Data for Assessment Results
Fall 2021 – Spring 2022
Purpose and Scope

- This document was created by the Data Coordinator to compile assessment data and summarize the institutional assessment results of the Academic Advising and Planning Center (AAPC) for the academic year 2021-2022.

- Process for assessment: The Data Coordinator uploaded summarized assessment data into Compliance Assist, the repository of the College of Charleston’s institutional assessment efforts, in December 2022. The AAPC Associate Director or Director contribute how the office will use the results.

- This document provides final summarized data results and important details about the data, data collection, analysis processes, data sources, and location of assessment documentation.

- Many of the details noted in this document will not be uploaded with the final data, but documentation of such details is necessary for consistency of data collection and data analysis efforts from one academic year to the next- and understanding what adaptations have been made to account for the impact of COVID-19 and resulting staffing crunch on this year’s assessment results. Some outcome measures have performance targets that compare the current year’s results to the previous year’s results. Where possible, consistency with previous years’ work has been maintained: where impossible, efforts to mitigate the continuity issues have been described and justified.

- The final assessment results submitted to the College of Charleston’s Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning: formerly located in the Compliance Assist platform, henceforth the College’s Microsoft SharePoint site.

Review and Discussion of Results

- The Academic Advising and Planning Center’s 15 staff members met for 2 hours to review and discuss these assessment results on June 9, 2022.

- The AAPC Assessment Committee met several times to discuss these results.

- This document includes the Data Coordinator, Brian Erb’s, comments about this data and incorporates feedback from that meeting.

Special Circumstances

- The previous Data Coordinator, Jennifer Marshall, resigned her position in September 2021 and Brian Erb was hired in November 2021 during this assessment cycle. Considerable effort has been made to ensure continuity, but this may cause minor differences in data collection and aggregation processes that could affect results marginally.

- Staff turnover in the fall caused considerable disruption to how the AAPC operates, forcing all mandatory advising in the fall semester and eight weeks in the spring semester to occur in a group setting considerably different from that in which past Assessment cycles were conducted. The effect of this change will be covered in detail in each section.
Academic Advising and Planning Center Usage
This is a summary of the AAPC’s student attendance at orientation advising and semester advising appointments.

Orientation Advising Count
This is a summary of the Academic Advising and Planning Center’s New Student Orientation activities. Due to the COVID-19 virus, Orientation (June-August 2021 and December 2021-January 2022) was conducted via Zoom in a 100% virtual format and consisted of a large number of one-day orientation sessions with small groups of students with each advisor during each session. Only in the June-August 2022 orientation sessions, outside the scope of this report, did operations return to normal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June-August</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2021 and Late Registration</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2021 early advisees: TAP, International</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Summer 2021 Orientations</td>
<td>2,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December-January</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2021 (including Charleston Bridge) (Note: due to COVID-19 virtual orientations, CofC offered December orientations to both Charleston Bridge students and regular incoming students for spring.)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2022 &amp; Late Registration</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Winter 2022 Orientations</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Meetings Fall 2021-Spring 2022

This summarizes the AAPC’s contacts with students outside the orientation season via appointments and walk-ins. Because of high staff turnover, the AAPC employed a group advising model for all mandatory advising appointments in the Fall 2021 advising season using a group virtual advising model the Center adopted to accommodate the mandate on our office to advise all first-year students. Virtual Group Advising was also employed in the Spring 2022 for an eight-week period through March 2022. In this period, students were permitted to participate in group advising or schedule a one-on-one advising appointment to satisfy their mandatory advising requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall/Summer 2021</th>
<th>May-Dec. 2021 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>3,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Ins: Drop/Add period</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Ins: Withdrawal Deadline</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Ins: Other</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Summer 2021 (excludes orientation) and Fall 2021</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,582</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2022</th>
<th>Jan.-April 2022 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>2,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Ins: Drop/Add</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Ins: Withdrawal Deadline</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Ins: Quick Question Drop In (QQDI)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spring 2022</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,261</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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]

In past Assessment years, this Student Learning Outcome was evaluated by means of a seven-question rubric in which advisors scored students on a scale of 1 to 4 on various measures of the quality of their plan to take them to graduation, administered to a 400-student random sample of first-semester freshmen.

