work Team Report
January 2014

Work Team: Efficiency Work Team

Chairpersons: Jeff Chitwood and Anita Joy

Team Members: Zenia Agustin, Susan Breck, Debbie Brueggemann, Jeff Chitwood, David Heth, Anita Joy, Vicki Kruse, Martha Latorre, Chris Leopold, Jodi Olson, Tim Schoenecker, Ian Toberman, Angie White, Susan Yager

The SIUE New REALITY Efficiency Work Team was charged with the task of "retooling our processes for speed and adaptability," the primary intent being to identify internal processes that could be streamlined in order to enhance efficiency and effectiveness. Robust discussions during our initial meetings clarified for the work team that our task could not be restricted to a single area of focus; the sub-team initially identified more than 35 individual internal processes that could be improved. In order to efficiently tackle the task at hand, we formed five sub-teams (see Appendix 4) to address the prioritized processes. For reporting purposes, we clustered the identified areas of concern into 3 broad processes that may greatly benefit from a more streamlined approach – **(1) Curricular Processes, (2) Admissions and Registration Processes, and (3) Technology Processes.** In this report we present short-term and long-term initiatives for each of the 3 clustered categories targeted at improving efficiency.

The co-chairs of the SIUE New REALITY Efficiency Work Team recognize that the task assigned to us was daunting, to say the least. We sincerely acknowledge and place on record the tremendous hard work, commitment and unique contributions of the work team members, whose combined efforts helped compile and collate the recommendations put forward in this report.

> **Summarize what SIUE has been doing in the area under consideration by your work team. Please investigate the scope and success of SIUE's prior efforts.**

(1) Curricular Processes

(1A) Curricular Change Process:

The current curricular change approval and form completion process at SIUE is cumbersome (see [Curriculum Council Operating Papers](#) and [Graduate Council Operating Papers](#)), and impedes our ability to meet short timelines for program changes mandated by accrediting bodies and/or legislation. The lengthy process also hinders our capacity to develop educational programs that strengthen our institutional portfolio when competing for student enrollment with private institutions.

(1B) Curricular Workflow:

As part of its Interim Report submitted in 2011, the AQIP "Curriculum Process Review, Improvement, and Implementation" Project Team recommended that the University adopt an electronic curriculum review process that would employ an electronic workflow software. At that time, the Project Team identified CurricUNet as a potential solution. The implementation of an electronic workflow has not yet been undertaken.

In November 2013, a group of stakeholders from ITS, the College & Schools, the Provost's Office, and Registrar's Office (including two members of the SIUE New REALITY Efficiency Work Team) participated in a webinar to learn more about CurricUNET's functionality and features, as it had been two years since the product was last reviewed by University constituents. Since then, Steve Huffstutler has indicated intent to schedule informational webinars with two additional vendors, Leepfrog and Curriculog. The expectation is that a decision regarding which product to adopt will be made in January 2014. It should be noted that the University currently utilizes SharePoint for the purpose of facilitating shared access to documents, discussion boards, etc., and Senates, offices, and departments involved in the curricular process have made use of SharePoint, with notable improvements in their ability to track progress toward approval. One limitation of SharePoint is that, while it has a workflow component, ITS has reviewed the component and determined that it is not robust enough to handle the complex conditional mapping required for the curriculum review process.

(2) Admissions and Registration Processes

(2A) Barriers to Registration:

One of the few ways that SIUE has to determine expected student persistence into future semesters is through the registration process for the upcoming academic semester. Our current system of registration at both the undergraduate and graduate level creates several barriers to that process, including:

- Various types of registration holds from campus offices (most often, from the Bursar, Financial Aid Office, Health Services, and academic advising units) that prohibit students from proceeding with registration
- Minimal communication between offices dealing with registration issues regarding student processes, responsibilities, and required actions; and
- Combination of electronic, paper-based, and manual registration processes that can limit class availability, provide students untimely or outdated information, or generally prevent a smooth, seamless, and structured experience for students.

Even prior to the formation of this sub-team, several offices were meeting to discuss changes to registration processes. Other items were adopted as a result of meetings between the sub-team and members of the Registrar's and Bursar's offices. Changes already in the implementation phase, or agreed to be implemented in the coming semester are as follows:

- Cancellation of registration for non-payment will be discontinued for graduate students (unless they owe prior term debt over $200). That will reduce the number of grad students dropped from classes for the upcoming semester.
- Students receive timely notification via their SIUE email and a mailed postcard: "Don't Forget To Register", "Don't Get Dropped", and "Are You Sitting This One Out?" so they are prompted to take action.
- Student workers are no longer dropped unless they owe prior term debt of over $200.
- The Bursar's Office contacts students with large unpaid balances during the semester as a courtesy to ensure that their financial aid has cleared. Students sometimes don't realize that they have to sign a promissory note or meet some other requirement before their aid applies, and are at risk of losing the aid if they wait too long.
- The Bursar's Office and the Director of Retention and Student Success informed unregistered freshmen that we will release the hold so they can register.
- Improved communication and understanding between offices regarding the role of payment dates (for students on the payment plan).
- Coordination of calendar dates that will avoid non-payment holds from going onto accounts before freshmen have a chance to register.
- Cooperation between the Bursar's Office and academic advising units that will identify students who are in danger of non-payment registration holds and/or non-payment cancellation from classes and allow advisors to consult with students prior to any negative registration action being taken.

(2B) Readmission Processes:

No current internal efforts to update existing processes for returning students (those who have not been enrolled for at least one year or three semesters) were identified. Discussions with staff from the Registrar's Office indicate that communication is sent to students who do not register for an upcoming term. However, there seems to be a lack of emphasis to proactively contact students who have stopped enrollment for more than one semester. In addition, we did not identify existing efforts to streamline or improve the admission and re-enrollment process for returning students.

(3) Technology Processes

(3A) Transactional Workflow:

It has been proposed that one way to harness unwieldy University processes into more efficient models might be to employ one or more workflow solutions. Some advantages of workflow software include transparency to stakeholders throughout the course of an action's life cycle, ease/automation/immediacy of communication among colleagues tasked with completing portions of a process, conservation of consumable resources (e.g., paper), decreased processing time, and an archive of completed decisions/tasks.

With the purchase and implementation of SCT's (now Ellucian's) Banner Student Information System, the University also purchased, but never implemented, Banner Workflow (see Appendix 3A). In a recent conversation with CIO Jennifer Vandever, she expressed that there may be an opportunity to explore implementation of Banner Workflow, as there is already a monetary allocation within the ITS Banner Student budget line for Banner-related initiatives.

