SLO #1 – Academic Planning and Progress: Students who attend their mandatory academic advising appointment each semester will be able to develop a plan for student progression to graduation.

Measure 1: Assessment Rubric [direct measure; advisor’s assessment of student’s academic planning]

Track the number of students who develop an academic plan after attending academic advising appointments using a rubric. And was the same used in past assessment cycles. The staff use the rubric to score students’ planning on a scale of 0-4. The number of students is limited to 400 randomly selected first year students (Admit Type: FR, PR, IF) who matriculated annually each fall. A “random” number generator website was used to select the students in the sample.

Performance Target: 15% increase in the average rubric score from fall semester to spring semester.

Results 1.1 (Rubric):

This measure consists of six questions evaluating students’ academic planning with a rubric. Academic advisors in the AAPC complete this evaluation in Achieve/Appointment Manager after the student attends their mandatory semester advising appointment. AAPC’s assessment rubric contains the questions and scoring criteria, and the sample group is limited to the 400 randomly selected students also evaluated in SLO #3.

N= 1,756 total first-year students who matriculated in Fall 2020 with Active student status and registered for classes on 9/1/2020.

n= 241 of the 400 randomly selected first-year students attended both Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 Mandatory Advising appointments, and the advisor scored the students on all rubric criteria for this assessment outcome.

The average rubric score increased by 8% from Fall 2020 (2.718) to Spring 2021 (2.934).

Compare with the previous academic year’s 10% increase from Fall 2019 (2.730) to Spring 2020 (3.009) and 8% increase from Fall 2018 to Spring 2019.
Academic Planning and Progress Rubric Scores of 241 Randomly Selected First-Year Students, as Evaluated by the Academic Advisor After the Student Attends two Mandatory Advising Appointments at AAPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Criteria</th>
<th>Fall 2020 Average Score</th>
<th>Spring 2021 Average Score</th>
<th>Difference between Fall &amp; Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation Level</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>+ 0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Decision</td>
<td>3.577</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>+ 0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies Intro Major Courses</td>
<td>2.969</td>
<td>3.149</td>
<td>+ 0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulates Goals</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>2.701</td>
<td>+ 0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands Prerequisites</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>2.627</td>
<td>+ 0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consults Advising Resources</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>2.876</td>
<td>+ 0.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Score (1 to 4 possible points)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.718</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.934</strong></td>
<td><strong>+ 0.216</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Note: The average spring rubric score increased by 3% from Spring 2019 (2.931) to Spring 2020 (3.009). Compare <1% decrease in average spring rubric score from Spring 2018 (2.956) to Spring 2019 (2.931).
Notes 1.1 (Rubric):

- Sampling methodology:
  
  - The initial sample group (n) of 400 students were randomly selected from a Fall 2020 list of 1,756 first-year students (N) assigned to advisors in the Academic Advising and Planning Center on 9/1/20.
  
  - Numbers of students by Admission type in the sample group were proportional to the student loads on the same date: First-year Freshmen (367 FR, 91.9%), Provisional (31 PR, 7.7%), and International First-year (2 IF, 0.4%).
  
  - Transfer students are not considered “first-year students”.
  
  - Sample size (n): The initial sample size of n=400 was chosen knowing that some portion of those 400 randomly selected students would be eliminated for assessment purposes due to:
    
    - Students who attend mandatory advising with their assigned Major advisor instead of their AAPC advisor (typically, 8.5% to 11% of AAPC’s advisees with Mandatory Advising), so the AAPC advisor would not be able to complete the rubric. If the student met with AAPC advisor in fall and Major advisor in Spring, the student would not be eligible for this assessment measure.
    
    - Students whose advising appointment content does not cover the student’s semester course plans (Mandatory Advising) due to the student’s intention to transfer, withdraw, or request a Leave of Absence from the College of Charleston.
    
    - Students with Inactive student status in Fall 2019 or Spring 2020.
    
    - Students who become athletes or are later identified as Honors College students.
  
  - Recommended sample size for a population of ~2,000 is 323.
  
  - An online random number generator is used to select the sample group.
  
  - Sampling methodology for measure 1 (for Compliance Assist): The population group (N) consists of 1,756 first-year students on a 9/1/20 Cognos report. Numbers of students by Admission type in the initial sample group of 400 students were proportional to the population group, so the sample group contained: First-year Freshmen (367 FR, 91.9%), Provisional (31 PR, 7.7%), and International First-year (2 IF, 0.4%). The sample group of 400 students were randomly selected using an online random number generator. New first semester Transfer students are not considered “first year students”. The final sample group for this measure was only 241 (n) out of 400 students because students had to attend a Mandatory Advising appointment in both Fall and Spring to allow the comparison between the two semesters specified in this Measure.
  
  - Rubrics are completed only on the same day as the appointment – never retroactively.
  
