

**ApplyTexas Advisory Committee Meeting Notes
February 28, 2017**

Members Present:

Candace Appleton-Kuntz—Texas Christian University
Larry Barroso—South Texas College
Melinda Carroll, Co-Chair—North Central Texas College
Margaret Dechant—Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Todd Fields—Collin County Community College District
Christine Gann—Sam Houston State University
Jamie Hansard—Texas Tech University
Lisa Hernandez—Angelo State University
Rebecca Lothringer, Co-Chair—University of North Texas
Nichole Mancone—Tarrant County College
Michelle Walker—Texas A&M University
Michael Washington—The University of Texas at Austin

Members Attending the Meeting via Telephone:

Connie Garrick—Lone Star College System
Vanessa Maldonado—Texas State Technical College
Pooja Mallipaddi—The University of Texas at Arlington (Student Representative)

Members Not Present:

Drew Canham—McLennan Community College
Nick Cioci—Lamar Institute of Technology
Joy Frazier—The University of Texas at Arlington
Nidia Arellano Hassan—Tyler Junior College
Mary Beth Marks—Sul Ross State University
Scott Smiley—The University of Texas of the Permian Basin

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Tim Brace—ApplyTexas Technical Team (UT-Austin)
Pilar Janis—Brownsville ISD

Other Attendees:

Derek Hutchins—Houston ISD
Malyn Picket—Texas Christian University

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and ApplyTexas Staff Present:

Jerel Booker—THECB
Diana Foose—THECB
Claudette Jenks—THECB
Rebecca Kindschi—ApplyTexas Technical Team (UT-Austin)
David Muck—ApplyTexas Technical Team (UT-Austin)
Monique Murphy—ApplyTexas Technical Team (UT-Austin)

Welcome and Introductions

Co-Chair Melinda Carroll called the ApplyTexas Advisory Committee (ATAC) meeting to order and welcomed everyone. She then asked members to identify themselves and the institution they represent.

Review and Adoption of Minutes

Rebecca Lothringer then presented the minutes from the December 5, 2016 meeting. One minor change was made. A motion for adoption of the amended minutes was made by Nichole Mancone, was seconded by Michelle Walker, and was passed by the committee.

ApplyTexas Technical Team Report

Tim Brace (ApplyTexas Technical Team Manager) led the discussion about changes that have been proposed for the 2018-19 application cycle. The following list includes items raised earlier during the 2016-17 ApplyTexas Advisory Committee meetings and new items raised since the October 21, 2016 meeting.

1. Show all custom questions at once instead of one at a time. Project Type: Large. Although the value of simplifying this section for students is recognized, the process is complex. **This item was left pending.**
2. Remove question in scholarship application about parental income. Project Type: Small. **This item was left pending.**
3. In residency questions, add "n/a" to parent visa question (currently some applicants choose "none of the above", which has a different meaning than "n/a" (not applicable)). **DONE.**
4. Parental education level questions: second parent can be "unknown or not applicable" for relationship. Project Type: Small. It would add consistency to the wording of questions related to parents. This was approved by the committee in October. **Currently in progress.**
5. Update "father/mother" to "parent 1/parent 2" in scholarship application. Project Type: Small. This was approved by the committee in October. **Currently in progress.**
6. Address deliverability. Project Type: Medium/Large. Involves the purchase of vendor service to confirm that mail can be delivered to the address provided by the applicant. An error message would be generated when the student "saved" the relevant page of the application. The members do not want an "undeliverable" status to keep a student from submitting an application. They also asked how this would be funded. The funds would come from the payments of participating institutions; there is a provision for "professional services" under which this could perhaps fall. It will generate no additional cost to the institutions. Identified by the committee on December 5 as a **high priority** item for the 2018-19 cycle. **The Technical Team is moving forward with this item.**
7. Add text to translate legalese on some items. Project Type: Small.

Removed from list by technical team (the original source of the suggestion). Will be brought to the committee for consideration if/when specific issues are identified.

