

Student Records Workshop Questions & Feedback captured from UG Degree Compliance 17.02.22

1. General Group Discussion around Rule Building

| Category | Commentary | Compliance Response |
|------------------|---|--|
| Group Discussion | <p>Areas for Consideration raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module Type -Core versus Optional modules • Checking across stages/terms - Rather than sequential rules - look at all terms in the interest of the student. • Risks - Compliant off old structure versus new. • How far back would we look? - Treated as part of the readmission process. Re-entry students need to be discussed at Prog Boards for structures completed they need. Compliance might not know that.- Students who take the "scenic route". Issue with this is finding these students is at the individual level versus over the line programming - needs a balance • Limits - Only where the structures are within the last 2/3 years? • Ongoing checking - after each GAP - flagging the student-"We're leaving this too late in the day" • Is 50% or 15/20/30 credits a sizable number? Core from stage 3 201920 SPR versus Elective 201921 Modules for that year -harder to gauge • Could be core from 2018 taken in 2019 or no core also? One module sufficient because one module could have been core when they've done this and shouldn't be taking additional core | <p>Student Records acknowledges based on the complexity of the topic, much more time was needed than initially planned to run through the questions raised in the discussion proportion in greater detail.</p> <p>However please note the contributed feedback will feed into wider discussions & considerations for the Student Records team which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how far back the limit should be • core versus optional • review of the identification timeframe for students • what is a sizeable number of credits |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>subsequently. However multi-stages & all structures for the most accurate approach. Terms from when a student did a module from a stage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider rather than sequential rules we look at terms in which a student did a module from a stage? And if a student is compliant for any one of them, then they would go through? Agreed by Arts & Humanities, Aim is to get students over the line. Risk raised about changing structures. They are compliant under old structures rather than current. If modules were part of the programme before, have the academic requirements changed that much? Majority No but may be exceptions Odd than Norm. Do we limit the structures to the last three terms? Flexibility is still needed for the 5% outside for manual compliance. Prog Managers aware of complex records for individuals before end- 'Scenic Route'. Systematic rule & pressures end of yr slip through volumes of students. Needs flagging at the Programme Board report. | |
|--|--|--|

**** We thank all participants for all input during the workshop and responses have been captured & reflected to the best of our interpretation. Please contact UCD Student Records if you wish to pursue further clarification of responses given during the busy session.

2. Opportunities for Improvement- Further Considerations

| Category | Commentary | Compliance Response |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Consensus from Group approach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commonality is the first trimester, when students entered the stage First term in which they took a bulk The first term in which the student took 50% or more of the credits associated with the stage - first term which the student registered to modules. | <p>Student Records acknowledges based on the complexity of the topic, much more time was needed than initially planned to run through the questions raised in the discussion proportion in greater detail.</p> <p>However please note the contributed feedback will feed into prioritised considerations for the Student Records team.</p> |
| Broad Consensus reached | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We broadly would look across all terms that a student was associated with a stage BUT that we would have some means of differentiation between students who took la semi scenic route and identify students whose time in a stage was too protracted. Issue tracking as we go - end of GAP the structures would be put in then so end Stage 1 we are in compliant; this is flagged unless student changes prog - give time say not compliant Food & Ag Sc Gives them the opportunity to take a module not taken. Starts stage 1 & 2 | <p><i>Important to note that this is where we are aiming for and not a promise on delivery. The discussion purposefully avoided limiting creativity by excluding considerations around system limitations however these remain a reality for consideration in delivering what was discussed.</i></p> |

**** We thank all participants for all input during the workshop and responses have been captured & reflected to the best of our interpretation. Please contact UCD Student Records if you wish to pursue further clarification of responses given during the busy session.