  - Advisors were reminded to use the rubric several times during each semester.
Advisors received the list of randomly selected students at the beginning of the fall semester and again at the beginning of the spring semester.

- Due to staffing changes, some students had different academic advisors in spring than in fall. Thus, some students were assessed by a different advisor in fall than in spring.
- The 2020-2021 assessment cycle is the fourth year using all rubric criteria during fall and spring semesters. (2016-2017 did not assess two of the rubric criteria in fall). The 2020-2021 assessment cycle is the fifth full year using the established rubric.

SLO #1 – Academic Planning and Progress: Students who attend their mandatory academic advising appointment each semester will be able to develop a plan for student progression to graduation.

Measure 2: Student Post-Appointment Survey [direct measure]

A post-appointment survey will be administered via Qualtrics via email to all students who participate in and complete an advising appointment to assess their knowledge of academic tools and/or resources. (Same instrument for SLO #4, Measure 1)

Performance Target: 70% of students will be able to identify two resources.

Results 1.2 (Student Post-Appointment Survey):

The post-appointment student check-out survey was distributed via email following a virtual meeting. Students attended 4,822 appointments (N) during the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 survey dates (not unique students). Of these, 86% (1,359 students) responded to the survey overall, but only 1,359 students (n) responded to survey question #2: “List the resources you discussed during your appointment today, beginning with the resources you are most likely to use.”

N= 4,822 appointments during the Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 survey dates (not unique students) – source: Appointment Manager/Achieve.

n= 1,359 students responded to survey question #2 – source: student check-out survey.

84% (1,142 students) of respondents to survey question #2 correctly identified two or more academic tools or resources. 16% (217 students) correctly identified one academic tool or resource.

Compare to 63% (1,781 students) identified two or more resources in 2019-2020, 60% (1,461 students) in 2018-2019, and 53% (1,341 students) in 2017-2018.
Notes 1.2:

- Total student check-out surveys completed: 1,565.
- Total appointments in survey date ranges: 4,822.
- Due to the COVID-19 virus, the AAPC offered exclusively virtual advising appointments and virtual drop-in appointments during Fall 2020 and Spring 2021. A link to the student check-out survey in Qualtrics was distributed by email automatically through Achieve/Appointment Manager after the student attended a virtual advising appointment.
- Spring: 2,044 student appointments attended between 1/20/2021 – 4/21/2021.
- The 2020-2021 assessment cycle is the fourth full year using this survey.
• Sampling methodology for measure 2 (in Compliance Assist): The population group (N) is based on the number of appointments held with students by the Academic Advising and Planning Center in the fall or spring survey dates (source: Achieve/Appointment Manager). The sample group (n) is limited to students who 1-took the survey and 2-answered survey question #2 used for this Measure (source: student survey). This survey question is shown to all students who complete the survey, but not all students respond to the question.

Use of Assessment Results

Measure 1: This was the fifth assessment cycle in which all rubric criteria were used in the fall and spring semesters. Data collected for this cycle is unlike data collected in any previously completed cycle due to the lasting impacts of the COVID-related government forced shutdown effective March of 2020. During the 2020-21 academic year, AAPC advisors continued to work from home for the fall semester and throughout April 2021, when required by the Governor’s mandate to return to their on campus office spaces. Regardless of which, however, all advising services including Mandatory meetings, General advising meetings and Quick Questions Drop In (QQDI) advising were all conducted in a virtual environment throughout the academic year. No in-person interactions took place in academic year 2020-21 between the AAPC staff and the student cohort. At this time, there has not been any conclusive research that has been conducted or reported that might reflect the impact of student perception or contextual feedback of this completely virtual experience. In the future, there may be an initiative by this office or of an external department to explore this impact; needless to say, students, particularly first-year students in the Class of 2024 will have had a keenly unique experience as students who began their college journey during the COVID-era.

Despite the forced virtual environment throughout the 2020-21 academic year, the AAPC continued its assessment efforts uninterrupted. While the collected sample size for 2020-21 was consistent with past assessment cycles, Measure 1 of SLO #1 was, and is historically demonstrated to be, below the performance target of 15% increase from fall to spring of students demonstrating the development of an academic plan across our six identified criteria. However, this demonstrated increase is consistent with a historic range of 8-10% increase as the longitudinal chart in this report reflects. Administrators can therefore reasonably expect that the AAPC advising staff is in fact fulfilling its mission of providing developmental advising that results in learning on the part of the student cohort in relation to is ability to independently develop an academic plan. This leaves only the question to what degree is the performance target reflective of realistic expectations or rather, that greater emphasis be placed on this increase of knowledge in future advising meetings. Therefore, AAPC administration and the AAPC Assessment Committee will reexamine the current performance target, consider altering the performance target to be more in line with past performances, retire the measure or attempt to continue to strive to achieve the existing performance target thorough ongoing training of staff and greater emphasis in new advising onboarding training. It is worth noting here that our 8% outcome was within the AAPC’s historical range despite the impact of COVID and the shutdown on students and staff alike. Similarly, it may
be worth considering reevaluating the performance target after services return to include in-person offerings, hopefully in the upcoming academic year.