8. Add CEEB codes for colleges to the EDI files. Project Type: **Withdrawn by requestor.**
9. Add word count to custom questions and scholarship short answers. **DONE.**
10. Add deadlines for essays. Project Type: Medium.
Suggestions were made to make the use of essay deadlines optional for institutions. It would have to be implemented as an additional field in the application set-up, and would allow different deadlines for different types of applications. **Was left pending by the committee due to higher priority on other proposed changes and is on backlog to work on as a secondary priority by the team.**
11. Open application cycles later in the morning than 12:01 am. Project Type: Small.
The committee agreed to the request to open at 10:00 on the first day of each application cycle. **DONE.**
12. Open the application cycle earlier than August 1 next year. Project Type: Large.
Adopted by committee. Application will open July 1. (See notes on pages 2-4). **DONE.**
13. Have class course information and extra-curricular information be copied when applications are copied from one institution to another. Project Type: Small.
Testing is underway, and the problem has not been replicated. Students can now copy these to other applications, but only if (1) this information was completed and saved in the original application, and; (2) the new institution has not opted out of collecting this information. Better instructions are needed for applicant at the starting point for copying the application. **DONE.**
14. Change wording in the confirmation page for institution charging a \$0 application fee to indicate no charge is levied, rather than wording that implies no decision has been made by the institution. Project Type: Small.
This was approved by the committee in October. *An interest in expanding the options for listing charges (for instance, unique fee for dual credit students) was also discussed, but no action was taken.* **DONE.**
15. Require high school graduation dates for those who indicate they have or will have graduated from high school. Project Type: Small.
Make HS graduation date mandatory, including for persons who complete a home-school HS program, and adjust the audit on this question so that it can reflect the graduation date for a person who graduates from high school even if he/she also completed a GED. Adopted by Committee as **priority item** at the December 5 meeting. **DONE.**
16. Give 2-year institutions the ability to break down the major sections into "colleges/schools" in a way similar to that available to 4-year institutions. Project Type: Small.

The discussion indicated some confusion about whether this is already an option. This will be checked. Melinda Carroll also suggested that the 2-year major selection text use the term "program of study" rather than "college/school." The committee's conclusion was that institutions should be polled on this topic. Can the wording be improved to meet college needs, or is the only solution to make the labels customizable? Making it customizable is a medium-to-large project. **More data needed. Left pending.**

17. Share a list of administrative options for 4-year institutions with representatives of 2-year institutions. Project Type: Small.
This would give 2-year institutions an opportunity to see if any of the unique 4-year options would be helpful to 2-year institutions. Two courses of action: (1) send the requestor a list of the options; (2) post information as FAQ in Administrative Suite. **Done.**
18. Clarify how students enrolling in dual credit or early college programs are to answer questions about college credit. Project Type: Small. The handling of dual credit residency questions is on hold until the CB legal office and/or Legislature has had an opportunity to meet and provide guidance. (Anticipated during the 85th Legislative Session, spring 2017.) **On Hold.**
19. Change input of birth year on employment and extracurricular page from a text option to a pull-down menu. Project Type: Small.
This was approved by the committee in October. **Done.**
20. Add respondent name and email as optional items on the application survey. Project Type: Small. **DONE.**
21. Confirm with committee that the essay word limits added to the 2017-18 applications are meeting their needs. Project Type: Small.
Mike Washington admitted that The University of Texas at Austin has found the lower limit of 350 words to be too low. Their goal is to receive essays that are approximately 1 1/2 pages long. The decision of the committee was to increase the recommendations from 350-500 with a suggested maximum of 650 words to a recommendations of 500-750 words with no maximum requirement. **DONE.**
22. Investigate extracurricular/volunteer/awards section for ways to make it easier to complete. Project Type: Small/Medium.
Fifty percent of the application survey respondents indicated this was the hardest section of the application. **Watch and see; poll survey completers who raise this issue.**
23. Make test scores page optional for schools that do not require that information for their admissions decisions. Project Type: Medium.
Consider making test page optional for the colleges. Supported by committee members. **Pending due to other priorities, but Technical Team should be able to complete.**
24. New. ApplyTexas graduate applications are listed in the undergraduate admissions page and need to be removed. Adopted by committee as a **priority item** at the December 5 meeting. **Done.**