(3B) E-ID Process and Identity Management:

The Graduate Admission Task Force submitted a report in November 2013 that identified the process of e-ID creation and maintenance as a perceived barrier in the graduate admissions and enrollment process at SIUE and provided recommended initiatives. ITS is currently engaged in the process of replacing the current identity management system. The scope of the project is large and will include analysis of the current e-id creation and maintenance process and potential updates and improvements. This project will lead to changes and updates to the existing process that focus on security, yet enhance user's experience with password management, sign-on, email account access, etc.

> **Describe promising models from other universities that could be modified, adapted or enhanced for our campus.**

(1) <u>Curricular Processes</u>

(1A) Curricular Change Process: Every college and university develops unique curriculum management processes. This is true even in cases where a given institution is part of a regional or statewide system. The nature of academic governance essentially requires such localized processes. **It is our belief that the overall curricular change process at SIUE needs revision.** Although some efficiency may be gained through implementation of technology, the current cumbersome process provides a competitive disadvantage for our University in comparison to competing institutions. The changing landscape of higher education demands a curricular change process that is responsive to immediate needs.

(1B) Curricular Workflow: Several universities utilize a curricular workflow solution, such as the CurricUNET System, that is designed to be configurable at the local level to reflect local requirements for course and program content, process workflows and report templates. If SIUE were to adopt a third-party workflow solution to streamline curricular processes, we would be joining many other institutions that have followed a similar path toward improving the efficiency of their curricular processes.

CurricUNET is used by four state-wide systems, including: the Illinois Community College System, comprised of 45 colleges; the California Community College System, comprised of 112 colleges; the Iowa Community College System, comprised of 15 colleges; and the Ohio Board of Regents, comprised of 203 public and private colleges and universities. St. Louis Community College is another local client. Examples of large, public, 4-year institutions include Arizona State University and Kent State University.

Leepfrog is used by the following representative institutions: UMSL, Washington University, Illinois Valley College, Carl Sandburg College, and University of Wisconsin – Green Bay.

Curriculog is used by Eastern Illinois University.

(2) <u>Admissions and Registration Processes</u>

(2A) Barriers to Registration: Many universities utilize a transactional workflow system (as addressed in the Technology Processes section below), which may be utilized to minimize several perceived barriers to registration.

(2B) Readmission Processes: Through web research, we identified several local/regional universities that offer returning undergraduate students a simplified application (or form); and all of the universities studied do not require a reapplication fee (i.e., SIUC, EIU, WIU, ISU, Missouri, and UMSL). We also identified several universities (i.e., SIUC, SEMO, IUPUI, University of Cincinnati, and Colorado State) that offer a "Fresh Start" or "Academic Renewal" program structured for returning students who left the University

with an unfavorable GPA (Examples: SIUC, SEMO, IUPUI, University of Cincinnati, Colorado State) to encourage re-enrollment and degree completion. Web research also indicates that some universities (i.e., Missouri S&T and UT Chattanooga) have a process to include transfer coursework in the institutional GPA, which may allow students to improve institutional GPA by re-taking equivalent courses at other regionally accredited institutions.

(3) Technology Processes

(3A) Transactional Workflow: In order to gather information from peer institutions, a 3-question survey was sent out to the Illinois Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (IACRAO) listserv asking the following:

1. What are the types of transactions for which you are using Banner Workflow (e.g., grade changes, course cancellations, etc.)?
2. What (if any) limitations have you experienced?
3. How long has it been in use at your institution?

Three institutions, Eastern Illinois University, University of Illinois at Springfield, and Harper College, responded. Examples of how they are using Banner Workflow include: admissions processing, grade changes, faculty course restriction and prerequisite overrides, program of study changes, notification of student deaths, and notification of student class attendance. None of the three respondents gave any indication of limitations they have experienced.

Additionally, by performing a web search, Temple University was identified as a large, public 4-year university that employs Banner Workflow to conduct transactional business, such as employee separation, new hires, off-matrix class schedule exceptions, change in major/minor, and grade changes. The benefits TU elucidates on its website (see Appendix 3B) include automatic notification to recipients, dashboards for accessing work queues, electronic signature/approval processing, and audit trails for completed transactions.

(3B) E-ID Process and Identity Management:

Web research was conducted to locate other universities with a website that clearly articulates the id creation and identity management process to multiple audiences. The website of the IT department at University of Nevada, Reno provides a great example that is user-friendly, addresses multiple audiences (students, faculty, staff, visitors), is visually appealing and clearly explains how to access pertinent technology and manage login id's (see Appendix 3B).

Using what you have learned, please outline innovative ideas of your own.

Working on the New REALITY project along with the passionate and dedicated professionals comprising our Efficiency Work Team has led to a number of insights including the following:

- Tapping into the collective knowledge, ideas and observations from a diverse team provides a forum for creative solutions and innovation.
- If our team is a representative sample of personnel throughout the University, then SIUE is full of potentially untapped ideas, suggestions and possible improvements that simply need a forum for submission.
- SIUE could benefit by creating a standing committee or other forum that encourages continued discussions in the area of efficiency and process improvement.
- Many of our team's ideas and suggestions (especially in the area of admissions, registration and communication) are based on perceptions of how current procedures impact student experiences. SIUE may benefit from development of an ongoing internal marketing research plan to assess students' experiences – paying special attention to topics not assessed by current institutional research benchmark surveys. This idea of creating an internal marketing research plan could be adapted to obtain faculty and staff feedback, as well.

> **Please describe two <u>short-term</u> initiatives that your team views as priorities for SIUE. You should include a rationale and description of resources needed.**

(1) <u>Curricular Processes</u>

(1A) Curricular Change Process:

Initiative #1 – Create Form 90 Submission Checklist (ACCOMPLISHED)

Completing Form 90s (90A Request to Add a Course, 90B Request to Drop a Course, and 90C Request to Modify a Course) accurately will expedite the approval process. The sub-committee recommends providing a checklist to aid faculty/departments in their efforts to submit complete and accurate information on the necessary forms.

This goal was *accomplished* in December, 2013. A checklist is now available on the Provost's website (http://www.siue.edu/provost/forms/pdf/CheckList.pdf), and the Provost's Office has notified the campus community about availability of this checklist.

Intitiative #2 – Create Fast-Track Queue for Minor Changes

Currently, minor changes (i.e., course name change, change in prerequisites, etc.) are in the same review queue as those with complex changes. We recommend the creation of a **fast-track queue for minor changes.** Creating a Form 90EZ for minor changes would be very helpful. Please see Appendix 1A with suggestions about how this might be accomplished.

(2) <u>Admissions and Registration Processes</u>

(2A) Barriers to Registration

Initiative #1 – Change Past-Due Account Bursar's Hold Process

Conversations are currently taking place about raising the amount of student debt (currently $200) that triggers a past-due account hold. There is concern about allowing students to accrue more debt, when they may already have problems paying current amounts. Since this change would not change the amount due, but instead the timing of when payment holds are applied to students, we do recommend the conversations continue and that a higher amount be considered.