Measure 2:

While the advisor generates the Measure #1 data for analysis, Measure #2 is a direct measure of knowledge from the student advisees themselves. The knowledge being measured is that of academic resources available to them at CofC including, but not limited to, registration tools, curriculum resources (catalog, Degree Works, etc.) and learning support services. This measure allows the AAPC to understand the level of understanding and recall of campus resources with which students are leaving an academic advising meeting. The sample includes any student who has sought advising services through a virtual advising during academic year 2020-21. Again, emphasis must be placed on the virtual environment in which services were provided. While no empirical data is available to inform the efficacy of this method of delivery of services, it is at least anecdotally suggested by AAPC staff and others that online exhaustion on the part of the student cohort can and would impact the sample of size and even the quality of feedback gathered through the measure of a post-meeting online survey. Nevertheless, while the completion rate dropped significantly from the previous two academic years (65% & 66% completion rate, respectively), a robust sample of 32% completed surveys among all meeting types surveyed garnered a healthy data set to review.

With 84% of respondents being able to identify at least two resources, and 60% being able to identify three resources, the performance target of a minimum of 70% identifying two resources was well achieved. This is a credit to the AAPC advising staff and their efforts to emphasize the campus resources available to encourage success, the ability of the AAPC staff to teach the cohort information critical to student success and the empowerment of the student cohort by the AAPC staff to know the access points to success. AAPC administration and the AAPC Assessment Committee will therefore reexamine the current performance target, consider altering the performance target to be more in line with past performances, retire the measure or attempt to continue to strive to achieve the existing performance target thorough ongoing training of staff and greater emphasis in new advising onboarding training. It should be seriously considered that this measure be retired as historical data, which is available, suggests that this performance target is routinely achieved. Therefore, it may provide opportunity to move to another area of measurement from the AAPC Assessment plan and will become a topic of discussion if and when normal committee operations return in the upcoming academic year.

Budget Changes

While the AAPC completed all mandatory advising appointments by mid-May 2021 despite the continuation of virtual advising appointments and activities through the Summer, Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, the AAPC lost six professional staff members, mostly to other job opportunities, between April and June of calendar year 2021, which would result in another very challenging 2021 Virtual Orientation experience for everyone involved. We also lost an additional 80 between August and September 2021. It goes without saying that with each staff member’s departure, the
AAPC takes a step away from reaching articulated outcomes as students must be reassigned to other advisors and staff attention must turn to a search, hiring, on-boarding and training of new staff members. It cannot be stressed enough that in order to truly stabilize delivery of advising services and assessment efforts, consideration for livable wages through across the board salary increases must be revisited so that the staff can also be stabilized and maximized student advising services can be realized.

Staff Attrition no doubt impacts our data collection in terms of consistency as well as accuracy. For the last several years staff have been burdened with excessively high and constantly shifting advising loads that has made it difficult to maintain and stabilize assessment efforts and a healthy office morale. Consideration for increase staff salaries and establishing an advising career ladder would be effective budgetary actions.
SLO #2 – Major Planning: Students who participate in academic advising and advising related programs will make a timely and informed pursuit of an academic major by the time they have reached 60 hours.

Measure 1 (a-b): Programming [direct measure]

Enumerate the percentage of students who attend the a) Choosing a Major Workshop and the b) Majors Fair respectively.

Performance Target: 10% increase in student attendance from the previous at each of these events.

Choosing a Major Workshop

Results 2.1a (Choosing a Major Workshop):

Fall 2020:

N= 9,148 unique degree-seeking undergraduate students with Active student status and enrolled at the end of Fall 2020.

n= 17 unique students attended one of four offered workshops: September 2-9, September 16-23, October 21-28, and November 4-11, 2020.

Attendance at the Fall 2020 Choosing a Major Workshops decreased 63% from Fall 2019’s 46 students.

0.2% of students attended the Choosing a Major Workshop in Fall 2020.

Note: Fall 2020 workshops were all offered as recordings with an option for students to opt-in to join a live virtual Q&A. Students registered to receive access to view the recorded workshop, but there is no way to tell if the student actually viewed the workshop. There were 17 students who registered for the recorded workshop, and 4 of those students attended the live virtual Q&A session.

Spring 2021:

N= 8,799 unique degree-seeking undergraduate students with Active student status and enrolled at the end of Spring 2021.

n= 10 unique students attended one of four offered workshops: January 26, February 25, March 24, and April 13, 2021.