25. New. Clarify language RE availability of graduate application so that student can tell whether the application exists for the institution he/she chooses, but is not yet open, or that the institution does not use the ApplyTexas graduate application. Project Type: S. No formal action taken. Advise the institution to contact the AT help desk. **No action taken.**
26. New. Make first residency question clearer. The handling of residency questions is on hold until the Legislature has had an opportunity to meet and provide guidance. (Anticipated during the 85th Legislative Session, Spring 2017.) **No action taken.**
27. New. Add English as one of the listed languages spoken fluently. In which applications should this change be made? If it is presented as a drop-down box, adding English would be easy. **More information needed. No action at this time.**
28. New. Remove scholarship question that asks where else the student is applying for scholarships and if the application in hand is for the first choice school. Question is slightly different – asks for top 5 institution preferences to which the student is applying. **Suggestion: Poll scholarship app users about their need of the question. No action taken.**
29. New. Provide students more information about which application to complete. There is confusion. (Is the “grad” app for those who graduated from high school? those who completed an associate’s degree?) Suggestion was to move instructions of the uses of the applications to the front of the process of completing an app, so the student can move to the correct form before wasting too much time on the wrong one. (Having the information as an FAQ is not enough. Too few applicants look at the FAQs.) **ApplyTexas technical team needs guidance on how to improve the instructions.**
30. New. Ask whether the applicant has ever been expelled, dismissed, suspended, etc., and provide space for explanation. This question addresses issues about student conduct as opposed to academic restrictions. Conclusion was that it is best to have the school collect this information via a custom question, rather than forcing each school to choose yes/no to collect the information. **For now, leave as custom question.** Would be interesting to search all the custom questions to identify pattern of asking for this information (or not).
31. New. Enable institutions to opt out of asking question about applying for fee waivers. In the past, the request to eliminate the question has been denied. **Decision was to leave things as they are – continue addressing this through custom questions. Also, add information to the effect that “all institutions do not offer fee waivers” to the statement that a waiver is based on meeting certain criteria; documentation must be provided.**
32. Basically, the same as request 17 – to improve the international application for 2-year institutions. Difficulty: Large. **Committee agreed to make this a priority item.** See discussion on page 4 of these minutes.

33. New. Add question to Re-admit application that will enable schools to know applicant's intention for re-enrolling. Conclusion was to add a question about student intent that lets the applicant choose one of the following: complete a baccalaureate; seek a second baccalaureate; enroll as a non-degree seeker; other. **However, no action is to be taken at this time; other projects are to be given priority.**
34. New. Reduce number of times a student has to write in his/her address. When completing supplemental parent information section, import the parents' address information into the student's cells if the student has indicated he/she lives with his/her parents. Difficulty: Medium.
No action at this time. Need to resolve how to handle situations when address is changed.
35. New. Add a questions that will help institutions identify students who are foster care youth that they the students may be advised of available aid and services. There is strong support of this in the Legislature. Jane agreed to work with Department of Family and Protective Services and the Supreme Court of Texas Children's Commission to develop the appropriate wording. Add to US Freshman and 2-year app at first; add to other apps as soon as possible. Difficulty: Medium.
Committee agreed to make this a priority item.
36. New. Expand the list of data elements sent to the colleges. Add transfer credit hours, parent education information, HS graduation date, high schools and colleges attended and dates to/from for all applications submitted at a given time. Committee agreed to make this a **priority item.** **Technical Team will be able to make these changes.**
37. New. Expand the list of data elements sent to the colleges. Add all custom questions. **Left pending due to other priorities.**
38. New. Update email sent to students when they submit applications, to include information about the timeline for the data reaching the schools. Suggested wording was: Your application will be sent to the above school in the next two working days, and there may be subsequent overnight processes necessary at your target institution before they are able to contact you. Please also keep in mind that weekends and holidays may further delay this communication. **DONE.**
39. New. Do not send institutions negative income numbers. Convert them to zeroes. Adopted as a **priority item** by the committee. **DONE.**