This was not possible in the 2021-22 Assessment year. A COVID-19 related staffing crunch in April 2021 resulted in the office’s staff member headcount being nearly halved, with its overall advising load increased by an additional 300 new students to account for the largest freshman class in the College’s history: this meant that the per capita advising load skyrocketed, forcing us to make necessary compromises. The rubric was one of those compromises. The group advising process did allow the continuation of basic services, but it made it impossible for an advisor leading a group advising session with up to sixteen students at once to provide the kind of particularized attention necessary to rank each such student on a rubric. It remained possible to ask assessment questions in what individual appointments were still possible- but even these were necessarily more hurried than those in previous years.

Accordingly, the assessment rubric was considerably simplified in Fall 2021. Rather than the defined sample of 400 students, the rubric questions were filled out on an ad-hoc basis whenever the advisor had an individual appointment.

Furthermore, six rubric questions were reduced to three- dropping questions about the advisor’s impression of the student’s preparedness for the appointment, the student’s ability to identify specific courses relating to their major, and the student’s knowledge of prerequisites for their major courses and retaining questions about major decidedness, the student’s ability to articulate their goals, and their ability to use advising resources.
### What the student does to master the learning outcome/criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>BEGINNING: No evidence is demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMERGING: Some evidence is demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROFICIENT: Most evidence is demonstrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADVANCED: All evidence is demonstrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Decision

**Student considers major or areas of academic interest.**

- **Very Undecided**: student has not identified any areas of interest.
- **Undecided**: Student has identified possible areas of interest.
- **Exploring**: Student has identified 2-5 intended majors but has not made a decision.
- **Decided**: Student has decided on an academic major.

### Articulates Goals

**Student articulates goals and relevant action items as they relate to their academic progress.**

- **Student goals did not come up at all.**
- **Student unable to articulate their goals independently: did not have buy-in, shut down, would not engage in conversation.**
- **Student articulates goal(s) but unable to identify action items towards them. Advisor informs of appropriate resources to do so.**
- **Student articulates goal(s) and identifies actions toward them in collaboration with the advisor.**
- **Student articulates goal(s) and precisely indicates their action plan and/or has already taken action toward that end.**

### Consults Advising Resources

**Student consults resources such as academic departments, course catalog, Degree Works/‘What-If’, Major Roadmaps, or POSM Worksheets to choose courses.**

- **Student is unfamiliar with any of these advising resources.**
- **Student is familiar with advising resources, but has not used them.**
- **Student has accessed advising resources, but needs advisor support to utilize/understand them.**
- **Student consulted the necessary advising resources and, based on this information, developed a proposed course list in advance of their appointment.**

This simplification, while necessary for the continued operation of the AAPC under difficult circumstances, makes 1:1 comparison to past years’ assessment data and performance targets challenging. Improvisation has also been necessary for comparisons between fall and spring semesters within the 2021-22 Assessment year, because the issues that complicated data collection were not smoothly continuous throughout that period: for a substantial period in Fall 2021 mandatory advising was only conducted through group appointments in which rubric use was not possible. The only advising appointments that are directly comparable between Fall and Spring in exactly the same way as previous assessment reports are those in which a student came back after their group advising appointment for a separate individual advising appointment in the Fall, then returned for their mandatory advising appointment with us in the Spring, and had their advisor fill out the rubric for them on both occasions. This happened exactly five times in total. These numbers will still be given for the sake of continuity with how data has been collected and reported in the past, but since this is hardly a sufficiently large population to draw reliable conclusions from, two alternative means of comparison are also presented below.

Though exact comparison between this year and previous ones has been muddled by these factors, our historical **performance target of a 15% semester-to-semester increase in average rubric score** was still used.
Results 1.1 (Rubric):

This measure consists of three 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.

Measure 1.1.0 is the data handled as similarly as possible to past assessment cycles—only first-year freshmen who matriculated in Fall 2021 with Active student status and registered for classes at the beginning of the semester, who had an individual mandatory advising appointment in Fall 2021 with all three rubric components for this assessment outcome, compared to those from this population who were also advised in Spring 2022 and were scored in all three rubric components. It is the most restrictive case, having the virtue of being most directly comparable to previous assessment years’ processes and the vice of having a very small sample size.

