University Academic Advising Executive Council (UAAEC)

Minutes

October 4, 2019

Discussion

1. MyWSU Advising Notes
   - GOAL – University wide adoption/use of advising notes
   - Chioma Heim, subcommittee lead, attended to share progress updates. The subcommittee is wanting to make sure they are on the right track with what they are supposed to be doing.
   - New members have joined the subcommittee including Chanelle Denman, ALP Coordinator, and Molly Clayton, Math advisor. Molly shared feedback on the importance of using advising notes during summer ALIVE as it directly impacted her work as well as the Math department when it came to pre-req checking.
   - CAS advisors met with their Dean who supports the initiative/practice and is willing to do what he can to support a more seamless method in using the MyWSU interface for notes. He is ready and willing to talk with ESG to create a more efficient note taking platform. It was suggested that Dean Jockers talk with fellow deans about the importance of this practice so they too, can support and send the message to advisors in their college.
   - University wide adoption of advising notes is listed as one of the core responsibilities of advising, but the lack of advising notes usage leads to a gap in supporting students adequately.
   - Individual advisors in the colleges/campuses are using advising notes but there are a few areas such as VCEA that need all advisors to adopt the practice.
   - When the subcommittee first started, Psychology (700+ per advisor) had the highest advising load but still found a way to do advising notes. The College of Business uses advising notes regularly as does Global campus; Global campus, however, uses as different CRM.
   - Greg Crouch, Faculty Senate chair, asked if there was a College to use as an example of wide adoption of this important practice. He offered to have Faculty Senate work to reinforce the importance of every advisor adopting this practice.
   - It was reported that there was some resistance during the ALIVE program by some advisors.
   - Question: Could the advising note field be a mandatory field to fill out in MyWSU?
   - Discussion centered on finding ways to make the process of taking notes easier, less clicks, or a simple/common format to follow.
   - The potential use of templates will be discussed at the upcoming ESG quarterly meeting with Ruth Ryan, Waylon Safranski, and Terese King.
   - All advisors at WSU Tri-Cities use advising notes religiously.
   - The Carson Center advisors also use advising notes regularly as well although their notes are extensive as they upload letters, email notes, etc. which some people think is too much. We need to look at variety or range of notetaking styles/methods. CAS has a model to learn from.
   - ESG offered to help by hosting open lab times for advisors to learn/practice.
   - Migrating notes in Navigate into MyWSU? Where is that at?
     i. Why hasn’t this happened yet? Darren Michael will follow up.
     ii. An “Advising Summary” pops up when advisors start an appointment in Navigate. Many advisors think this is where to type in advising notes. General confusion.
     iii. Advising notes in MyWSU takes a lengthy amount of time to click through and find.
• Moving forward, Chioma Heim and Darren Michael's group will put together training through the ALP to help advisors learn and use advising notes on a regular basis. The Tri-Cities campus is a good example to use as they advise for a year at a time and rely on everyone using advising notes for this model to be successful.

2. Advising Model (equitable advising) Next Steps (See Attachment)

   Assessment & Expansion

   • Through advising directors’ meetings, ACG meetings, there are some grumblings about the new advising model. After campus wide implementation in Pullman (2018), the intent is to expand to other campuses.
   • Students excluded include academically deficient students and special populations like CAMP.
   • If a student is new to WSU and transfers with 30 credits or less in residence, they will still have a hold.
   • Example of impact: Business advisor with approximately 720 advisees, 600 who are actually enrolled, has 229 students in the VDAP group without holds placed in MyWSU. This example shows a reduction in the mandatory advising load but students can always schedule a meeting with their advisor anytime.
   • CAHNRS spoke at the last ACG meeting, fearing students could get off track. Questions around students coming in at 75 credits and realizing they are off their class sequence which delays graduation. Some advisors fear they will get blamed if they didn’t come in because they didn’t have a hold?
   • Are seniors retained and being successful as students outside of the pilot program?
   • Gizerian, Stout, and Lessmann suggested one of ways to combat this is to work with students before time they reach 30 credits in residence and make sure they have a solid 2 year or 4 year plan; teach and empower them to make good choices. Maybe spend more time with freshmen, or transfer students. This is a big change that would benefit from advising notes.
   • It was suggested to ask advisors in the initial pilot to look at their completion rates for students. Are they on track to graduate, complete on time, etc.?
   • Year-long advising plans at Tri-Cities: maybe good time to talk about their processes.
     • Tri-cities: complete front end work, so at advising orientation, they have all the information for them. Tri-Cities regular model is to meet face to face with new students for the first of 2 consecutive semesters. Advisors are available to meet the second semester in person as well but mandatory advising can be done online. During the initial meeting, front load educating students to find notes, email questions, and give them a graduation plan. Tri-Cities finds that students who use the online format are successful, but many students still choose to come in person.
     - Only change would be having the hold to lift. There is some discussion about expanding the model to the Tri-Cities next.
   • There is some hesitation from engineering as their course scheduling has nothing to do with this process.
   • CAHNRS advisors suggested having an open town hall to discuss the advising model or gather feedback at the advisor forum in spring.
   • Samantha Gizerian volunteered herself and Jeremy Lessmann to speak at the Spring Forum about these specific concerns.
   • Lessmann shared that his advisees have graduated in the program; nobody has been delayed because they were in VDAP. Only performance issues.
   • Stout shared COMM has never had a student not graduate because of something missed.
• We need to help individual advisors know that we have systems in place to talk about issues and concerns, but when it comes down to it input doesn’t equal decision. Running the pilot and assessing the results led to the implementation of the new model.