(2B) Readmission Processes

Initiative #2 – Streamlined Application and Enhanced Communication for Returning Students

We recommend that staff resources from the Office of Admissions, Graduate School, Registrar, and Marketing and Communications work together to update the admissions application process for

returning students and enhance proactive communication as follows:

- Waive the $30 application fee for returning applicants.
- Utilize current staff and technical resources in admissions and registrar units to implement a streamlined application process by creating a simplified web application or brief form (eliminating the need to re-apply for admission).
- Enhance web presence and communication to increase opportunities to enroll returning students through the following:
  - On the admissions website, create a clear tab for Returning students. Currently, returning students must click through multiple pages before locating pertinent content.
  - Create and implement a plan to encourage students who have dropped enrollment to re-enroll.

Rationale: The changing landscape of higher education indicates increased opportunity for enrollment of non-traditional student populations. SIUE has a substantial number of students that have departed the University over the years for various reasons prior to graduation and may be interested in enrolling as returning students. By working to streamline the readmission process, SIUE may capitalize on additional enrollment, encourage degree completion and decrease admissions processing time.

(3) Technology Processes

(3A) Transactional Workflow

Initiative #1 – Consult with Ellucian to Explore Banner Workflow

We recommend that staff from the Registrar, ITS and other identified units actively pursue a consulting engagement with Ellucian within the next three months to explore implementation of Banner Workflow. The rationale is that the Banner workflow solution has the potential to improve delivery of student services, facilitate an electronic approval process that would reduce the number of forms students, faculty, and staff are required to complete in order to conduct University business, and enhance communication among colleagues through automated notification of action to be taken. Jennifer Vandever has verbally indicated that ITS is amenable to considering this option and committing dollars toward a consulting engagement.

If the Banner Workflow does not appear to provide the deliverables we expect, an alternative might be to explore in-house ITS development of custom applications that could approximate some aspects of workflow functionality. It has been established this fall that ITS has the technical knowledge within the existing Banner Student Analyst team to create customized web-based forms that draw on data stored in Banner tables. One example is the Tuition and Fees calculator that is in pre-production status and is expected to be launched by May 2014. Another example that is more relevant to the discussion of workflow is the Registration Hold Release feature, currently in pre-production status and expected to

launch in January 2014. This feature was developed by ITS using an Apex application to create a web-based process for advisors to use for releasing students' advising holds, making them eligible to register. It employs dynamic search, mass selection, and mass transaction capability and may be accessed by approved users within CougarNet. Furthermore, it has been built to include the option of launching an email application so that the person completing transactions may alert students to the action taken. While this is not precisely an automated notification system, it does approximate an automated system. This approach would require ITS to examine the University's existing IT priorities and determine whether the analyst(s) with this technical knowledge could be made available for development of additional web-based processes aimed at improving the efficiency of completing and communicating Banner-related transactions.

(3B) E-ID Process and Identity Management:

Initiative #2 - Enhance Communication of E-ID Process

We recommend that staff from the Office of Admissions, ITS, and Marketing and Communications work together to implement the following efforts aimed at enhancing communication and increasing understanding of this complex process during the interim period prior to the ITS implementation of a new system:

- Update the "Getting Connected at SIUE" piece (see Appendix 3B) sent to students in their admission packet by scaling back text content and increasing visual appeal.
- Utilize the content from the updated "Getting Connected" piece to enhance web presence (upload PDF or convert to html).
- Consider adding email communication to remind admitted students of e-ID creation process and introduce them to pertinent SIUE technology resources (email, CougarNet, Blackboard). This is especially important for new graduate, transfer and non-traditional freshman students who receive varying levels of guidance with this process (unlike traditional freshman who receive individual support at Springboard to Success).

Rationale: The changing landscape of higher education indicates increased usage and reliance on technology. Technology resources provide a vital role for students, faculty, staff, alumni and other university partners by enabling pursuit of SIUE's mission to communicate, expand and integrate knowledge. Resources, such as Cougarnet, SIUE email, Blackboard, wireless networks, computer labs and classrooms, rely on individual users to create and maintain an e-ID for login purposes – however, this process is not clearly understood by all audiences, especially those who are new to the University.

Please describe other short-term initiatives that your team would like to recommend.

       Due to the broad scope of our work team's charge to identify efficiencies for processes throughout all campus units, we have divided recommended initiatives into three categories and were able to include all short-term initiatives recommended by our sub-teams and team members in the prioritized short-term initiative section. Please note that our work team's initial brainstorm and topic discussion surfaced approximately 35 internal processes for consideration (see Appendix 4). Due to limited time, resources, and the need for prioritization we were unable to address several of these suggestions. However, all suggested topics are listed and archived as individual threads on the Efficiency Work Team Sharepoint site in the *discussion board* feature for future usage.

> **Please list and describe three <u>long-term</u> initiatives that SIUE should consider to improve in the area under consideration by this work team.**

(1) <u>Curricular Processes</u>

(1A) Curricular Change Process

Long-term Initiative #1 – Revise Overall Process and Review Operating Papers

It is our opinion that revision of the entire curricular change process is imperative to the long-term success of SIUE. Our University has grown and evolved over the years, the Schools deal with multiple accrediting bodies, and the current operating papers have been in use for a very long time. Are the Curriculum Council and Graduate Council Operating Papers still serving the intended purpose at SIUE? We suggest a critical review, keeping in mind current responsibility rather than blindly accepting what was previously considered appropriate oversight.

Long-term Initiative #2 - Create Department of Curriculum Development and Review

We recognize that the review of Curriculum Council Operating Papers needs to be addressed prior to consideration of this proposed long term recommendation. We also acknowledge that adopting a curriculum workflow solution (as proposed in section 1B) is a significant investment with large one-time and continuing costs. Therefore, we suggest formation of a Department of Curriculum Development and Review – an Ombuds office to assist with curricular process across campus – for support during the interim period while the University considers selection and implementation of a workflow solution and beyond. Recognizing that faculty members are not involved with the required forms often enough to become proficient, full time administrative and clerical staff would provide support to all departments and faculty in preparing and expediting paperwork related to curriculum development and review. This department will work closely with the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council and the Graduate Council.

(1B) Curricular Workflow

Long-term Initiative #3 – Select and Implement Curriculum Workflow Solution

Actively continue the selection process for a curriculum workflow solution. The rationale is that a curriculum workflow will improve transparency to stakeholders throughout the course of a curricular action's life cycle, simplify and automate communication among colleagues tasked with completing portions of the review process, promote sustainability and cost-savings by reducing the expense of consumable resources, decrease processing time, and allow archiving of completed tasks. Implement the selected solution within a year's time to optimize the University's ability to introduce new course content and curricular innovation that enhances the learning experience of our students in a more expeditious manner.