\( N_0 = 2,008 \) total students seen by the AAPC who matriculated in Fall 2021 with Active student status and registered for classes on in Fall 2021

\( n_0 = 5 \) first-year students who attended both Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 individual Mandatory Advising appointments, and the advisor scored the students on all rubric criteria for this assessment outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Criteria (1-4)</th>
<th>Fall 2021 (comparable mandatory: ( n = 5 ))</th>
<th>Spring 2022 (comparable mandatory: ( n = 5 ))</th>
<th>( \Delta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Decidedness</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>+0 (+0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulates Goals</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>+0 (+0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consults Advising Resources</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>+0.4 (+14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>+0.13 (+4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semester-to-semester change in average rubric score from Fall 2021 (3.27) to Spring 2021 (3.4) was an increase of 4%—compare with the previous year’s 8% and the performance target of 15%.
Measure 1.1.1 is the least restrictive case in which all available rubric data is used. It has the virtue of having the greatest sample size, but the vice that the population is not very similar to data examined in past assessment years- including both mandatory and non-mandatory appointments, data from students who were not new freshmen in Fall 2021, data from students who showed in only Fall but not Spring, and including students who were not seen by professional advisors.

N₁ = 3,430 total students in any year seen by the AAPC in either Fall 2021 or Spring 2022 with Active status in at least one of those semesters, who matriculated in any semester.

n₁₋₁ = 612 students in Fall 2021 individual advising appointments in which the advisor scored the students on all rubric criteria for this assessment outcome.

n₁₋₂ = 1391 students in Spring 2022 individual advising appointments in which the advisor scored the students on all rubric criteria for this assessment outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Criteria (1-4)</th>
<th>Fall 2021 (All: n = 612)</th>
<th>Spring 2022 (All: n = 1391)</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Decidedness</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>+0.03 (+0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulates Goals</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>+0.36 (+14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consults Advising Resources</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>+0.39 (+16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>+0.26 (+9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semester-to-semester change in average rubric score from Fall 2021 (2.86) to Spring 2021 (3.12) was an increase of 9% - compare with the previous year's 8% and the performance target of 15%.

Measure 1.1.2 is an attempt at a happy medium. It compares all AAPC appointments with completed rubric questions of freshmen newly enrolled in Fall 2021 who were seen by professional advisors- whether they came to a Quick Question Drop-In appointment or a full advising appointment, and whether or not the same student was seen and evaluated in both the Fall 2021 and Spring 2021 semesters. Its sample size is large enough to draw conclusions from, while still
omitting data points like juniors who had to come in for one semester to get a missing-major hold lifted who would be a poor measure of whether the AAPC is fulfilling its core mission.

\( N_0 = 2,008 \) total students seen by the AAPC who matriculated in Fall 2021 with Active student status and registered for classes on in Fall 2021.

\( n_{2,1} = 279 \) first-year freshmen in Fall 2021 individual advising appointments in which the advisor scored the students on all rubric criteria for this assessment outcome.

\( n_{2,2} = 1033 \) first-year freshmen in Spring 2022 individual advising appointments in which the advisor scored the students on all rubric criteria for this assessment outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Criteria (1-4)</th>
<th>Fall 2021 (New freshmen: ( n = 279 ))</th>
<th>Spring 2022 (New freshmen: ( n = 1033 ))</th>
<th>( \Delta )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major Decidedness</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>+0.1 (+3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulates Goals</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>+0.51 (+21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consults Advising Resources</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>+0.58 (+25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>+0.4 (+15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The semester-to-semester change in average rubric score from Fall 2021 (2.86) to Spring 2022 (3.12) was an increase of 15\% - compare with the previous year's 8\% and the performance target of 15\%.

Whether we met our performance target is thus dependent on which of 1.1.0, 1.1.1 or 1.1.2 is considered the more appropriate version of 1.1. To make this determination, it is helpful to examine each measure in the context of how it compares with performance in previous years. (Past years’ data has not been recalculated to match each new method: the only difference in the line charts below is the figure for the exceptional 2021-22 Assessment year.)
The chart for 1.1.0, the most restrictive case in which the very small number of students who are comparable in exactly the same way as used in previous Assessment years, makes this look like a very strange year, with record-breaking high average rubric scores and much less difference between Fall and Spring than is typical. While the 2021-22 year was unusual, it seems implausible that the year’s changes would produce a population of students who started off their first semester at the College doing dramatically better than their peers in previous years. 1.1.0’s unusual results can safely be written off as an artifact of its much-smaller sample size.

1.1.1 and 1.1.2 both appear to be better proxies for what things looked like in past years. In 1.1.1, the least restrictive case incorporating as much data as possible, average rubric scores in both the Fall and Spring semesters are slightly elevated relative to the past. Since it contains those who have received multiple semesters of advising already, as well as transfer students and readmits who start with more knowledge of how college works than new freshmen, this is to be expected. The semester-to-semester change in average rubric score using that measure was 9% - not equal to the performance target of 15% set after 2016-17’s 16% semester-to-semester increase, but broadly comparable with performance since then.