Discussion of ApplyTexas Application Change Requests

Claudette Jenks presented the committee with a copy of the updated "ApplyTexas Change Request" form. The committee discussed suggestions for improving the form:

- web-based, changes to wording, options, etc.
- the need to establish a process for handling the requests
- the creation of an ATAC email box and where it would be hosted (UT or THECB?)
- develop a place on the ApplyTexas website where the form should be posted

Claudette Jenks will update the form to include changes discussed at the meeting. For the time being, forms will be submitted to the AT Help Desk via email, until a web-based form is created and an ATAC email account is established.

Specific changes to the ApplyTexas Change Request Form:

- Box 1: Add "Title" to the Requestor Information
- Box 2 (New): "Is this a new request or a modification to an existing application?" Add check box or a drop-down list for completer to indicate which.
- Box 2 becomes Box 3: No other change
- Box 3 becomes Box 4: No other change
- Box 4 becomes Box 5: No other change
- Box 5 becomes Box 6: Remove all current wording. Add "On which application would you like to see this change be implemented?" Add "Fall", "Spring", "Summer" options (add check boxes or drop down list) and add a line for the year (text fill-in or drop down box). Add additional space for an explanation.
- Box 6 becomes Box 7: Change Title to "Applications/Systems Impacted". Add "International Freshman", "Counselor Suite", and "Admin Suite"
- *ApplyTexas Use Only* Box: Change wording to "Date reviewed by ATAC" and "Date reviewed by THECB". Add "Action Taken"
- Other Changes: Add instructions on where to submit the form, which will include the email address for the AT Help Desk through the AT Admin email.

Discussion of ApplyTexas Application Change Requests

Claudette Jenks led the discussion regarding change request submitted to the THECB and UT. The committee discussed and voted on changes.

Request 1: Reword the question dealing with reverse transfer so that the default answer is "yes" and the applicant has to opt OUT of having this done. Suggested wording:

Your transcript will be shared with the Texas community college(s) you previously attended for considering your eligibility for and awarding of an Associate's degree (if you qualify). Do you consent?

Yes *No* *Not applicable – question does not apply to me*

Nichole Mancone asked if there are FERPA implications with an automatic opt in to yes to release the students' academic information and explained that the student should opt in. Margaret and Michelle referenced legislation says students opt in. Michelle stated the wording of the question is not an issue, but the default to yes is an issue. Tim reviewed the current question with the committee and said the intent is the same but the language is stronger. Rebecca said the suggested language is stronger to have the student select yes, however, there is a concern with opting the student into a yes. Claudette recommended the question be vetted through CB legal staff to see if there are any implications with the question. Rebecca asked why it is a default question. Michelle agreed with the language but recommended the question be left without a default. Tim confirmed with the UT team that the current question defaults to yes. Tim asked the committee if they want to keep it at a default yes, change it from a required question, or

make other changes. Michelle said institutions do not rely on this question for reverse transfer and institutions follow-up with students despite the question. Christine Gann referenced House Bill 3025, it does not indicate that the student has to opt in or out and according to National Student Clearing House, reverse transfer is FERPA compliant. Nichole said National Student Clearing House is FERPA compliant because they get consent from the student. Claudette confirmed with THECB staff the current question is an automatic default yes. Tim explained the THECB directed the automatic yes. Rebecca said the question gives the impression to a student that the institution will automatically send the transcript and legislation says the institution does provide this opportunity for students.