(2) Admissions and Registration Processes

(2A) Barriers to Registration:

Long-term Initiative #1 – Ensure Course Availability for Students Who Need Them Most

We acknowledge that current advisement, registration and curriculum planning procedures are intended to ensure student success, retention and degree attainment. Additionally, we recognize that anecdotal, yet real, feedback from students indicates these internal processes sometimes restrict registration in the courses needed most which may unnecessarily increase time to degree. As an institution of higher learning, it is our opinion that the University bears responsibility to eliminate administrative barriers inhibiting student success. However, we understand that due to the complex nature of university business, no policy or procedure – even those that are carefully crafted and continually updated – can take into consideration the wide-ranging needs of our diverse community. Therefore, we suggest a two-pronged approach to help ensure students have necessary support to enroll in those courses needed most for retention and graduation purposes:

1. **Create support position for students who face registration barriers**. This concept is modeled after a successful initiative proposed by the President of University of Nevada at Reno highlighted in a 2010 *Chronicle of Higher Education* article (see Appendix 2A). This position would have administrative authority to support academic advisors and students faced with registration dilemmas that are unresolved by traditional efforts. In addition to serving as a go-to contact for these individual dilemmas, the position could track and analyze common registration or course sequence issues and initiate resolutions.

2. **Re-visit the dropped course procedure for non-payment of undergraduates.** Conversations between pertinent units on campus have taken place regarding the current cancellation procedure to drop registration for students who fail to make the first required payment for the upcoming semester. A change to this process was recently initiated for graduate students, but no change is currently under consideration for undergraduates. We recommend that this issue be re-visited as part of a long-term strategy after the new cooperative process between the Bursar and advising units has been implemented. While dropping students from courses serves some University purposes (such as improving retention rates by eliminating "ghost" new students who registered but decided not to attend, and managing course section availability and capacities), the procedure may be improved by creating a long-term strategy that enables successful management of enrollment and course sections while minimizing barriers for students.

Long-term Initiative #2 – Create Team to Examine and Revise Waitlist Procedures

Waitlist procedures at SIUE create a significant hurdle to student registration and create a burden for staff in multiple departments. Included in Appendix 2A is a summary of waitlisting processes and procedures already in place at SIUE. The procedures have been in place for several years; and we recommend a critical review to examine the technological, pedagogical, registration and enrollment management impact of using the current de-centralized, manual process for creating, managing and using waitlists. We believe that changes in technology, student expectations, and staff availability have mitigated the current utility of waitlists. Therefore, we recommend that waitlist procedures be examined, changed and more centrally-managed, if not eliminated entirely.

(2B) Readmission Processes:

Long-term Initiative #3 – Create Team to Investigate Fresh Start Program

Create a team, including personnel from admissions, advising, registrar and academic units, to investigate creation of an Academic Renewal or Fresh Start policy for SIUE by either adapting the current Academic Forgiveness policy or creating a standalone program. The team should also consider an outreach plan for targeting potential students and work with Marketing and Communications to develop pertinent materials.

Rationale: The changing landscape of higher education indicates increased opportunity for enrollment of non-traditional student populations. SIUE has a substantial number of students who have departed the University, including those on academic probation or suspension, and who may be interested in re-enrolling in a degree program. This audience is not part of traditional recruitment plans and represents a sizable opportunity. Creating an Academic Renewal or Fresh Start program that is uniquely tailored for SIUE could increase total enrollment by encouraging the return of students who departed the University—particularly those who left due to past substandard academic performance that is not indicative of their current abilities.

(3) Technology Processes

(3A) Transactional Workflow:

Long-term Initiative #1 – Create Plan and Long-Term Strategy for Transactional Workflow

This long-term initiative is a continuation of the short-term recommendation to investigate transactional workflow opportunities with Banner Workflow or ITS development of custom applications. We recommend the formation of a team to compile and review processes within key departments that would yield the most immediate and substantial benefit from implementation of transactional workflow. This team would help select and implement a transactional workflow solution within one year. Creating a team that includes staff with technically-oriented responsibilities across campus (including but not limited to ITS, admissions processing, Registrar, advising and academic departments) will help

maximize the monetary investment in a transactional workflow solution by making it an enterprise solution utilized throughout the University.

(3B) E-ID Process and Identity Management:

Long-term Initiative #2 – Create and Implement New Identity Management Process

As previously mentioned, ITS is currently engaged in the establishment of a new process that will significantly improve the cumbersome process currently in place. We have included this initiative for added emphasis that we believe the implementation of a new system within an acceptable timeframe will significantly improve the user experience for all University partners, including students, faculty, staff and alumni.

Long-term Initiative #3 – Create Communication Strategy for SIUE Technology Resources

We recommend formation of a team from units including but not limited to ITS, Marketing and Communications, and the Office of Admissions to enhance communication that allows all audiences to easily access SIUE technology resources. As a minimum suggestion, the team should work to do the following:

- Create comprehensive web strategy for displaying SIUE technology resources in a manner that addresses all audiences including new and returning students, current faculty and staff, alumni, campus visitors and other stakeholders. See Appendix 3B for an example from the IT Department at University of Nevada at Reno.
- Consider adding multiple touch points (web and email) to not only encourage creation of required id and passwords, but guide users from the creation process immediately into a log-in process that provides a brief tutorial/overview of the existing resource (such as University email account, CougarNet, BlackBoard, etc.).
- Consider the location of SIUE technology icons on the SIUE home page to make the resources more prominent and easily accessible to all users, including new students and staff who are unfamiliar with the specific icons and resources

Rationale: The changing landscape of higher education indicates increased usage and reliance on technology. Technology resources provide a vital role for students, faculty, staff, alumni and other university partners by enabling pursuit of SIUE's mission to communicate, expand and integrate knowledge. Resources, such as Cougarnet, SIUE email, Blackboard, wireless networks, computer labs and classrooms, rely on individual users to create and maintain their log-in credentials – however, this process is not clearly understood by all audiences, especially those who are new to the University. Enhancing communication will help increase understanding and improve efficiencies throughout campus.