1.1.2 appears broadly similar, save that the rubric score for students in the Fall appears to be in line with historical averages for the previous measure- presumably because it is not inflated by those who have already received advising or previous college experience. The greater-than-expected 15% increase in average rubric score from Spring to Fall, meeting the performance target, may be a genuine reflection of good performance, an artifact of the change in data collection between now and previous assessment years, or a mix of the two.

In short, comparison with previous years is difficult, but the scenario which shows a dramatic miss from the stated performance target is implausible: it seems that the AAPC performed as or better than expected.
Notes 1.1 (Rubric):

- The primary source for the data in this section was reports in our ‘Appointment Manager’/Achieve software platform, from Sign-in/Check-in → History Lookup. ‘Appointments’ with students of the last name ‘Test’, as well as those marked as meeting or requesting to meet with non-advising employee, Jennifer Marshall, were scrubbed as not being actual student encounters. Only appointments marked as Closed in the Status column were included, removing those which were no-shows or cancelled, as well as a few appointments erroneously indicated as being still ongoing months after the fact.

Students’ status as being admitted as freshmen, transfers, or otherwise, as well as their semester of admission, is not natively present in this Appointment Manager report: Measures 1.1.0 and 1.1.2 required cross-referencing with a Cognos report drawing that data from [Student Detail].[ADMISSIONS_POPULATION] and [Student Detail].[Academic Study].[ACADEMIC_PERIOD_ADMITTED].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Admit Type</th>
<th>Freshman FR, IF, PR</th>
<th>Transfer T4, T2, TB, TM, IT</th>
<th>Readmit RA, RC</th>
<th>Other SR, RE, ND, GR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>81.36%</td>
<td>15.34%</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
<td>83.96%</td>
<td>13.77%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Fall</td>
<td>78.42%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Spring</td>
<td>84.36%</td>
<td>14.23%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Fall</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Spring</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Freshman Types</th>
<th>Freshman Admit type FR</th>
<th>Provisional Admit type PR</th>
<th>International Freshman Admit type IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>92.28%</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
<td>92.08%</td>
<td>7.67%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.0</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Fall</td>
<td>92.17%</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Spring</td>
<td>92.54%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Fall</td>
<td>93.18%</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Spring</td>
<td>93.05%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Again, measure 1.1 has conventionally been applied only to those who were new freshmen in the Fall 2021 semester. While the original 1.1.0 measure and the ‘middle ground/happy medium’ 1.1.2 measure remain faithful to this, the ‘least-restrictive’ 1.1.1 version, abandoned it in attempt at maximum sample size. The table to the left shows the consequences of this: 1.1.1 is reflective of the demographics of all of the students met by the AAPC over the 2021-22 advising season rather than being limited only to freshman admit types, which is what makes it more difficult to compare to past years’ data than 1.1.0 or 1.1.2.

- Not only is measure 1.1 typically applied only to freshmen, the goal is for the sample measured to be representative of the proportions for what kind of freshmen were seen by the AAPC in this assessment year. This goal was met. 1.1.0 looks a bit off, but with its sample size of 5, it would be numerically impossible for it to be more representative: the next closest would be for us to have seen 4 FR and one PR student, and 100/0/0 is much closer to 92.3/7.4/0.4 than 80/20/0 is.

- The plan for future assessment cycles is to return to the seven-question rubric originally adopted in 2016-17. This year’s use of the three-question condensed version was a temporary emergency measure, not a permanent and deliberate departure from previous practice.
The use of a measure very close to the original 1.1.0 version of SLO #1, Measure 1 is also planned to resume. 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 were improvisations designed to provide a ‘close-enough’ substitute for the original measure.

However, the abandonment of the 400-student random sample procedure used in past Assessment years is likely, to be replaced with the convenience-sample/pseudo-census procedure used in this year’s report of bringing together rubric data from all appointments with students who were first-year freshmen in Fall 2022 and also had an appointment in the following Spring semester. This is due to the observation that this method resulted in proportions of admit types that were quite similar to those of the sampling frame of all students recorded as having met with the AAPC in the relevant semester.

- In this assessment cycle, advisors spent 1.5 hours on 9/9/22 to review case studies to compare and normalize rubric responses across advisors in the office.

