Attendees: Dolores Sharpe, Anne Gupton, David Schaaf, Troy Boquette, Cheryl Bassett, Chris Vonfintel, Mark Hope, Steve Robinson, Lori Wcisel
Absent: Kelli Sproule, Gail Ives

Minutes were sent via e-mail and copies were provided at the meeting.

To Do Follow-ups:

Troy was able to obtain information from Jennifer McDonald. He was unable to provide historical information to committee members at this time, he will send information from previous work (copy of report) prior to next meeting date

Gail was unable to bring information from previous Student Flow Model grant; she will bring to the next meeting date.

Dolores will bring information about Datatel’s services and feedback from existing users.

Dolores Report:
Dolores provided three (3) handouts from the Datatel website including:
1. Datatel Website Review – support services
2. Responses from Datatel listserve from ST Datatel List Serve
3. Colleague Student Degree Audit flyer
Discussion consisted of reviewing the information, especially the responses from the listserve. Dolores/Steve suggested working with Institutional Research to complete a web based survey for in-state users. Dolores will work on creating a list of questions and following up with Gail Ives for implementation. The group brainstormed survey questions to include the following:
   Experience with alternative degree audit program (something different than Datatel)?
   Student feedback
   Advisors, counselors feedback
   Information System/Data Entry feedback

Discussion continued as to the amount of time required to develop survey, distribute, analyze results and create an action plan.

Chris provided a written current graduation process.

Chris’ Report:
Chris provided a historical perspective of the graduation process that dated back to 1984. Steve recommended creating a flow chart for the process.
Discussion ensued about the matriculation date of students and the challenge presented based upon the numerous points of entry.

Dolores made a request that we again obtain clarification from Kelli as to the direction for the committee with regard to the use of Datatel.

Troy provided a historical view of the Student Services cross-functioning group that spent 18 months on the previous recommendation. Troy researched and wrote the report. He will distribute the report prior to the next meeting since no one on the committee has seen the report and there will be comparative data available in it.

David provided a verbal description and sketched a flow-chart of the current Advising process.

David’s Report:
David described the Advising process from entry through degree completion and interaction with student.

Goals for the Degree Audit Software:
1. Criteria Item: real time comparison – use change in course to immediately review impact in degree audit
2. Program system to select correct matriculation date automatically.
3. Ability to track course changes in program i.e. computer courses
4. Number of historical years will it reference?
5. What if there is more than one program code- internal problem? Should there only be one program code?
6. Give student the ‘what if” choices. If wants to pursue another program, allow that search capability.
7. Could it be both # 4 and # 5 listed above?

For discussion:
Research the number of degrees requested per year and the matriculation date. Chris agreed to track this information beginning now.

Dave suggested reviewing and/or using Associate of General Studies as an implementation starting point. Chris added also using Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees.

Troy stated that the user would have to select the accurate matriculation date for the program to provide the correct information.

To Do:
Troy will send information from previous work (copy of report) prior to next meeting date.
Chris/Troy will bring a flow chart of the graduation process, Steve provided a cursory outline to be modified.
Dolores will bring a draft of survey questions to be sent to colleges designed to solicit feedback from institutions utilizing a degree audit system. Dave will bring a flow chart of the advising process. Dolores will bring the “bag of tools” used at AQIP Training. Gail will bring information from previous Student Flow Model grant.

**Potential project targets from previous discussions include:**

October/November – gather evidence and analyze data
November/December – prepare software recommendation
January/February – plan/deliver training in curriculum management (equate codes, prerequisite syntax), degree audit, electronic use of product, student educational planning and related
March – arrange consulting to prepare first “catalog”
April/June – build full catalog, test, staff training, and student training
July 1 – begin communication strategy including orientation of materials

The AQIP Shared Calendar in Outlook will be kept updated. Please provide Gail Ives with calendar information.

**Next Meeting:**

October 31st from 10-11:30, CM 1002