3. Barriers to student success - review
• Rule 34- limitation of retaking a course-“threepeat rule.” Drafting a memo from registrar to academic affairs, to include IR summary on data, and from ESG that talks about departments concerned about protecting first time attempts, vs someone with a second repeat.
  • Extend from one to two repeats, so it happens automatically. ES have created a unit workaround, so if they can override prerequisites, they can add the student to class with repeat rule. Matt Zimmerman sent out directions last week on how to do this.
  • Definite progress has been made to make the process for students/staff more efficient.
  • IR data showed that there is substantial chance of successfully passing the course upon the third attempt.
  • Questions on how the threepeat rule aligns with financial aid requirements? There is a meeting on Oct. 14th to included SFS where this will be asked.
• Defining a “Full Time Student” at WSU is confusing
  • We need to help students and staff understand:
    o 10 credits = full time tuition charge
    o 12 credits = full time for the purpose of federal financial aid
    o 10 or 12 credits per semester does not equal graduation in four years.
  • This is generally misunderstood by students and parents.
  • Greg Crouch shared that the State set 10 credits as full time for the purposes of the GET program. RCW could be amended from 10 to 12 credits and wondered if there is a legislative step forward?
  • What action if any does this group suggest?
• Drop vs. Withdrawal Period
  • Concerns about drop period: 30 days being too long, 10 days too short. Students need to experience enough of the course to gather good information in order to make a decision; most haven’t even had an assignment in ten days that they have been graded on.
  • If the drop period is narrowed to 10 days then students could switch to a different class to keep their credit load the same.
    o Having more late start classes is desired to students have better options then starting a new course 10 days late.
  • Choosing week 13 as the deadline to withdraw from a course seems arbitrary. It had something to do with uncontested withdrawals back in the day but no real reason as to why the deadline wasn’t the end of week 15.
  • Moving the deadline back to the end of week 15 gives faculty more time to get everything in the gradebook before the student takes the final. Extending to the 15th week, gives students more information: “can I make it, or should I withdraw because the final won’t save me?”
• Holds
  • Have departments look at services to make sure they are offering a resolution to the hold in timely manner for students?
  • Academic affairs have an academic forgiveness policy for FSRs who return 4 years later or more. Student Affairs doesn’t practice any forgiveness. If the student leaves WSU with a
conduct hold, the hold remains on their record until they complete the condition. Is this necessary or should the degree of the violation play into this somehow? If a student left the University with a first offense that was alcohol related, do they need to come back now and write a paper for alcohol use with student affairs? Or is it an unnecessary deterrent for them to come back?

- Some Conduct holds are more severe; not suggesting those be wiped clean. But for more minor ones, would it help FSR return?

- Writing portfolio hold: new leadership group is looking at that to make some changes.
  - Reconstituting all university writing committee, new talks are occurring.
  - Looking to automate it, for global campus so it is completed and turned in electronically

Placement Exams

- Knowing who needs to take placement tests and who doesn’t is an issue. There needs to be an easier way for students to navigate whether they need to take the Aleks test, they usually want to talk to an advisor because it’s hard to decipher all of the exceptions put forth on the webpage.
- Discussed validity of ALEKS as predictive tool. All data from IR shows HS GPA has a better correlation to student success than Aleks score.
- Business ran data, placing students based on last math course completed in HS. 94% of these placements matched the ALEKS placement.
- Math is requiring ALEKS although it is expensive, hard to navigate and shows no evidence that it actually works according to IR data.