- Rubrics are completed only on the same day as the appointment – never retroactively.

Use of Assessment Results

Measure 1:

As reflected in the details provided above, accurate data collection for the 2021-22 assessment cycle may have proven more difficult than any cycle prior to the COVID-era. The AAPC’s challenges in this regard begins with understanding the staffing issues and the ever-growing expectation of institutional administrators that service providers serve greater numbers of students without additional staffing. In the summer of 2021, the College of Charleston enrolled a record number of students through New Student Orientation. 3182 students completed New Student Orientation, compared to 2674 the year before, an increase of 508 students. Of these, 2309 were designated as first-year students (freshman), an increase of 382 over the previous year (1927). In fact, in a campus-wide email, College President Andrew Hsu named the [incoming] freshman class of 2021 the largest in school history (11/3/22). This means that a record number of students would, by default, be receiving the academic advising from the AAPC and receiving a mandatory advising registration hold. Moreover, this increase of 382 freshman students constitutes more than the entire caseload of one full-time AAPC professional advisor. Coupled with the fact the AAPC was in fact already short four full-time professional advisors among its available lines of employment at the start of the academic year, the Leadership Team of the AAPC was forced to make the difficult decision to employ Group Advising as the only realistic way to meet the advising requirement of the College because of the excessive, yet ongoing and persistent, staff attrition facing the AAPC in the 2021-22 academic year. While the resulting Group Advising did meet the needs of the advising requirements of the College and its students, both first-year and otherwise, it produced significant impacts on the 2021-22 AAPC Assessment cycle.
The impacts on the AAPC and the students were not limited to the assessment of services. Numerically, as the usage tables above demonstrate, the AAPC was able to maintain its ability to provide advising to the freshman cohort and even more beyond the mandate. It was a reported by the AAPC advising staff that there was a palpable lack of the desired developmental advising provided in a Group Advising environment. Because of sheer volume, the Group Advising model must rely on the prescriptive advising philosophy to be successful. While it was proven by the significant efforts of the AAPC staff that servicing record numbers of students through group advising was successful in meeting the goal of meeting with all of its assigned students for advising, it did not provide the opportunity for advisors to engage with students in the desired developmental manner where “advising is teaching.” With a diminished opportunity for advisors to “teach” the competency-based knowledge to students regarding academic planning, use of resources and other transferable skills, it will and should become an ongoing assessment goal of the AAPC Leadership to assess, longitudinally, the impacts of group advising on the CofC Class of 2025 and those incoming students of fall 2021.

Notwithstanding the undesired aspects of Group Advising, the AAPC Leadership and staff did learn positive outcomes as well, namely that it can be done and done with integrity. The agility and adaptability with which the AAPC staff learned and applied a completely new style of advising (Virtual Group Advising) should be commended. This was a near herculean task to determine best practice for a new style of advising with limited preparation time, given the limitation of CofC online resources available for staff with which to serve students and to implement it within a matter of just a few short weeks. Additionally, the task of determining how best to maintain the AAPC’s high standard of assessment of services throughout the Virtual Group Advising experience, for which, again, AAPC Leadership and staff should be applauded. Therefore, results from Measure I above in its various iterations, depending on the sampling, the AAPC was still able to determine that the target performance was achievable, and which also proves to be historically consistent. This would suggest that despite the changing in service delivery, those students that are in the sample assessed in the spring semester by in-person meetings with advisors did grow in the of areas of decidedness, goals and identifying resources. Though it was determined at the end of the previous assessment cycle that this measure will continue to be assessed at least one more year after in-person advising services are again offered, it would be appropriate for the AAPC Leadership and Assessment Committee to consider if this measure would continue unchanged, modified or retired after the conclusion of this 2021-22 Assessment Cycle. AAPC administration and the AAPC Assessment Committee will also reexamine the current performance target and consider whether or not the performance target needs to be altered for the 2022-23 assessment cycle. Nevertheless, the AAPC will continue to strive to achieve the existing performance target thorough ongoing training of staff and greater emphasis in new advisor onboarding training.
Budget Changes