APPENDIX 1A: CURRICULAR CHANGE PROCESS

SIUE Documents Referenced in Report:

Curriculum Council Operating Papers
Link: http://www.siue.edu/ugov/faculty/curriculumcouncil/cc_operating_papers_2011_final.shtml

Graduate Council Operating Papers
Link: http://www.siue.edu/graduate/council/operating_papers.shtml

Form 90A: http://www.siue.edu/provost/forms/form_90a_2013.pdf

Form 90B: https://www.siue.edu/provost/forms/form90b_2013.pdf

Form 90C: http://www.siue.edu/provost/forms/pdf/form90c_2012.pdf

STREAMLINGING THE FORM 90S CURRICULAR PROCESS AND RESPECT A QUALITY REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Below may be a short term solution for the Form 90s approval process in order to respect the current oversight approval levels and keep a quality review and oversight in place for the Curricula approval process before deciding to make a drastic change in the approval oversight that may not be necessary or could cause some issues of coordination and tracking further down the road.

Forms with minor changes will be designated as EZ. Forms will have a timeline with deadlines for each approval oversight level across the top in an obviously visible place. There will be two types of SharePoint sites:

1) A SharePoint site for each School, Department, College Curriculum Committee: CAS, SON, BUS, ENR, PHAR, SOE and

2) A comprehensive SharePoint Site with Folders for each of the Schools, Departments, College for the Curriculum Committee Chairs or assigned person to upload the forms into which are approved by their committee. The comprehensive SharePoint site will be utilized by the Review Committees simultaneously: Undergraduate Courses Committee, Undergraduate Programs Committee, General Education Committee, Committee on Assessment and possibly the Graduate Council.

The Forms 90s will be revised to include a timeline of deadlines for each approval oversight level for constant awareness of deadlines to streamline the process in order to give respect to a quality review.

An EZ Form would be created or use current form with relevant areas grayed or marked for simple changes such as General Ed, one or two simple changes ONLY. Guidelines will be included with the instructions or prompts as the form is completed electronically by faculty/designated person. The EZ form would be flagged in order to expedite for a fast quality review.

Department, School or College faculty/designated person completes the form electronically and submits into a Department/School/College SharePoint site or a currently available site

The Department, School or College Curriculum Committee moves EZ forms in a fast track way after reviewed and signed by the Dean into a Comprehensive SharePoint site that includes folders for ALL departments/schools/college

REVIEW and APPROVE EZ Forms

FLAG approved forms for relevant Chairs to sign (General Education, Committee on Assessment and Curriculum Council).
*POWER 90S SESSION

Forms MOVE to the Provost's Office and Registrar's Scheduling Office.

The committee will work electronically simultaneously on the SharePoint site or a currently available site with ability to make visible revisions and add comments electronically for all committee members to see. At the end of the approval process, the form should be complete and accurate with all the revisions that were made. Once all the committees have approved, then the forms are flagged or a group email sent to relevant parties to converge into a POWER 90s SESSION FOR signing of the relevant Chairs for oversight approval. The revisions are available for the Chairs to see in hardcopy format attached to the original forms. forms are stacked as follows:

UCC only	UCC and General Education	General Education Only	CoA and UCC	CoA, UCC and General Education	Graduate

After signatures are attained, all forms are copied as two sided documents for filing posting in a spreadsheet in the Governance Office. The originals will move to the Provost's Office.

CurricUNET

A promising software tool to assist with processing and tracking the approval process is CurricUNET Curriculum Management. Every college and university needs to develop its own unique curriculum management processes. This is true even in cases where a given institution is part of a regional or statewide system. The nature of academic governance essentially requires such localized processes. As a result, the core **CurricUNET System** is designed to be configurable at the local level to reflect local requirements for course and program content, process workflows, and report templates. At the same time, CurricUNET can also properly interface local campus curriculum design components with both upstream and downstream systems, such as local student systems, multi-campus curriculum searches, state reporting standards, and similar requirements.

CurricUNET's most recent upgrade, **CurricUNET Meta**, further enhances and streamlines the user experience with advanced, customizable tools that are both highly intuitive and simply functional. New customizable modules designed to enhance curriculum processing include:

(i) CurricUNET Notifications, which provides notice about similar courses, text-book recommendations, and other convenient alerts;

(ii) CurricUNET Analytics, which provides ad hoc analysis of statistical summaries about all internal and external proposed courses/programs in database;

(iii) Lesson Planet, a repository and distribution center for instructor-to-instructor curriculum sharing;

(iv) CuricULINK, a higher education social networking module that enables educators in the network to contact and interact with one another.

CurricUNET's most recent upgrade, CurricUNET Meta, further enhances and streamlines the user experience with advanced, customizable tools that are both highly intuitive and simply functional.

The key components of the local implementation of CurricUNET Meta include:

- Integrated course and program/degree processing
- Web entry and edits from a custom dashboard with functional widgets and notification badges
- Automated workflow with real-time status reporting
- Configurable design with "drag and drop" screen elements to facilitate rapid implementation without re-programming effort
- Streamlined navigation tools with convenient bread crumb displays
- Standard report templates and ad hoc report writing tools
- Interfaces to other internal and external systems
- Facilitation of catalog production
- Web-based searches of local, state, and international curriculum databases

<h1 style="text-align:center">APPENDIX 2A: BARRIERS TO REGISTRATION</h1>

The following pages were prepared by this sub-team based on conversations with SIUE personnel.

BARRIERS TO REGISTRATION: WAITLIST DISCUSSION

While there are several barriers to student registration that occur before a student even can choose classes, one of the most significant occurs **after** a student has accepted the financial clearance, addressed any existing holds, and made financial arrangements to clear any outstanding issues with the Office of the Bursar. Waitlists present a serious barrier to student registration.

Background Information

Waitlists exist when a department has decided to allow students to enroll/express interest in a class that is beyond its actual capacity. Some departments use waitlists extensively; some departments choose not to use them. Some waitlists are maintained at a small number (i.e., 5 spaces on the waitlist), while others may be as big or even bigger than the actual class capacity.

When a class exists without a waitlist, the ability to register for the course in CougarNet remains "live." The seats available will accurately reflect the actual number of openings in the class and can be filled by any student who meets the requirement. If a student enrolled in this class drops the class through CougarNet, the class will immediately change from its "closed" status to an open registration status – a new student can register for that seat and the class will again close. The absence of a waitlist, then, presents a real-time picture of the class availability and ability to register to the student, the faculty, advisors, and the department.

When a class does use a waitlist, the information remains "live" in CougarNet only until the class officially fills the first time. Once the class closes, the waitlist will activate. Students can still drop seats, which will reflect in the "seats available" section. However, unlike the "live" classes listed above, adding the class only adds a student to the waitlist. In other words, a class may appear open, but in reality, the only option is a waitlisted seat.

Problems and Concerns with Waitlists

Waitlists present a basic registration barrier to students, as noted above. There are additional concerns that exist with waitlists that do not occur with non-waitlisted courses.

A faculty member may accept an additional student into a closed class without regard to the students on the waitlist.

For courses with waitlists, CougarNet misleadingly shows classes as "closed" even when the waitlist is technically open. The system allows students to add the class only through the "add class worksheet" function, rather than by clicking on the class as is the case normally. Many students may conclude that a course is unavailable, when in reality, options exist.