Attendance at the Spring 2021 Choosing a Major Workshops (10 students) decreased 41% from Spring 2020’s 17 students.

0.1% of active, degree seeking undergraduate students attended the Choosing a Major Workshop in Spring 2021.
Note: Spring 2021 workshops were held as live virtual sessions.

Choosing a Major Workshop Attendance, 2014-2021

Notes 2.1a (Choosing a Major Workshop):

- Fall 2020 population size (N): 9,148 on 12/21/20 report, degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status at end of term (FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/RA/RC/GR/GC); unique students.

- Spring 2021 population size (N): 8,799 on 5/6/21 (the day after final grades), degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status at end of term (FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/RA/RC/GR/GC); unique students.

- Sampling Methodology, Compliance Assist: Sampling methodology for Measure 1, Part A, Choosing a Major Workshop: Fall 2019 population size (N): 9,148 on 12/21/20 report Cognos report, degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status at end of term (FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/RA/RC/GR/GC), unique students. Spring 2020 population size (N): 8,799 on 5/6/21 Cognos report (the day after final grades), degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status at end of term (FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/RA/RC/GR/GC), unique students. Sample size (n) attendance both semesters is based on sign-in sheets provided by the Career Center staff.
SLO #2 – Major Planning: Students who participate in academic advising and advising related programs will make a timely and informed pursuit of an academic major by the time they have reached 60 hours.

Measure 1 (a-b): Programming [direct measure]

Enumerate the percentage of students who attend the a) Choosing a Major Workshop and the b) Majors & Minors Fair respectively.

Performance Target: 10% increase in student attendance from the previous at each of these events.

Results 2.1b (Majors & Minors Fair):

N= 9,272 unique students (this population size includes 9,148 degree-seeking undergraduate students with Active student status and enrolled at the end of Fall 2020, plus 124 Charleston Bridge program non-degree students who could become CofC students in the spring).

n= 56 students attended the week-long virtual fair. Compare to 517 students in Fall 2019. Student attendance decreased 89% from Fall 2019 (517 students) to Fall 2020 (56 students).

0.6% of students attended the Fall 2020 Virtual Majors and Minors Fair.
Notes 2.1b ( Majors & Minors Fair):


- Fall 2020 attendance notes:
  - The virtual fair limited our ability to track attendance. Thus, attendance count is based on the number of unique email addresses collected by academic departments at their virtual majors fair sessions.
  - 56 unique students attended 76 virtual meetings with 51 departments who reported attendance (56 total departments). Included in that 56 unique students, 8 unidentified students completed the follow-up survey.
  - 3 students attended AAPC’s live sessions, “How to Explore Majors and Minors” or “Choosing a Major Q&A”. We are making the assumption that those students did not attend the department sessions, as AAPC staff did not record the students’ email addresses that would have allowed us to uniquely identify those students.

- NOTE: Charleston Bridge students (not yet admitted as CofC students) may have attended the virtual Majors and Minors Fair in the fall, so that student group is added to the count of degree-seeking students for the population size (N).

- Fall 2020 population size (N) of 9,272 is based on the sum of two student populations:
  - 9,148 unique degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status on 12/21/20 report at end of term (FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/RA/RC/GR/GC).
  - 124 Charleston Bridge students on 8/24/20. In the fall, these students are not yet admitted as CofC students.

- Sampling methodology in Compliance Assist: Sampling Methodology for Majors and Minors Fair: Fall 2019 population size (N) is based on the sum of two student populations: 9,329 students on 12/14/19 report, degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status at end of term (FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/RA/RC/GR/GC), unique students; plus 130 Charleston Bridge students on 10/18/19 (in the fall, these students are not yet admitted as CofC students). Fall 2019 sample group (n) attendance count is based on the combined counts of unique student email addresses provided via these sources: 1-Student check-in (electronic) at two sign-in tables, one at either end of Cougar Mall; plus 2-department table sign-up lists (paper, later typed into spreadsheet by staff).

- These are AAPC attempts to explain potential differences in attendance 2013-2020:
  - These are some factors which could potentially have affected the Majors and Minors Fair numbers:
    - LOCATION. We used the Stern Center Ballroom (2013-2015) in the first three years versus Cougar Mall (2016+) thereafter.
Varied methods of COUNTING attendees (at sign in tables, an exit survey, or handing out bags, at departments’ virtual events),
- EXTRA POPULATIONS (namely, Charleston Bridge’s estimated student attendance around 110 per year starting in 2017, and potentially department’s student representatives who may have signed in simply to get popsicles in years we brought in King of Pops).
- REGISTRATION/sign-in locations to consider,
- OVERLAP with other events (2018 being the biggest I remember, with an overlap with the Career Fair), and my last contributing factor,
- ADVERTISING and incentives.
- VIRTUAL in Fall 2020 due to COVID-19 pandemic.