Budget changes in regard to this measure and most areas of assessment remain the same for this assessment cycle and the AAPC historically. Staff retention remains a persistent problem in the office due to a non-competitive pay, little opportunity for next level positions, the continual increased demand for our service, and the stress of the work. While beginning the academic year with multiple staff vacancies placed an undue burden on the team, this was exacerbated by the ever-increasing demand of institutional leadership that student enrollments continually increase while student support staff numbers remain the same (or in some cases, decrease). There becomes a greater challenge placed upon the current staff to meet those demands and the needs of the students. As such, the ability to provide accurate and timely assessment of services and analysis of whether services can achieve desired SLOs is diminished in the interest of expedited services provided. Notwithstanding, the AAPC staff continued to provide a high level of quality in their advising services and this is reflected in our adapting assessment efforts to reflect the modified advising delivery method, but only through the concerted effort of each staff member to do so, despite the fact that meeting this expectation of assessment while providing meaningful, timely academic advising goes above and beyond what should be expected of staff to do. Despite the ability of the Data Coordinator, Assessment Committee and AAPC Leadership to conduct meaningful assessment, the above reported results serve as an indication that lower-than-desired staffing levels and increased student enrollment creates unnecessary and avoidable challenges to effective assessment practices and data collection, which was only magnified by the continually changing landscape due to realities associated with COVID-19. As has been stated in previous annual assessment reports submitted by the AAPC, 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, in addition academic advisor lines must be revisited so that the staff can be stabilized, which maximizes student advising services that can be realized.

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 was administered via the Qualtrics platform to all students who participate in and complete an advising appointment to assess their knowledge of academic tools and/or resources. This survey was also used for Measure 1 of SLO #4, covered later.

This Qualtrics survey was distributed by E-mail to all students who met us- the second Assessment year in which this method was used. Prior Assessment years used the same survey, administered on a tablet in the AAPC lobby as the student left their appointment.

Performance Target: 70% of students will be able to correctly identify two resources.
Results 1.2 (Student Post-Appointment Survey):
It appears that this is another case in which how we adapted to COVID complicates Assessment results, though not as much as 1.1.

Post-Appointment Survey Response Rates

- Did not respond to survey: 97, 2%
- Did not discuss resources: 90, 1%
- Did not answer survey question #2: 465, 8%
- Responded to questions: 5104, 89%

Students attended 5,756 appointments (N) during the Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 survey dates- a count of appointments, not unique students. There were 652 responses to the survey in the same period, a response rate of 11.3%. A further 90 failed to answer survey question 2, “List the resources you discussed during your appointment today, beginning with the resources you are most likely to use,” and 97 claimed not to have discussed resources in the appointment- leaving SLO #1, Measure 2, with a useful sample (n) of 485 responses.

In years prior to 2020-2021, this survey was administered on a tablet in the AAPC lobby as students left their appointment, and response rates were much higher: 65% 2019-2020, 54% 2018-19, and 66% 2017-18. The switch to a virtual-only group advising model and E-mail distribution of the survey substantially lowered response rates is perhaps unsurprising, but that response rates would fall again, from last year’s effective 28% to this year’s 8%, is more difficult to account for.

Possible explanations for this decline in response rates include:

- The more hurried nature of advising appointments left fewer opportunities for advisors to give students reminders to complete it.
- The importance of the post-appointment survey was not conveyed to AAPC staff due to compressed training schedules for new advisors during the staffing crunch, or due to the continuing lack of an Assistant Director for Training and Development.
- Something else about the group-advising setting left students less likely to answer or unsure how to answer: if six academic resources were discussed in a group session, only one of
which pertained to your situation, does that make the appropriate answer to the question
“List the resources you discussed during your appointment today…” one resource or six?
• The survey itself was rephrased in Fall 2021 to reflect the switch in which all mandatory
advising appointments occurred via group advising, but not promptly revised in Spring
2022 to reflect the return of individual mandatory advising alongside group appointments.
For some time students were left without a fully accurate option to report that they had
attended an individual mandatory advising appointment- which may have confused
students into leaving the survey unfinished.

With the full return to individual mandatory advising, normalization of caseloads, more seasoned
and experienced staff, and revision of the survey, we anticipate a significant increase in the
survey’s response rate in the coming year.

Regardless of why the response rate declined, 485 responses is not the 5 students of 1.1.0: unlike
Measure 1, no drastic improvisations will be necessary to draw conclusions from the available
data. The following will proceed along identical lines to previous Assessment reports and be more
straightforwardly comparable to previous years’ figures.

Of the 465-student sample, 45% (209) students correctly named three or more academic resources,
and a further 29% (135) students correctly named two. In total 74% (344) correctly identified
two or more academic tools or resources, meeting the 70% target.
Whether the improvement here is indicative of sampling bias (students inclined to respond to the survey E-mail being more clued-in on average) or an actual increase in the ability of our advisees to name resources discussed in their meeting is an interesting question, one that will be more firmly answerable as we see more years of data collection through the E-mail survey.