Christine said she has an issue with the "s" on college/s. The student selects the college they want the transcript to go and with the most credit hours. Todd Fields said to keep the "s" to allow student to have a choice of what colleges to send their transcript. Connie Garrick said UT sends to multiple community colleges if a student has attended more than one, however, a student cannot get degrees from more than one college. Melinda heard from another institution that also sends to multiple colleges if they meet the number of credits listed in legislation. Christine said to leave the "s" in college/s. Michelle moved to accept the wording changes as requested. Rebecca asked the committee about the default to yes part noting that Nichole raised concern with opting yes. Melinda recommended to make it a required question without a default. Rebecca received external communications from other institutions listening in to the meeting that also feel the default yes is a FERPA concern. The committee's recommendation is to make it a required question with no default.

Michelle recommended to accept language as proposed, there be no default with this question, and maintain it as a required question. If the THECB determines that the response should auto-default "yes", then the ATAC will follow the recommendation.

Motion: Michelle Walker; Seconded: Todd Fields. Approved.

Request 2: Provide a question to identify students who were in foster care or conservatorship of the state and may qualify for benefits.

Michelle asked if a student was in foster care in 3rd or 4th grade, would they be eligible. Claudette said this is a self-reporting question to bring awareness to the student that they may qualify for benefits. Jamie Hansard said yes the student would qualify, when adopted out of foster care, they receive a certificate to turn in when the student applies to college. Rebecca asked if this question is prompting the institution to do something with this information. Currently, the institution's student information systems are not set-up to gather this information. Nichole said the question implies that answering this question assumes the student is applying for aid. Christine said this is a post admission question. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the reason for adding the question. Claudette Jenks commented that this was developed as part of a work group relating to HB3748, which requires the THECB and the Department of Family and Protective Services to coordinate together to let students who have been in foster care know about opportunities in higher education. Rebecca said it is true there is nowhere on the application to know if a student is eligible, likes the intent, but the wording suggest that the student will use this question

to apply for aid. Nichole was concerned about institutions retaining this data due to data request. Claudette stated this is a hot topic with the legislature and they would like to see this question on the application. Michelle stated the language is confusing for students who answer all questions on the application. Margaret questioned as to whether or not ApplyTexas was the appropriate platform to pose this question to students. It might be better for Financial Aid to handle this question. Margaret stated Apply Texas application cannot be the catch all for every bit of legislation. Rebecca added that others listening in agreed the question needed be reworded and recommended a link to the College for All Texans website so students can get information. Margaret said foster care is addressed during orientation at their campus. Claudette said if it is consensus of the committee to change the language, it can be changed and include not applicable as an option to be consistent with the prior reverse transfer question. Claudette said there is a workgroup of foster care experts was established regarding HB3748 who developed the question. Christine referred to the bill and said it is for students to ease transition within the first two weeks of enrollment at a new school. Claudette said there is currently a committee that met to respond to this legislation and the recommendation is to include this question. It was determined that not all institutions are set-up to receive the information and do not have processes in place to follow-up with students. Nichole said if the data collected it is not applicable to admissions, then it shouldn't be on the application. It would set a precedent to store other information on exemptions and becomes a database. Jerel Booker addressed the committee to give some insight about legislative actions that may be implemented once the current session is concluded. He stated there is a movement to reach the foster care population and the committee may be required to add a question if mandated by legislature.

Claudette recommended we table the question, revise the language as suggested, and return upon further guidance from legislation or leadership. Rebecca stated the other concern is the expectation of the institutions and colleges receiving and owning/housing the data. Claudette said that's a valid concern and there needs to be further discussion if the data is collected and where the data goes. Jerel said this is a helpful discussion when meeting with the legislature. Margaret stated it would be unfortunate if the committee is forced to do anything. The purpose of the advisory board is to protect the integrity of the application. Margaret agreed there is a value to the question and services need to be provided, but the expectation that they would steward the information puts a huge burden on the admissions office and it is outside the scope of the responsibility. Christine stated that she is hesitant to put on the application a question that would give a student an advantage or disadvantage regarding admission. Melinda said if this is to be a required question it needs to include a link to CollegeforallTexans.com so the student knows the requirements and agreed with Margaret that this would be additional responsibility to the admissions office without the mechanisms to follow-up with the students. Jerel said the THECB collects the data, but the data is not adding up. Christine said questions 40-53 on the FAFSA application already address foster care. Jerel said he would consult with the committee if there is additional information needed from the legislature.