Use of Assessment Results

Measure 1a: The Choosing a Major Workshop programming is intended to allow students the opportunity to discuss with professional staff members from the AAPC and the Career Center the possible outcomes to major pursuits. Measuring the attendance of the workshops helps the programmers determine the scheduling and promotion of the events. An attempt is made to provide students with at least three opportunities per semester to attend these workshops. While these opportunities were offered in the academic year, they were heavily impacted by the forced virtual environment. After experiencing an increase in attendance in the 2019-20 academic year to the workshops, due in part to a more aggressive promotional campaign including social media and other platforms utilized by the Career and the AAPC, the attendance dropped sharply in 2020-21 and can be attributed to the lack of in-person offerings. Students were perceived as having experienced “Zoom fatigue” that lead to a lack of attendance at workshops and because of a increase of general texting and other social media volume, the invitation to this specific workshop likely becoming lost or overlooked by to students who might otherwise be reached. As a result, the performance target of a 10% increase in attendance over the previous year was not achieved.

This set of workshops is a collaboration between the Career Center and AAPC and will continue is the next academic year. With a renewed effort on the part of the AAPC to emphasize services and programming promotion though a newly formed Social Media Committee, the AAPC will continue its partnership with the Career Center and continue to assess this program as part of its overall assessment plan for the next academic year.

Measure 1b: The Majors and Minors Fair (MMF)

While the 2019 Majors and Minors Fair (MMF) proved a highwater mark in attendance for this critical, campus-wide event, the MMF suffered the same fate as so many of its companion programs from the AAPC and across the campus community in 2020. With restrictions on in-person gatherings and programs still in place, the 2020 MMF was offered in a virtual format only.
As a result, there was a dramatic reduction in participation by the academic departments as well as student attendance and the performance target for this measure was not achieved.

Much like the “Choosing and Major Workshop,” the MMF was not able to maintain the attendance momentum achieved in the previous year. However, this event did highlight the adaptability of the AAPC and its leadership to continue to provide critical, campus-wide programming opportunity in a virtual format rather than simply cancel the event all together. Despite the government-forced shutdown and extended virtual environment, the AAPC values this event as a cornerstone programming event and its outcome critical to our AAPC mission. Cancellation was not considered as an option and the event did garner attendees, despite the environmental limitations. And despite the low number of attendees, the MMF continues to be viewed as impactful to those students who did choose to attend. As more and more campus events and programming return to an in-person format in the next academic year, the MMF is also expected to return to an in-person event and continue the success reflected in attendance achieve in recent years. The MMF will continue to be assessed as part of the AAPC assessment plan in the next academic year.

**Budget Changes:**

The ability to capture when and how often students declare their major at the College of Charleston continues to be impossible given the limitations of the Program of Study Management (POSM) software. It is recommended that the College consider revisiting this software and consider a different product that has the capacity to generate reports and aggregate data from various data points. Until this occurs, or staffing is in place to mine information in a meaningful and useful way from POSM, the College will be limited in understanding the frequency by which students declare/undeclare majors and minors and connect it more easily to retention and graduation data.
**SLO #2 – Major Planning:** Students who participate in academic advising and advising related programs will make a timely and informed pursuit of an academic major by the time they have reached 60 hours.

**Measure 2: Major Decision/Decidedness** [Students who have decided on a major as reported by the advisor; indirect measure]

Enumerate the percentage of student appointments who have decided on a major as reported by the advisor in Appointment Manager after the student attends an academic advising appointment.

**Performance Target:** 75% of students will be identified by the advisor as decided (1 identified major) in their spring mandatory advising appointment.

**Results 2.2:**

N= 1,918 students eligible to attend a Mandatory Advising appointment at AAPC in Spring 2021.

n= 1,520 mandatory advising appointments in Spring 2021 attended at AAPC (unique students).

73% of students (1,103 out of 1,520) who attended a Spring 2021 Mandatory Advising appointment with their AAPC advisor were identified by the advisor as “Decided (1 identified major)”.

*Compare to:*

- Spring 2020: 68% (1,004 out of 1,470 mandatory advising appointments);
- Spring 2019: 71% (1,126 out of 1,583 mandatory advising appointments);
- Spring 2018: 70% (969 out of 1,385 mandatory advising appointments);
- Spring 2017: 69% (1,204 out of 1,735 mandatory advising appointments).
Major Decision/Decidedness of 1,520 Students who attended a Spring 2021 Mandatory Advising Appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Decision (reported by advisors after student attends advising appointment)</th>
<th>Spring 2021 Mandatory Advising Appointments</th>
<th>Spring 2020 Mandatory Advising Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Undecided (no areas of interest)</td>
<td>17 (1%)</td>
<td>22 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided (lots of options)</td>
<td>51 (3%)</td>
<td>42 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring (2-5 identified majors)</td>
<td>343 (23%)</td>
<td>397 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided (1 identified major)</td>
<td>1103 (73%)</td>
<td>1004 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (did not discuss)</td>
<td>6 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,520</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,470</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes 2.2:

- Data source for “Major Decision”: Post-appointment check-out questionnaire filled out by AAPC advisors in Appointment Manager. This question is on the AAPC’s assessment rubric and is also one of six rubric criteria used for SLO #1 (Academic Planning and Progress).
o Major Decision is a required advisor check-out question for all advising appointments.

o Five possible responses: Very Undecided (no areas of interest), Undecided (lots of options), Exploring (2-5 identified majors), Decided (1 identified major), or N/A-did not discuss. Note: N/A was added in Fall 2019 to accommodate meetings in which major decision was not discussed with the student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Decision: *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Undecided: no areas of interest (Beginning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided: lots of options (Emerging)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring: 2-5 identified majors (Proficient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided: 1 identified major (Advanced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A-did not discuss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

o Major Decision is also used in the assessment rubric filled out by advisors for the 400 randomly selected sample students (SLO #1 Academic Planning and Progress).

- Rubrics are completed only on the same day as the appointment – never retroactively.
  o Advisors were reminded to use the rubric several times during each semester.
  o Advisors received the list of randomly selected students at the beginning of the fall semester and again at the beginning of the spring semester.

- Population size (N) is the total number of first year students (FR, PR, IF), first year Bridge students (TB), and first semester transfer students (T2, T4, IT) on 1/25/2021, four days after the Drop/Add period ended and students could attend potential Mandatory Advising appointments. This number does not take into account whether the student ultimately receives an advising hold from AAPC. For example, the student’s major department may place advising holds or the first semester transfer student may declare a major, meaning that student will not be required to attend AAPC mandatory advising but is still invited to attend an appointment with “Mandatory Advising” content if they come in. Also, only UNDE first semester transfer students receive AAPC’s hold requiring an advising appointment.

- Sample size (n) is the number of appointments marked by the AAPC advisors with appointment Reason “Mandatory Advising”.
  o Appointments should be considered “mandatory advising” if the student is a first year student or a first semester transfer student, regardless of whether they ultimately receive an advising hold from AAPC or from their declared Major department.
Spring 2021 inclusive dates for mandatory advising appointments (n): 1/20/2021 (day after Drop/Add period ends) – 4/21/2021 (last day of classes).

Unique students enforced by looking for duplicate CWIDs, as each student can have attended only one Mandatory Advising meeting in spring. Any additional appointments should be marked in Appointment Manager as General Advising by the advisor.

Excludes appointments for which this check-out question was not filled out (appointments not closed out in Appointment Manager). An incomplete check-out questionnaire might not have an accurate Appointment Reason.

- Sample size (n) students marked as “Decided” may not have actually declared their major in POSM or their major declaration may be pending with the department, so “Decided” students in this measure may differ from what is recorded in Banner as a student’s declared majors.

- In Compliance Assist: Sampling methodology for Measure 2, Major Decision: The population group (N) consists of three groups of students: 1) first-year students in their first or second semesters (admission types: FR, PR, IF); 2) Bridge program transfer students in their first or second semesters (admission type: TB); and 3) Transfer students in their first semester only (admission types: T2, T4, IT). Source for N: Cognos report on 1/25/21. Students in the population group are assigned to AAPC advisors and are invited to advising at AAPC. However, not all of the students in the population group are ultimately required to attend advising with AAPC, so the sample group is smaller than the population. The sample group (n) consists only of students who met with their advisor and their advisor reported the appointment as "Mandatory Advising" according to the rules defined by the AAPC between 1/20/21 (after Drop/Add period) and 4/21/21 (Reading Day). The students marked as "Decided" may not have declared their major in the Program of Study Management (POSM) system. Source for n: Appointment Manager post-appointment evaluation of student completed by academic advisors and Major Decidedness (n) is also a question on the AAPC assessment rubric.