(To return to the tablet-survey method would be less than ideal, because while group virtual mandatory advising was a temporary emergency measure, virtual individual mandatory advising is here to stay, and going back to doing the survey on a tablet in the AAPC’s lobby would exclude such students.)

Use of Assessment Results

Measure 2:

Once more and as described in the assessment methodology in the previous measure, the AAPC was challenged to render truly accurate data that was not affected by the necessity of providing academic advising through the Virtual Group Advising setting temporarily adopted for the 2021-22 assessment cycle. There can be an assumed correlation between the diminished sample size of completed surveys as described in the measure methodology written above. However, the sample size still proved large enough to measure the SLO comfortably and confidently and make a historical comparison to previous year’s data. Once more, given the challenges of volume in advising in a Virtual Group Advising environment and the diminished capacity of the AAPC staff to offer in-person advising sessions in the spring of 2022, spring being the term in which most growth is likely to be demonstrated, the result of 74% of respondents being able to identify two or more resources is impressive, at the very least. Achieving this benchmark in these conditions of advising is a continued testimony to the ability of the AAPC staff to provide meaningful, knowledge-based, and transferable skills to a large cohort, regardless of the advising delivery method. Perhaps more impressive is, while meeting the performance target, this percentage also represents a higher-than-average performance target of five years, as demonstrated on the chart above. This suggests not only improved efforts to collect meaningful
assessment data, but it can also be correlated by AAPC leadership to be reflective of precise and deliberate training and onboarding as well as ongoing training of AAPC staff to provide advising that emphasizes resource knowledge and teachable transferable skills. The AAPC leadership will use these results for 2021-22 assessment cycle to determine if this SLO should be retired, amended, or continued in an effort to determine if other knowledge-based skills can, will or could be taught by advisors to the AAPC’s cohort. Further discussions revolving around the best practices for onboarding and training will also stem from this result, with future positive outcomes anticipated.

**Budget Changes**

While this measure can be viewed as a success in achieving the desired SLO performance target, the AAPC will continue to stress the need for increased staffing levels and retention of staff by continuing to encourage institutional leadership to increase its financial commitment to the AAPC. When an SLO can be achieved with this level of success under these conditions, then AAPC Leadership can comfortably infer that the same or increased results can be extrapolated across a greater number of students to a higher degree of success with a greater number of available professional advisors to provide meaningful, developmental advising. Further, greater resources committed to the ongoing training and development of professional advising staff can then again infer the same or greater success in teaching resource knowledge, transferable skills and an understanding of institutional systems to the AAPC cohort.

**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 earned.

**Measure 1 (a-b): Programming** [direct measure]
Enumerate the percentage of students who attend a) the **Choosing a Major Workshop** and b) the Majors & Minors Fair respectively.

**Performance Target:** 10% increase in student attendance from the previous year’s figure at each event.

**Results 2.1a (Choosing a Major Workshop):**
Fall 2021:
N= 9,825 unique degree-seeking undergraduate students with Active student status and enrolled at the end of Fall 2021.
n= 24 unique students attended one offered workshop.
Attendance at the Fall 2021 Choosing a Major Workshops increased 41% from Fall 2020’s 17 students, meeting the performance target of a 10% increase.

0.24% of students attended a Choosing a Major Workshop in Fall 2021.

Note: Workshops in Fall of the previous year were all offered as recordings with 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. 17 is the number who registered for the recorded workshop, 4 of which attended the live virtual Q&A session. By contrast, this semester’s figure of 24 students is the number who verifiably attended one of four live, supervised, hosted Zoom sessions.

Spring 2022:

N= 9,297 unique degree-seeking undergraduate students with Active student status and enrolled at the end of Spring 2022.

n= 16 unique students attended one offered workshop.

Attendance at the Spring 2022 Choosing a Major Workshops increased 60% from Spring 2021’s 10 students, meeting the performance target of a 10% increase.

0.17% of active, degree seeking undergraduate students attended the Choosing a Major Workshop in Spring 2022.

Note: Spring 2022 workshops were held as four live, in-person sessions in a return to pre-pandemic practices.
Notes 2.1a (Choosing a Major Workshop):

- Fall 2021 population size (N): 9,825 on a Cognos report of students filtered for unique degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status at end of term, admit types FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/TM/RA/RC/GR/GC/BT

- Spring 2022 population size (N): 9,297 on a Cognos report of students filtered for unique degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status at end of term, admit types FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/TM/RA/RC/GR/GC/BT

- Sample size (n) attendance both semesters is based on sign-in sheets provided by the Career Center staff.