3. Priorities for Improvement through Rule Building

LIST OF RULES



Feedback Survey Findings – 11 Responses Received

| Question Number | Commentary | Compliance Response |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Q6. What was your key takeaway from the Compliance workshop? | <p><u>Open to Change</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Willingness to revisit compliance reporting <p><u>Modules by Stage</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I thought that the point made to look at all years that a student completed a module from a Stage was a very good one. This would hopefully make the compliance checking process easier in the future. • I had to leave about 5 mins before it ended to go to another meeting I'm afraid. It seemed like the rule 'The first term which the student took at least 50% or more of the credits...' was coming out on top but then a combination of rules was discussed. I'm afraid I got slightly lost at that point and am not clear on the final outcome (sorry)!! <p><u>Future Automation-Manual Reviewing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That automating as much of the compliance process as possible is a desired outcome, with the caveat that some degree of manual review will remain required • The challenges that are faced when systematically applying compliance to reduce manual checking, and that its particularly difficult when a student's record stretches beyond the normal duration for the programme with multi-terms/or mid-year/next stage modules, and where the curriculum may have changed. However, great to see positive intention by Registry to try to improve this! <p><u>Understanding Complexity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different programmes have different compliance related challenges, particularly related to changing programme structures. • That it's complicated and different schools/colleges have different rules on compliance which makes streamlining the process difficult. • It was good to hear from colleagues working in other programme areas and to see that we could reach consensus on the best way to approach compliance checking. • A sense of the manual work required to ensure a student's degree compliance for complex programmes. So it's reassuring to know that our suggestions for further development are taken into account. • Thank you for taking on this challenge of making the compliance process easier and less labour intensive. I found the online nature of the workshop challenging. I thought the Mural Software was extremely confusing and chaotic as I had never used Mural before. Most of the time that we had to discuss the issues was used talking about who could use mural. It was also unclear to me what questions we were being asked. | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every programme is different | |
| Q7. What is the most challenging aspect of compliance for you? | <p><u>Solutions for Noncompliance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stress of having to identify solutions for students who are not complaint. Also having to tell students they are not compliant of which they are totally unaware. <p><u>Manual Checking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checking students who have exchange/ Erasmus/ RPL credits as they are generally compliant but take a good amount of time to check. Checking compliance in each Stage is something I currently do that takes a lot of time. • Identifying students across all stages that are at risk of not being compliant. At the moment, this involves manually checking compliance via the "Programme Exam Board Reporting, ", "Student Degree Audit Report" AND "UView - Student Enquiry Sections". • The manual compliance check • Compliance (Aut 2021) was very clean and helpful with the additional feature of linking from the degree audit report to banner. We have some programmes that have sub-options approved so we still need to do some manual checking. Not sure if this can be captured centrally. <p><u>Timing to Act</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding out about a student who is non-compliant at a point in the trimester when its too late to do anything about it. • Identifying non-compliant students very late in the day - sometimes too late! <p><u>Volume Checking</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the Spring trimester, it's the volume of manual checks required, particularly when we come across cases where the student is compliant with structures but still appears on the output report. I also think that the need to confirm compliance for students who fall outside of the standard GAP timelines (students who remediate IX grades at different points during the year and complete the credits required for their programme) could be improved upon. I'm still not clear why the compliance for students need to be checked where they satisfy the programme structures etc. • The volume of student records to be checked by hand. Telling students and sometimes parents that they are not finished their degree because they did not do the correct modules. <p><u>Multiple Terms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manual compliance of students where a student's record stretches beyond the normal duration for the programme and/or mid-year/next stage modules and the curriculum may have changed. • Comparing student records against multiple terms. | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Q8. What else would you like to see compliance doing?