**Use of Assessment Results**

**Measure 2: Major Decision/Decidedness**

In the Spring of 2021, AAPC Advisors recorded via the assessment rubric function through the Appointment Manager meeting check out process. Advisors assessed their advisees reached a major selection decision 73% of the time. This is the closest that the student cohort being has come to achieving the Performance Target of 75% since the measure began in the spring or 2017. While many of the measures and the cohort being measured in this report were significantly impacted by the effects of the government forced shutdown due to COVID, resulting in a virtual work and learning environment, this measure continued to stand as a reflection of the efficacy of the developmental advising provided by the AAPC and its advising staff to encourage students to make a timely and informed major decision, which is critical to the AAPC mission.
Despite the fact that all academic advising meetings reflected in the captured data for the 2020-21 AAPC Assessment Cycle were conducted in a virtual environment, the AAPC demonstrated through this measure that the content of the meeting could and would remain consistent in informing students of the outcomes of major selection and encouraging students to do so in a timely manner. It is important to note that College of Charleston historically attributes major declaration to higher rates of retention and persistence toward four- and six-year graduation rates. This is consistent with the role of academic advising and specifically the AAPC in achieving the goals delineated in Pillar One of the current College of Charleston Strategic Plan. It further assists the staff of the AAPC in moving students who have exhausted the mandate for mandatory advising into their area of study and faculty advising, allowing AAPC advising staff to remained focused on students still within the mandate and thus continuing to encourage students to make a timely major selection, encouraging higher retention rates in perpetuity. Despite this high mark of achievement for this measure in this academic year, this measure will continue to be assessed at least one more year after in-person advising services are again offered. AAPC administration and the AAPC Assessment Committee will reexamine the current performance target, consider altering the performance target to be more in line with past performances, but continue to strive to achieve the existing performance target thorough ongoing training of staff and greater emphasis in new advising onboarding training.

**Budget Changes:**

Budget changes as a result of assessing this measure are minimal as the key element of continuing this measure is the ongoing use of the Appointment Manager platform, which is subscription based. The platform is critical to effective and timely collection of this data and there are no plans to alter the exhibiting relationship or subscription between the AAPC and the vendor. Impacts as to the major decidedness and the need for greater resources be steered toward the AAPC for the purposes of staff training and staff retention are part of an ongoing dialogue among AAPC and institutional administrators.

**SLO #4 – Policies and Procedures:** Students will demonstrate knowledge of key academic policies and procedures after attending an academic advising appointment.

(Assessment outcome #3)

**Measure 1: Assessment Rubric** [direct measure; advisor’s assessment of student’s knowledge]

Track the number of students who can identify policies and procedures after attending mandatory advising appointments using a rubric. The same rubric from SLO #1 will be utilized.
Performance Target: Set to baseline.

Results 3.1:

This measure consists of two questions evaluating students’ academic planning with a rubric. Academic advisors in the AAPC complete this evaluation in Appointment Manager after the student attends their mandatory semester advising appointment. AAPC’s assessment rubric contains the questions and scoring criteria, and the sample group is limited to the 400 randomly selected students also evaluated in SLO #1.

N= 1,756 total first-year students who matriculated in Fall 2020 with Active student status and registered for classes on 9/1/2020.

n= 243 of the 400 randomly selected first-year students attended both Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 Mandatory Advising appointments, and the advisor scored the students on both rubric criteria for this assessment outcome.

17% increase in student knowledge of academic policies and procedures from Fall 2020 to Spring 2021.

Policies and Procedures Rubric Scores of 243 Randomly Selected First-Year Students, as Evaluated by the Academic Advisor After the Student Attends two Mandatory Advising Appointments at AAPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Criteria (each scored 1 to 4)</th>
<th>Fall 2020 Average Score</th>
<th>Spring 2021 Average Score</th>
<th>Difference between Fall &amp; Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understands Prerequisites</td>
<td>2.308</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>+ 0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands POSM</td>
<td>2.687</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>+ 0.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score (1 to 4 possible points)</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>+ 0.424 17% increase from Fall to Spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare to Fall 2019’s average of 2.572, Spring 2020’s average of 3.015, and difference between 0.443 (17% increase).

Notes 3.1:

- The Understanding POSM rubric question was new to the rubric in 2019-2020 assessment cycle, whereas Understands Prerequisites was on the original rubric and is being used for both SLO #1 Measure 1 and this SLO #4 Measure 1.
• SEE SLO #1 Measure 1 notes for population (N) and sample (n) methodology.

SLO #4 – Policies and Procedures: Students will demonstrate knowledge of key academic policies and procedures after attending an academic advising appointment.  
(Assessment outcome #3)

Measure 2: Student Post-Appointment Survey [student’s knowledge after mandatory advising]

Students will complete a post-appointment survey demonstrating their knowledge of campus policies and/or procedures after their mandatory advising appointment.

Performance Target: Set to baseline.

Results 3.2:

The post-appointment student check-out survey was administered via email following a virtual meeting. Students attended 3,342 mandatory semester advising appointments (N) during Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 survey dates (unique students per semester). Of these, 39% or 1,300 students (n) responded to the two survey questions about policies/procedures.

N= 3,342 mandatory semester advising appointments (according to advisors) during survey dates, 9/1/2020 to 12/4/2020 and 1/20/2021 to 4/21/2021.

n= 1,300 student responses to survey questions (by students who reported their visit was for mandatory advising). These survey questions were required to complete the survey.