Rebecca recommended tabling this question. Claudette said she will revise the language "wish to apply" to a neutral statement, add not applicable, and will talk with our internal leadership regarding recommendations for this question. The committee agreed to table the question.

Request 3: Regarding language changes to the scholarship application.

Nichole asked why it was suggested to remove word "briefly" from question 4. A student can get very wordy about their plans after attaining Bachelor's degree. Christine clarified that the student is limited to 80 characters.

Motion to approve the changes: Christine Gann; Seconded: Michael Washington.
Approved.

Lunch session: Break for 30 minutes

Rebecca called meeting back to order. Rebecca started discussion with reviewing outstanding items from the December meeting to give Tim and the team direction on final changes for this year. The committee re-reviewed the items from the morning that needed additional information.

1. Show all custom questions at once instead of one at a time. Project Type: Large
Rebecca said it was left pending, it is a big project all the custom questions were shown at one time but Tim suggested it can be two reports. Tim said it would be two different things, showing them in the application and adding it to download. Tim said the separate download is already on the list, Rebecca said this is about having all the custom questions show at one time on the application. It was left pending from last meeting. Item is tabled for a later time.
2. Remove question in scholarship application about parental income. Project Type: Small
Dropped from consideration. This is regarding asking parental income question, could be added as a custom question. Rebecca asks if committee wants to remove the question, no objections, Rebecca stated committee will remove this question from consideration.
10. Add deadlines for essays. Project Type: Medium
Left pending last meeting. Tim said it is on the backlog to complete. It is on the list secondary priority and would be considered for completion, but priority list comes first. Tim said the deadlines for essays will have the option to be equal to or later than the deadline for the application.
22. Investigate extracurricular/volunteer/awards section for ways to make it easier to complete. Project Type: Small/Medium. Tim said there has been discussion and looked at other applications where students list top three. Feedback from the committee recommended not to limit. Tim said they could get rid of the items, or increase them and make suggestions to the team. Rebecca noted they need to look into the limits. No specific changes at this point and will wait for survey results. Tabled at this time.
23. Make test scores page optional for schools that do not require that information for their admissions decisions. Project Type: Medium. Rebecca noted it was on back log and asked if it will be completed. Tim said this a secondary priority, not a high priority on the list, will work on this if there is time.
25. New. Clarify language RE availability of graduate application
Tim said some institutions don't use the application for their graduate students, recommended language in the system that states this institution does not use Apply Texas as a graduate application. Tim recommended including for more information and

- to contact the institution. The team added that institutions can also be removed from the dropdown list. Work is progress, nothing more needed from committee.
27. New. Add English as one of the listed languages spoken fluently. Rebecca asked if the team needed information from the committee. Tim asked where the committee wants this, what application type, what field, if there's a drop down to add English? Michelle said English is implied since it is other languages. Committee agreed to remove.
 28. New. Remove scholarship question that asks where else the student is applying for scholarships and if the application in hand is for the first choice school. Tim shared that NACAC has a document on ethics saying students should not be asked this question. Michelle said there is one scholarship provider that does require this question and would want to know if this student is on multiple scholarship list but it can be managed differently. Michael read the NACAC Admission and Financial Aid statement that members would agree they will not ask students to list or rank college or university preferences on documents. Committee agreed to remove question. Christine said some institutions may not know this and may be asking this question somewhere else. Nichole motioned to remove the scholarship question, Christine seconded. Approved.
 29. New. Provide students more information about which application to complete. Rebecca noted that this question was left pending with a possible work around and needed guidance from the committee. Tim recommended better instructions and to put the link in a more prominent place. Need committee to provide clarification on instructions. This is a text change. Team will review and make suggestions to THECB and bring to the chair and co-chair, if needed.
 37. New. Expand the list of data elements sent to the colleges. Tim said this is on the list to get done if there is time. Add custom questions to the exported file with two separate downloads, Tim said this can be added anytime throughout the year after July 1. Michael Washington asked to look into essay prompts in the application process.