Finally, because waitlists are managed differently, a student may or may not know that s/he has ultimately been added to a class. According to our conversations, waitlists for some courses are managed by the Registrar's Office. For these classes, staff members will periodically move students from the waitlist into the class and notify the student via e-mail. The student's registration screen in CougarNet will also reflect the change, as would programs like Week at a Glance, Blackboard, etc.

Some departments maintain local control over their waitlists. In those cases, there is no central guiding philosophy or rule on waitlist management. Some departments will regularly move students off the waitlist and into the class. Some departments use waitlists only to gauge the "interest" in a particular class, but do not use it in placing students into the class. Some departments notify students; others do not.

Because a student is not actually registered for a class, students are allowed to register for more than one section waitlist for any given class. Some students may get into a section of one class, but then place themselves on the waitlists of other sections in hopes of getting a more preferred time. Students entirely blocked from a class often place themselves onto the waitlists for multiple sections in hopes of getting into the class.

In summary, depending on the class, a student who places her/himself onto a waitlist is not guaranteed a seat in that class, regardless of her/his ranking on the waitlist, and if moved into the class, may not be notified of the change.

According to our contacts, waitlist management is largely a manual process. Waitlists could be useful, if the management/information was centralized and Banner would automatically enroll the top person from the list any time there was a vacancy. Unfortunately, Banner does not have an easy and useable functionality that would allow for this to be done electronically.

Immediate Items for Consideration

- Until the larger waitlist question can be examined, immediately limit the number of students on a waitlist to a reasonable number.

- Find technological ways to manage how Banner represents/reports waitlists. Change the terminology when dealing with being added to waitlists. The action drop-down item currently reads "waitlisted" as an action option, rather than something more direct like "add to waitlist."

Short-Term Items for Consideration

- Elimination of waitlists. Some departments function well without them, and as noted, they create severe barriers to students without providing students any appreciable benefit. Going to a truly live system eliminates those problems and provides fairness to students in registration.

- Creation of "dummy sections." As noted, some departments use the registration process to gauge interest in courses. The way students use waitlists presents an inaccurate picture of actual interest/need. We can see value in creating options that would serve the interests of both departments and students. Creating TBA sections of relevant classes may be one way to do so. If registrants reach a certain threshold, the class could be activated; otherwise, it could be cancelled. We would need to communicate very carefully with those involved about the nature of this section.

- If waitlists are to be maintained, require University-wide policies on creating, updating, and notifying students as to their status. Require that students on waitlists be added to classes regularly and that waitlists also be honored during the two-weeks add/drop period at the beginning of each semester. As one option, consider creating a central point (likely in the Registrar's Office) for waitlist management, thus allowing for fair and universal treatment of students on waitlists. While we recognize the challenge in

mandating certain policies, the registration process is largely administrative in nature – and changing or discontinuing waitlists will not change the content of any class offered.

Long-Term Items for Consideration

The waitlist problem is more a symptom of a larger problem with class management and scheduling. For the long term, class scheduling (conflicting required courses, for example) and class sequencing in certain majors present major barriers to students being able to enter a degree, complete its requirements, and graduate within the four-year time period.

Finally, we encourage continued review and use of our technological resources for registration. Currently, once school begins, students must be signed into classes with a literal paper enrollment form. Banner has the capability to continue to allow for adding/dropping courses electronically, and if waitlists are ultimately eliminated, it makes sense to use the technology at our disposal. The tradition on campus of students traipsing from class to class in search of an elusive signature to get into a class sends a terrible signal about student centeredness, about our caring atmosphere, and about our technological capabilities. It also undermines the point of the waitlist, since a faculty member is not required to use the waitlist in prioritizing who s/he signs into the class.

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Students

February 21, 2010

Need That Class, Desperately? The Course Concierge Will See You Now

By Eric Hoover

Paul Neill's title is director of the core curriculum at the University of Nevada at Reno, but students there know him as the "course concierge." He's the one they contact when they can't get into a class they need.

A few years ago, officials at the university decided that they had to do more to reduce the hassles of registering for courses. They imagined a kind of registration czar, someone who could communicate well with faculty members but who had the authority of an administrator. Mr. Neill, a faculty member who works in the provost's office, fit the bill.

Soon Nevada was promoting Mr. Neill as the course concierge, the man advisers and students could turn to when stuck. Each semester, he helps 50 to 60 students solve their scheduling problems, working one on one with those who need a particular course to graduate, or who have trouble getting into classes they must take in a sequence. Often he creates a spot in a class that's full, or steers students to suitable alternatives.

"In the past, it was often left up to the student and the professor to see who could get in where," Mr. Neill says. "It was very informal."

Even in times of plenty, students often learn a tough lesson when they register for courses: You can't always get what you want. In this era of budget cuts, however, students on some campuses have scrambled to get not only the courses they would like but also those they need for their majors and to satisfy core requirements.

As colleges pack more students into fewer courses, the scheduling puzzle has become more challenging for administrators, instructors, and students alike. Institutions are using a variety of

strategies to alleviate the course crunch, and often that begins with improving the registration process.

Nevada's president, Milton D. Glick, proposed the course-concierge program as a way to improve timely progression toward degrees at the university, which has about 13,000 undergraduates. Over the years he has learned that even small scheduling snags can discourage students, delay their progress, and make them more likely to transfer or drop out.

After he arrived, in 2006, Mr. Glick developed a plan to improve Nevada's retention and graduation rates. He pledged publicly that students would get the courses they needed to graduate on time. To that end, his course-concierge program provides a backstop for the university's academic advisers.

Mr. Neill is not a replacement for advisers, who continue to meet with students and help them select courses. But they sometimes encounter dilemmas that they can't handle on their own. "They don't always have the ability to cut through red tape, to get through to the department, to get something done," Mr. Glick says. "Paul can get a phone call through."

'A Relief Valve'

When Natica Rudavsky contacted Mr. Neill this winter, she was frantic. Ms. Rudavsky, a transfer student who has a bachelor's degree from another university, wanted to pursue a second degree, in nutrition, at Nevada, but she was confused about which core requirements would apply to her. Would the university waive that required mathematics course?

By the time she and her adviser had sorted that out, it was late in the registration cycle, and all the courses she needed were full. Mr. Neill evaluated her record, then discussed her options with her. Ultimately, he found Ms. Rudavsky a spot in three of the four courses she sought. "If he hadn't helped, " Ms. Rudavsky says, "I probably would have just waited until the next semester to enroll."

The course concierge doesn't cater to whims. A student who just wants to avoid that 8 a.m. class would not get help from Mr. Neill. The same might go for a senior who had never bothered to register

for a required course that he had every opportunity to take.