63% of respondents (822 students) correctly answered questions about two policies/procedures related to academic advising in Fall 2020-Spring 2021, 32% only answered one policy/procedures question correctly (409 students), and 5% did not answer any correctly (69 students).

Compare to 2019-2020: 44% of respondents (1,018 students) correctly answered questions about two policies/procedures related to academic advising. Note: Students wrote their response into a text box, rather than the now multiple choice questions.
Student Post-Appointment Check-Out Survey
Evaluating Student Knowledge of Policies/Procedures
after Mandatory Semester Advising Appointment, 2020-2021

Notes 3.2:

- N: 3,342 mandatory advising appointments. This number is based on the academic advisor’s selection of Appointment Reason “Mandatory Advising” in the post-appointment check-out questionnaire advisors complete in Appointment Manager. This number gives context for the measure but it may or may not match the students’ selected visit reason (n) in the student check-out survey.
  - Fall mandatory during survey dates, 9/1/2020 to 12/4/2020: 1,838
  - Spring mandatory during survey dates, 1/20/2021 to 4/21/2021: 1,504

- The survey questions for this measure were displayed only to students who selected “Mandatory Advising” as the reason for their visit to AAPC.

- Due to the continued COVID-19 virus in Spring 2021, AAPC advising appointments continued as completely virtual/online. AAPC provided virtual advising appointments and virtual daily drop-in appointments. Thus, a link to the student check-out survey was distributed by email.
automatically through Appointment Manager after the student attended an advising appointment instead of the previous year’s distribution of the survey in-person at the AAPC front desk.

- Changes since the 2019-2020 assessment cycle:
  - Both student survey questions were switched to multiple choice answer choices. This allowed a correct answer response to students if they answered incorrectly.
  - The Fall 2020 – Spring 2021 assessment cycle should be considered the first year of comparison for this measure’s results. Do not include the previous year’s pilot results for comparisons due to the measure’s change of methods from free text boxes for students’ typed responses to multiple choice.

**Use of Assessment Results**

**Measure 1: Assessment Rubric**

This is the first year of assessment for these two specific areas of SLO #4 Policies and Procedures specific to the students demonstrated knowledge of prerequisites and their knowledge of how to utilize the Program of Study Management system to declare their major. As the first year, the results from this feedback will be used to set a baseline for achievement for future semesters of assessment. When determining baseline, AAPC administrators and the Assessment Committee will consider the raw number of achievement and adjust the performance target accordingly. In this data set, AAPC advisors assess their cohort to be at 2.89 on a four-point scale of demonstrated knowledge where one represents beginning knowledge demonstrated and four represents advanced knowledge. As AAPC advisors assessed this cohort to be a nearly a three on the four point scale which represents “proficient” knowledge (2.89 of a possible 3), the assessment could be viewed as students having a desirable level of knowledge following a spring advising meeting in the areas of understanding prerequisites and the POSM system. Additionally, the increase of knowledge by a rate of 17% can be viewed as desirable by the AAPC Administration, as it reflects the efficacy of teaching polices and procedures by the AAPC advising staff to the student cohort, consistent with the developmental advising philosophy and the AAPC mission. With this in mind, the AAPC administration and Assessment Committee will determine the performance target and continue to strive to achieve the performance target thorough ongoing training of staff and continued emphasis in new advising onboarding training.

**Measure 2: Student Post-Appointment Survey**

This is the first year of assessment for these two specific areas of SLO #4 Policies and Procedures specific to the students demonstrated knowledge in two policies, the required number of credits for graduation and the number of credits threshold for which a student is required to declare a major. As the first year, the results from this feedback will be used to set a baseline for achievement for future semesters of assessment. When determining baseline, AAPC Administration and the Assessment Committee will consider the rate of achievement and adjust the performance Target
accordingly. In this data set, a total of 94% of respondents were able to demonstrate knowledge of at least one of the desired policies. Correlatively, only 6% of respondents were unable to demonstrate knowledge of either of the desired policies. Once again, this high rate of success in demonstrated knowledge can be viewed as desirable by the AAPC Administration, as it reflects the efficacy of teaching policies and procedures by the AAPC advising staff to the student cohort, consistent with the developmental advising philosophy and the AAPC mission. With this in mind, the AAPC Administration and Assessment Committee will determine the Performance Target and continue to strive to achieve the Performance Target with thorough ongoing training of staff and continued emphasis in new advising onboarding training.

**Budget Changes:**

Budget changes as a result of assessing this measure are minimal as the key element of continuing this measure is the ongoing use of the Appointment Manager platform, which is subscription based. The platform is critical to effective and timely collection of this data and there are no plans to alter the exhibiting relationship or subscription between the AAPC and the vendor. Impacts as to the major decidedness and the need for greater resources be steered toward the AAPC for the purposes of staff training, professional conference engagement, and staff retention are part of an ongoing dialogue among AAPC and institutional administrators.