Rebecca asked Tim if the questions regarding the reverse transfer and scholarship question discussed during this meeting can be worked in. Tim said the questions are text changes and can be done in approximately two weeks.

Michael discussed a new change requests from UT to change the essay structure by creating a custom essay prompt similar to custom questions. Institutions cannot use the custom questions because of the word limit. This suggestion has been recommended before. Since the essays are revised every three years, the intent is to use the custom essay for more holistic purposes. Claudette said adding additional essays may be a barrier to students who start working on their essays earlier. Tim said they receive emails from counselors about the essay prompts. Michael would like to make their essays more relevant to their university. Michelle clarified that the customization benefits the student and prevents having supplemental applications. Claudette wanted to clarify if the institution whether or not the request was just to use custom essays or to use them in addition to the current essay prompts. Tim explained the best way to accommodate this request is to create the capability of custom essays rather make the custom questions larger.

Discussion of the High School Counselor Responses Regarding the ApplyTexas Cycle Start Date Change

Claudette Jenks said only two responses were received for clarification. First response regarded the fact that counselors do not work during the summer. The counselor was notified that this is an option for students to start working on the application earlier due to the FAFSA date opening earlier. The second response was if admission deadlines were going to move up and whether all information would have to be submitted all at once. Claudette responded to both stating no, deadlines do not change and information does not have to be submitted all together.

At this time, Tim asked the committee if they wanted to assess custom essay and look into a way to do so this cycle. This would be a medium project. Tim reviewed how this would be accommodated in the Admin Suite. Claudette said currently, students already know the essay prompts and can prepare. Michael said they would publish the information earlier to help students. Michelle and Margaret supported looking into this option. Michael stated that the general essay prompts might not get at what admissions looks for in the review process. Rebecca mentioned the essay prompts might need to be reviewed earlier. Tim asked the UT team what would be needed for this change. This change would be needed for each app type. The team will review and put on the secondary priority list.

Claudette asked if Derick Hutchinson, from secondary education, if he had anything to contribute. Derick asked that the committee consider the other essays students complete in addition to the ApplyTX application. It may be difficult for students to be prepared for as many essays and he would be in favor of common essays to make the application easier for the students. Margaret asked how a custom question would be a barrier to a student. Claudette said a student can potentially be submitting multiple applications with multiple custom essays. Derick said students also fill out essays for scholarships. Margaret did not see this as a barrier for the student and supports the option. Claudette asked that a change request be submitted. Committee will table the request and wait to receive the change request.

Update on the International Applicants and the 2-Year Application

Nichole Mancone reported on the international application and the 2-year application. All information was compiled to see what's on international and two year application and try to figure out the skip logic that Apply Texas would need to create the application. For example, the question, "Are you a US citizen" and fill in questions from the international application that were missing in the two year application. This would be put in a way that if a student doesn't need to answer the international questions, the student would not see the information. Nichole sent the question to the ApplyTX team with follow up information regarding visa types and would test when ready. Tim recognized Nichole for her work and suggestions and asked Rebecca Kindschi to provide additional information. Rebecca K. said the plan is the same as what's done with the four year app by guiding them to use international or US app. Difference comes from selection of dual credit or not dual credit. If a student answers they are not a US citizen, not a resident, or visa that makes them eligible for domicile, or not a Texas resident for 36 months, then the staff would replace the current residency section with the preliminary visa section from the international four-year app. They will also add test scores for international apps to one of the educational background pages. Rebecca K. asked the committee if they want just the two international test scores or other test scores also. Tim asked Nichole and other institutions to help provide additional feedback and testing. The changes will be for this cycle.