**ATTENDANCE for 10/4/2019**

<table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee Members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, Brian</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
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<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Director of University Affairs</td>
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<td>Yes</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Assistant Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>WSU Tri-cities</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiers, Mysti</td>
<td>Senior Academic Advisor</td>
<td>WSU Tri-Cities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan, Amanda</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>New Student Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell, Debbie</td>
<td>Director</td>
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<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressley, Shelley</td>
<td>Associate Dean,</td>
<td>VCEA</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safranski, Waylon</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Transfer Resource Center</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scourey, Joy</td>
<td>Senior Associate Director</td>
<td>Student Financial Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stout, Sara</td>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>Program in Communication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wack, Mary</td>
<td>Vice Provost for Undergrad Education</td>
<td>Office Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter, Jon</td>
<td>Admin Planning Specialist</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wehrung, Nancy</td>
<td>Senior Associate Director</td>
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<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yocum, Darren M</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Enterprise Systems</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman, Matt</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Registrar’s Office</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Criteria:

1. Student has completed a minimum of 30 credits at WSU but fewer than 75 total credits
2. Student has a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher
3. Student is not on academic probation or warning status (Rule 38, Rule 38-2 students)

• The New Advising model is:
  o An advising model that decouples registration from advising for students who have earned more than 30 credits at WSU.
  o Fall 2018 implementation
  o WSU-Pullman only

• The New Advising model is not:
  o A model that prevents students from meeting with advisors.

Background

• Following two years of planning, in 2017 the University Advising Executive Council recommended the "equitable advising" initiative to the Provost and received approval to move forward.

• Data used to inform the recommendation for a new advising model:
  o Advisor Workload Study
  o Analysis of Registration holds
  o Study of advising systems nationally
  o Availability of new advising communication tools
  o Analysis of advisor caseloads
  o Analysis of seat availability in high demand courses

• A four-semester pilot study (2015-2017) with nearly 1000 students and more than five participating departments found that student registration and advice-seeking behavior was no different, whether or not an advising hold was placed.

Benefits to new advising model

• Students’ academic success, persistence to graduation, and self-sufficiency for simple registration and degree audit tasks, supported through training and their knowledge of the tools.

• Academically deficient students are more able to meet their reinstatement conditions, which includes meeting with their academic advisor three times a semester.

• Departments have more information for section management and hiring decisions when students secure needed seats for progress toward degrees by accessing course registration as soon as it becomes available.

• Advisors have greater flexibility to meet with students who have higher needs (educational goals, study abroad, internships, career choice) and who need more in-depth conversations.

• Advisors can spread student meetings over the entire semester rather than targeting a specific registration period.

• Academic advising is transformed from routine course scheduling to a focus on student success. It changes the use of advising holds for course management, faculty mentoring, or other non-advising functions.
Reduce barriers presented by policies and processes (APLU project in parallel)

- Building evidence base on the following:
  - Rule 34
    - Repeat Courses
      - inconsistent application of the rule across departments
      - allowing repeats in the summer only
    - Number of credits that comprise “Full-time” enrollment (12)
      - Does not equate to on-time graduation
      - Does equate to minimum needed for maintaining financial aid eligibility
      - Full-time tuition is charged at 10 credits
      - Appears to be poorly understood
    - Length of drop period (30 days) seems overly long (Rule 67)
      - Recommendation has been made to move to a 10-day period
    - Length of Withdrawal period (13th week) seems unnecessarily short (Rule 68)
      - Recommendation has been made to move the last day to withdraw to the end of the 15th week
  - Holds
    - Timing of when the hold gets placed
    - Availability of service once the hold has been placed
    - Automation issues to hold removal
    - Availability of staff in departments to release holds (manuallifts)
    - Coordination of temporary lists for students with multiple holds
    - Certification/Change of major-faculty senate working on this
    - Admission to themajor
  - Advising
    - Lack of consistency in advising as students migrate between majors
    - Learning or re-learning the tools that aid advising
    - Variation in appointment times (10-60 minutes)
  - Others that have been suggested by advisors and students, such as:
    - Improve ease of registration from student point of view, including multi-semester planning
    - Re-application fee (e.g. for Global students)
    - Need for tuition payment plan
    - Understanding of financial aid and timing of notifications
      - Ability to use financial aid for summer courses-- Understanding of advisors and students appears to below
      - Timing of scholarship notifications
    - Timing of access to funds from Univ. Receivables