The service does cater to those who truly have a need, or are simply stuck or confused. "We've taken some of the burden off the shoulders of advisers," he says. "It's a relief valve."

The course concierge has also helped the university plan more effectively during a difficult time. For the current fiscal year, the state cut the university's budget by $33-million, or 15 percent. Last semester, Nevada offered 96 fewer course sections than it did in the fall of 2008, a 6-percent reduction.

Recently, Mr. Neill's work with students helped him identify scheduling conflicts that made it difficult for them to register for the right courses. For instance, freshmen and sophomores taking biology or chemistry courses are supposed to enroll simultaneously in Math 127. Yet Mr. Neill realized that that math lecture overlapped with several of the laboratory sections.

He discussed the issue with the three departments, which adjusted their schedules accordingly. "The departments probably would have become aware of this," he says, "but the concierge service helped them understand it quickly."

Better Communication

Elsewhere, administrators have looked for ways to make small but meaningful changes in the registration process. This fall the University of California at Santa Barbara, which has seen substantial budget cuts and an enrollment surge, created an online waiting list for courses. The system formalized the process of determining who gets a spot, allowing advisers to better evaluate students' needs and communicate with them more effectively.

"It was a huge help," says Mary Nisbet, acting dean of undergraduate education. "Now faculty aren't getting hundreds of e-mails, and students know there is somewhere to go where advisers will get back to them."

This past fall, the university reduced the number of credits students could sign up for during the second round of registration.

As a result, juniors and seniors, who have priority, can snag a total of four classes, instead of five, at that time.

In the past, many students eventually dropped their fifth course anyway. The new policy has encouraged older students to focus on getting the courses they really need, and the change recently freed up at least 1,500 class spots for other students, Ms. Nisbet says.

For the first time, the university is offering schedule-planning workshops, in which students learn how to prioritize. "We're trying to help students weather a storm," she says.

Many institutions have turned to sophisticated data analysis to better anticipate course demand. At the University of California at Berkeley, Catherine P. Koshland helps lead a task force that will determine which courses students will need—and how many—in the coming years.

To do that, Ms. Koshland and her colleagues have begun to examine a decade's worth of enrollment data, which help them predict how many freshmen will need to take a specific math sequence, for instance, or how many sections of pre-med physics courses the university will need.

"We can bring some rationality to the offerings, rather than having departments guesstimate," says Ms. Koshland, vice provost for teaching, learning, academic planning, and facilities. "We're bringing more and more discipline to something that could grow organically before, when there was elasticity in the system. There's no elasticity now."

(Head Count explores the changing enrollment landscape. Please send ideas to eric.hoover@chronicle.com)

APPENDIX 2B: READMISSION PROCESSES

Returning Student Application Data

The table below includes data compiled from application survey reports from the Office of Admissions to provide analysis for the impact of initiating a $30 application fee waiver for this population.

Returning Undergraduate Application Summary

	2011	2012	2013	3-Year Avg.
Fall	500	548	482	510
Spring	325	304	339	323
Summer	255	206	229	230
Total	1080	1058	1050	1063

Please note this data includes total applications submitted, including incomplete applications or those not requiring submission of the $30 fee due to current policy which allows an application fee to be valid for three semesters. Therefore, calculating the total decreased revenue from waiving the application fee would require further analysis.

Admissions Policy 1E1
Link: http://www.siue.edu/policies/1e1.shtml

Readmission of Former Students (Undergraduate)

Section F: Former students who have not attended SIUE for one calendar year (i.e., registered and paid fees) must apply for readmission.

The readmission criteria for former students are as follows:

1. Former students are admissible, subject to the following conditions:

   a. Those whose academic classification is "good standing" or "academic probation" will be admitted with the same classification and class/college/major. Students indicating a desire to change majors on the application for readmission, or who were previously admitted to programs that are no longer available, shall be readmitted with undeclared status. These students may request a new major through the advisement process and must meet the entrance requirements for that program.
   b. Those whose academic classification is "academic suspension" will be admitted with undeclared status on "academic probation" provided the student has not had more than one suspension. Such students must receive academic counseling and advising prior to enrolling in classes and must adhere to the agreed upon plan of action developed with their adviser.
   c. Those students who have had two or more academic suspensions and have completed a minimum of 30 credit hours of coursework at any other regionally accredited college or university with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0 since their last attendance at SIUE will be admitted in undeclared status on academic probation.

   Former SIUE undergraduate students approved for readmission after six years of absence (from their last term of enrollment) from SIUE under one of the following conditions will have the option to be treated as transfer students for the purpose of calculating their SIUE grade point average (GPA) earned after reentry:

   o Successful completion of 30 semester hours at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
   o Completion of a transfer associate's degree at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

APPENDIX 3A: TRANSACTIONAL WORKFLOW

Ellucian Website – Banner Workflow Software Description

Link: http://www.ellucian.com/workflow-management-software/

Temple University was identified as an institution utilizing Banner Workflow.

Link: http://www.temple.edu/cs/administrative/BannerWorkflow.asp

APPENDIX 3B: E-ID PROCESS AND IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

University of Nevada, Reno IT Website Example: www.unr.edu/it

Screenshot of identified website example:

e-ID

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
EDWARDSVILLE

Getting Connected at SIUE

Most University business is conducted electronically, thus, it is very important that you "get connected" as soon as possible. You will be assigned an e-ID which will be required to access many services at SIUE. You also will be assigned an SIUE e-mail account. It is important that you fully activate both as soon as possible. Keep in mind that important messages regarding your financial aid award package, academic advisement, account balance and enrollment status will be sent to your SIUE e-mail account only.

What is an e-ID?

An e-ID (short for electronic identification or user name) and its corresponding password is your means of identifying yourself to the various electronic services available at SIUE. Obtaining your secure e-ID is a **three-step process** that requires you to apply for the e-ID, obtain a password, and finally, verify or preserve your e-ID within 60 days of activation. You will need your e-ID to register and pay for Springboard to Success (fall freshman only) and University Housing. Also you will use your e-ID to access your SIUE e-mail account and Blackboard. Plan to know and use your e-ID often.

e-ID frequently asked questions

Q. What if I do not preserve my account per the instructions on the pink post card within 60 days?

A. If you do not preserve/verify your account within 60 days, your account will be locked. To unlock your account, you will need to contact Information Technology Services at 618-650-5500 during normal operating hours.

Q. What if I forget my password?

A. If you have previously gone to the e-ID website and entered a secret phrase, simply go back to the site and choose "I have an e-ID but I forgot my password." Follow the steps to get a new password.