</p> | <p><u>Identification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying non-compliant students very late in the day - sometimes too late! <p><u>Discounting/ Approval</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discounting students who have been on exchange/ Erasmus or have RPL credits - recognising them as compliant. Compliance checking for each Stage of a programme. If students could be flagged as compliant as they progress through their degree rather than in their final trimester, it may help the process. <p><u>Flagging</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal approval of sub-options being flagged - Study Abroad being flagged. Flagging to students that they have not chosen the correct modules during online registration/ self-service portal where they could check their compliance. <p><u>New reporting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating the possibility to review the academic record & credit status of all students within a programme, either within a report per stage, or within a section of Infohub per stage, without needing to use multiple different sections/searches. The creation of a report which highlights all students in a stage with failing grades, or those with below the expected amount of credits for any of their stages, would also be welcome. The ability to check compliance at different stages of the programme would be beneficial; self-service for students would also be useful. Highlight only the modules taken against the programme structure(s) rather than listing all modules and include a summary of the above rather than a manual tally. <p><u>Support- Drop in Clinics</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drop-in clinics (similar to Curriculum & Assessment) to be held after compliance run their processes behind the scenes however well before graduation. <p><u>Functionality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Provide additional functionality: a live compliance Self-service for students which should help a students' understanding of their course requirements in terms of overall degree compliance and flag any issues to be resolved be it on their side or internally with some requirement for resolution that gets recorded and tied to Unishare (and helps give students ownership of their degree journey); 2) Compliance for graduate taught programmes. 3) That when a student is systematically deemed compliant that there is a flag on their record (and visible on Unishare and their Degree Audit Report). | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checking compliance from stage one up | |
| <p><i>Q9. Would you like to see additional options for staff training in Compliance? If so, what would you suggest?</i></p> | <p><u>N/A</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/a • I found the guidance given to me for Autumn was sufficient. • I am not sure what type of training could be beneficial. <p><u>More Training- New Staff</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be great to have compliance training for staff, as each School/unit has their own method for checking. It would be good especially for new staff to have a compliance training event, as it's often presumed that staff have experiencing completing these checks when that might not be the case. • A short video showing the most efficient way(s) to assess compliance by stage would be useful • It would be useful to schedule annual or bi-annual training sessions around compliance (process, tips, etc.) and available reporting, which will be especially helpful for new staff members or staff that have changed roles to take on more compliance related tasks. <p><u>Programme Level & New Reporting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would it be possible for programme areas to run their own compliance, or will this also need to be a centralised process? If it could be delegated to programme areas, some training on this would be useful. • Perhaps, if and when new report additions are made. • A run thought of any new reports and how to use them to their maximum effect. <p><u>Webpage & Supports</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) Link information (e.g. the guide "How_to-run... etc.") on training from the compliance topic on the Registry-Records webpage. 2) Also link this guidance to the Compliance report application on InfoHub so easy to refer to. 3) Run a periodic Registry Master Class. 4) Post on Google Currents Channel any updates regarding compliance as well as informing College/School Offices. | |
| <p><i>Q10. Any other feedback on the Compliance event?</i></p> | <p><u>Thank You</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Always glad to work with colleagues from registry. It was nice to see folks again after the pandemic. • Thanks so much for arranging it - it was great to contribute to! • None other than to say thank you to those involved with organising the event. | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks to Lee for all his help and guidance! • Great that this useful event took place and the wide group of participants. <p><u>More Guidance on Mural & Time</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the use of Mural was clearly well intentioned, there was a lot of information to take on board, especially for anyone unfamiliar with using Mural. • I think we were a bit rushed and would have benefited from a bit more time in the breakout sessions and also additional time with the Q&A session after the breakout discussions. • Participants would need a full lesson in mural before being asked to use it. <p><u>More Training</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I didn't understand the full complexities around compliance rules for students in final stage where they may start in one year and end in another. It's very challenging for Student Records. I think it will be important to clearly communicate the final outcome here. <p><u>Erasmus/Exchange Trimester</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This comment is not about the event but is it possible that students who go on exchange/Erasmus for a trimester not be included in the noncompliance report. Each year it makes up the majority of students who come up as non-compliant. In Law we have introduced a trimester on internship for students, and while this year there are only 15 students involved, they are also, using the current criteria, going to come up as non-compliant. A trimester on Internships/Erasmus/exchange/research are all options the university wants introduced for students to have, so in essence if the compliance criteria does not change, eventually every student in the university will come up as non-compliant. | |
|--|---|--|