Update on Results of Institution's Dual Credit Application Process

Melinda asked for an update on the dual credit application process. No specific committee member was tasked with this. Nichole Mancone crafted a question for a survey to be sent out and sent it to Jane Caldwell in the transition, no movement on this has occurred. Nichole will resend the information to Claudette. Claudette said it was understood that this was a general discussion to find out more research on how the dual credit question was being utilized in Apply Texas, not everyone uses the dual credit question. It was understood there might be custom questions added to find out more information but it was decided that the committee would table the discussion because there is interest to create a dual credit application. The THECB can send this question out through the TACRAO website, but would be reviewed for next cycle. Rebecca stated as more students are taking dual credit, the regular application is difficult to use. Dual credit students have to fill out the whole application to take one course, this would help the student. Claudette said from a counselor perspective, another issue about using the full application is those applications also get counted and are not separated in the Counselor Suite.

Update Regarding Technical Training for the 2018-19 cycle and a July TACRAO Presentation on ApplyTexas Content Changes

Michelle Walker reported to the committee the meeting will be July 19 in Austin, TX between the university issues meeting and the community college meeting and it will be the traditional Apply Texas meeting. By having the meetings at similar times helps schools save money. Rebecca said it was discussed that a web-based meeting for the technical teams be in April based on survey results. Tim said they have not asked the technical teams about having online training. They will send out the changes but won't have the conference until after they are up and running. They will not use the conference to introduce what's in production but should be done with testing by that time. Tim and Rebecca K. will be providing a presentation at a conference in May which will take care of about 40 institutions. Tim said they will need to think of another way to reach other institutions and suggested to poll the IT contacts to see what they want. They have already submitted a proposal for the TCC conference also. Christine asked if they could post changes prior to the meeting. Tim said the goal would be to post changes to Admin Suite in May or early June. Tim said we also need to keep vendors posted on changes. Christine recommended when changes go out, to also send notice to TACRAO. Rebecca said regarding the two meetings, Tim will get with the technical teams to find out what support they need. The workshop will be more for users and will have to decide if it should include IT, SPEEDE will have their teams, but this might be more a user conference. Michelle said typically the meeting is co-chaired by one of the chairs from the ATAC and Richard Jimmerson, the standing IT committee chair, and meetings should begin soon. Tim said UT provides sessions but does not get feedback about things that are in production, more about how people are consuming the applications. Michelle recommended to Tim to let Richard Jimmerson know they are presenting because they are looking for more ideas to get more technical teams to come. Michelle said the meeting times have changed, university issues will meet all day on July 18 and community colleges half a day on July 18 and half day on July 19. Michelle recommended to connect with Richard Jimmerson to begin planning to get an agenda in place and confirm with presenters.

Discussion of Future Agenda Items and Next Meeting Date

The committee agreed to have its next meeting on Wednesday, April 12, 2017, beginning at 9:00 am. Items for next meeting include:

- Residency update

- Workflow for receipt and review of change requests
- Apply Texas workshop update
- Update on progress of ApplyTexas application
- Discussion of new changes
- Planning time/dates for future ApplyTexas virtual meetings

Claudette informed the committee that there is a recommendation from the state to limit expenses for advisory committees and it may impact the frequency of future Apply Texas meetings. Jerel shared with the committee that there may be legislation that would require these changes.

Derick said in reviewing the May 4th minutes there was a panel discussion regarding student user names. He asked for an update on the status on this discussion. David Muck said this is in testing and that ApplyTX is moving to use email as a user ID, hopefully moving to production in March.

Adjournment

Rebecca adjourned the meeting at approximately 2:40 p.m.