Accessing Your SIUE e-mail account

Now that you have been admitted to SIUE, an SIUE e-mail account has been issued to you. Your e-ID user name and password are required to access your SIUE e-mail account. (Instructions for setting up your e-ID and password are listed on the back of this sheet.)

Why use your SIUE e-mail account?

You will need to activate your e-ID in order to sign up for Springboard to Success (fall freshman only) and apply for University housing.

Many departments including Academic Advising, Housing and Admissions will contact you via your SIUE e-mail.

All financial aid information (e.g., award letters, award status) is sent to your SIUE e-mail account.

You can stay informed about your University bill, payment deadlines and account status.

It is important that you check your e-mail regularly to stay current and to ensure a successful enrollment at SIUE.

To access your SIUE e-mail account, click on the envelope icon on the SIUE home page at siue.edu. You may also access your SIUE account at connect.siue.edu (not Internet Explorer compatible) or webmail.siue.edu (Internet Explorer compatible).

If you have any questions, please contact Information Technology Services at 618-650-5500 or help@siue.edu.

e-ID

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
EDWARDSVILLE

Obtaining Your e-ID (user name) and Password

Step 1: Apply for your e-ID. In order to obtain an e-ID user name, you will need your student identification number which is included in your admit letter. This is a nine-digit number and begins with 800.

Go to **siue.edu/e-id**.

- Choose the "I want to get an e-ID" button
- Click "Continue"
- Enter your name (as submitted on your application for admission), birth date and SIUE student identification number
- Identify yourself as a "student"
- Fill in all requested information and click "Continue"
- On the next screen, **choose the "post card" option** and click "Continue" (Please Note: a post card containing a secret 'key code' will be mailed to your address. As soon as you receive this postcard, you need to once again access the siue.edu/e-id website to verify your identity. **You must return to the e-ID website within 60 days of creating your e-ID. If you do not complete this follow-up step, your account will be deactivated.**
- Choose a secret phrase and a clue. The purpose of this phrase and clue is to reset your e-ID password in the event that it is forgotten or lost.

Follow the directions on this page closely and remember your secret phrase.

- The following screen is the Acceptable Usage Agreement and must be accepted if you want to create your e-ID. Once you choose "I agree," click "Continue."
- The final screen displays your e-ID and password. **Write this information down, memorize it and keep it in a secure location. For security reasons, you will periodically be prompted to change your password. Your e-ID user name will be with you the entire time you are a student at SIUE**
- For the next 60 days, you will have full access to your e-ID and e-mail account. Be prepared to preserve your e-ID as soon as you receive the pink verification postcard.

Step 2: Select a strong e-ID password. Passwords must be a combination of letters and numbers and are case sensitive. Do not use words or proper names. Listed below is a strong password that is a combination of each of the following:

Dog's name is **S**pot
Cat's name is **F**luffy
Mom's name is **C**heryl
Phone number is 923-**1234**
A strong password might be **12SFC34**

Step 3: Preserve your e-ID with POSTCARD VERIFICATION! Watch for the pink verification postcard in the mail. The security of your account is of the utmost importance to us. Therefore, we require that you re-access your account upon receiving the pink postcard and secret key code. Simply visit siue.edu/e-id and **choose "I received the postcard with my key code and I need to preserve my e-ID."**

New REALITY Project – Efficiency Work Group

Sub-Team Topics, Roster and Charge

1. **Curriculum Change Process**
    Team Members: Vicki Kruse, Debbie Brueggemann, Martha Latorre, Susan Yager, Zenia Agustin, Ian Toberman, Jodi Olson, Susan Breck

2. **Investigating new Workflow System for University**
    Team Members: Chris Leopold and Zenia Agustin

3. **Investigating barriers to course registration including**
    a. Financial clearance and dropped courses procedure
    b. Other barriers
    Team Members: Dave Heth, Angie White, Ian Toberman

4. **Admissions processes for returning students including:**
    a. Re-admission of former students
    b. Probation, Suspension and Re-instatement Process
    Team Members: Tim Schoenecker, Jodi Olson, Jeff Chitwood, Evan Wilson

5. **Process for e-ID creation, maintenance and password management**
    Team Members: Anita Joy, Angie White, Jeff Chitwood

Each sub-team will research the area under consideration to develop recommended initiatives and information for the Efficiency Work Group Final Report. **Sub-teams are asked to provide the following by Friday, January 3**:

*   Summary of what SIUE has been doing in the area(s) under consideration by your sub-team including scope and success of prior efforts
*   Describe promising models or examples from other universities that could be adapted to SIUE (if applicable)
*   Description of your sub-team's recommended initiative including rationale and description of resources

The Final Report will be compiled and discussed at a final Efficiency Team meeting on **January 7** and **submitted no later than January 10**.

Efficiency Work Team

Nov. 12 Meeting - Ideas/Topics Ballot

Team-members were asked to individually submit a vote of top 5 priorities based on the following list of topics identified during brainstorming with the work team:

Academics
1. Process to change/update course attributes
2. Development of Health Career Degrees
3. Department Chair Selection Process

SIUE Culture/ General Policies
4. Shared Governance and Culture at SIUE of being slow to change
5. Funding for conference presentations is limited to one faculty member
6. Addition of exception clause for policies
7. Policies and processes designed for Graduate, Non-Traditional and Online Students
8. Process for Internal Communication of Policy Changes

Admissions /Registration/Records/Advisement
9. Re-admission of former students – eliminate need to complete application (streamline)
10. Waitlist Process – Investigating way to automate
11. Course Section Planning Process – open high demand courses
12. Application Fee Payment Process – real-time updates
13. Online registration process – extend time open into beginning of semester
14. Graduation/commencement Application Process
15. Policy for multiple undergraduate majors/concentrations/specializations
16. Financial Clearance and Dropped Classes Procedure
17. Transfer Credit Process for current SIUE students planning to transfer in courses
18. Undergraduate Academic Program Application Deadlines – lack of consistency
19. Declaration of Major Process for Transfer Students – Direct Entry?
20. Usage of 'Common Application' for Admissions
21. Probation, Suspension and Re-instatement Process

Financial Aid / Tuition and Fees / Billing
22. Tuition and fees billing policies – Out of state Graduate discount
23. Fee structure for graduate and non-traditional students
24. Financial Agreement Hold Process
25. Increase Scholarships for Transfer Students and Continuing SIUE Students
26. Parking Fines Payment Process

Human Resources
27. Hiring Process
28. Performance Evaluation Process
29. Policies for Terming and Re-instating Contract Employees
30. Onboarding Process for New Employees

Student Affairs / Campus Life
31. Policies regarding alcohol consumption by students

Information Technology
32. Process for E-id creation, Cougarnet Login and Identity Management
33. Improved wireless access across campus
34. Purchase/Selection of Workflow System – university-wide usage to increase efficiency