Campus Community FUG
Minutes
July 14, 2010

Members present:

Discussion

Jennifer, Mary and Rohit met about the Guiding Documents the group has spoken about earlier. Idea’s will be brought back to the group at the next meeting. They will try to adhere to the guidelines and governance that was originally set up. The CAC group is also looking at putting documents together.

1. Mary: Citizenship status definitions attached.
   The definitions will go to the Admissions and Records FUGs so that everyone is on the same page in regards to inputting the citizenship status in the correct manor. The option of adding a row for correcting purposes is not available because you may only have one country represented. Everyone will need to just change the dropdown choice under the citizenship status.

2. Mary: If we are to fill out both the citizenship screen and the birth information screen, is it possible to have the country default in the birth information screen to USA since that is the majority of our applicants. Currently, if a staff member enters in a country in the citizenship detail screen, it does not auto-populate in the Birth Information screen. Also, whether or not a country is designated in the citizenship screen, USA is defaulted and then information would need to be changed if appropriate.
   There was concern from the group that so many different modules use this information for reporting that the information would be inaccurate if defaulted to USA. It was suggested that this information be brought to the other individual FUGs before we put it to a vote.

3. Mary: Please update the VISA_PERMIT_TBL under country USA with the visa data indicated in the attachment. The definition of the Country field in this table is "the country issuing the visa," which is the USA for anyone entering the USA. Except for AR1, none of the visa types that allow study in the US are included in the table under the USA country, and we need them to record visa data properly.
   This request came from one campus that is looking to set up this information in SEVIS. PeopleSoft was set up differently when we went live meaning it would be a major undertaking to do. The group decided to have this information brought back to the individual FUGs for feedback. IF this request were to pass, all past data would need to be cleaned up. Again, being very time consuming.

4. Janet/LaDona: Attached is the request by the SF User Group to the CC User Group regarding getting an edit check on the residency screen - including screen shots.
   This modification could be done in a reasonable amount of time but there are other requests of priority. There will be other modification happening later with residency, as requested by the board, so maybe this specific modification could happen then. Some institutions already receive a tuition code error while others do not. It is possible to have an error screen appear if no information is added before saving. A vote was taken to have the modification of an error appearing when no residency information is entered. Vote passed unanimously. When the residency data was sent to campuses earlier for cleanup there were less than 150 names. The group was reminded that there is a query that can pull the students with missing residency, it is NDU_0070_ADM.

5. Rohit: ND HEUG - I am writing to you as Chairs of your FUG groups. I have been asked to investigate having another ND HEUG Conference. One of the issues we had for the last conference was coming up with good topics. Would you please visit with your user groups and get me answers to two questions?
   a) Would your Users Group like to see another conference? YES
   b) Would someone on your Users Group be willing to represent your Users Group on a ND HEUG Conference Committee? If so, I would need a name and e-mail.
Please come up with some good solid topics that you would like presented at a HEUG conference with suggested speakers. I would like to get these answers by July 15. At that time I will visit again with the CAC Committee and decide whether we should continue to move forward with a conference.

The topics the group mentioned for the ND HEUG conference were: Definitions of Bio Demo fields as it relates to reporting, residency issues, and a general meeting to discuss how other offices from the different campus’ input data. If there were any other topics you can think of, you are to let Rohit know.

6. Mary received a ticket requesting a new address usage from one campus because of their one office with a special situation. Some campuses were making the permanent address inactive. There were concerns from the group that changing the order of addresses affects many different modules. If one campus and one office can make adjustments in the order of the addresses there was concern that other institutions may want to do the same. This takes away from the consistency that now exists within PS with all campuses. The group voted to allow this one campus to set up a different address usage then what is currently being used by all of the other institutions. Rohit, Sandy, Janet and Lori voted YES. Charlene, Rhonda and LaDona voted NO. Vote passed.

Next meeting will be August 11, 2010 at 1:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Charlene Stenson