- Practice in past assessment years has been to run the Cognos reports establishing population size, N, as close to end of semester as possible, presumably to get a snapshot free of issues like students dropping out mid-semester or being removed from that semester’s data after the end of that semester. This semester, both reports were run on 10/16/2022. Future assessment years will resume the practice of past ones.
Results 2.1b (Majors & Minors Fair):

N= 9,829 unique students

**n= 401 students attended the fair.** This year’s Majors & Minors Fair returned to its pre-pandemic format of a one-day in-person event.

Student attendance **increased more than 10%** from Fall 2020 (56 students) to Fall 2021 (401 students), **meeting our performance target.**

4.1% of students attended the Fall 2020 Virtual Majors and Minors Fair.

While it is technically true that we met the formal performance target of a 10% year-over-year, the increase in attendance between this year’s Majors and Minors Fair and the last is not very useful to know: the 2020 event was exceptional in a number of respects, because the pandemic forced it to be held as a weeklong virtual event rather than its typical in-person, one-day format. More instructive comparisons include:

- **The pre-pandemic average of 314.**
- The average of 246 for the first three years of the event, when it was held in the Stern Center Ballroom.
- **The average of 365 in the 2016-2019 period, pre-pandemic but after the event was moved to the Cougar Mall.**
- **The pre-pandemic average of 386 for 2017-2019, after Charleston Bridge students were mandated to attend.**
Each of these possible points of comparison for this year’s attendance numbers were also exceeded, all but one of them by 10%.

Notes 2.1b (Majors & Minors Fair):

- This year’s Majors and Minors Fair was held on September 29, 2021.
- Fall 2021 attendance note: the Cougar Mall is an open-air space with many entrances and exits, one in which it is not practically possible to count 100% of those who enter and exit with a card swipe- but this shortcoming is shared with past Cougar Mall Majors and Minors Fair events, and the undercount is presumably similar to that of past years.
- Charleston Bridge students (not yet admitted as CofC students) may have attended the virtual Majors and Minors Fair in fall 2020, so that student group is added to the count of degree-seeking students for the population size (N).
- Fall 2021 population size (N) of 9,829 is based on the sum of two student populations:
  - 9,825 unique degree seeking undergraduate students with Active student status in Fall 2021 (admit types FR/IF/PR/T2/T4/IT/TB/TM/RA/RC/GR/GC/BT).
  - 4 Charleston Bridge students. In the fall, these students are not yet admitted as CofC students.
  - The Charleston Bridge program is typically ~100 students, not a single-digit number: it is likely that the number was updated after the conclusion of the semester by the CB program to reclassify CB students who successfully made the transition as having a different admit type. Again, the typical assessment practice of pulling a Cognos report of College attendees at the end of the semester rather than examining retroactive data while compiling the assessment report would likely have yielded a different result here, and will be resumed in future Assessment years. In all likelihood, these students’ contribution to the top-line number of the population size is correctly recorded, because their admit type would have changed to TB.
- In addition to the ‘eras’ given for comparison on the chart above, here are some other factors which could have affected Majors and Minors Fair attendance numbers:
  - Ease of count due to location. While the Cistern Yard is more heavily trafficked than the Stern Center Ballroom and thus likely attracted larger student numbers, this effect would be partially offset in the data by the fact that it’s practical to count everyone entering and leaving the room, rather than the more open situation in the Cistern Yard.
  - Varied methods of counting attendees (at sign in tables, an exit survey, or handing out bags, at departments’ virtual events). Notably, this is why 2016’s attendance number reads ‘300+’ rather than 300: we were using bags handed out to count attendance numbers, and lost count of students when we ran out of bags to hand out.
  - Differing incentives: handouts/food to entice students to participate have not been perfectly uniform from year to year.
  - Registration/sign-in locations have not been perfectly uniform year-to-year, even when the event has been held in the same general location.
  - Overlap with other events: 2018 was held in Cougar Mall at the same time as the Career Fair was held in TD Arena.
Use of Assessment Results

Measure 1a:

“Choosing a Major” Workshops are an important piece of student programming involving the AAPC and its staff. While the workshops in academic year 2021-2022 failed to achieve the target performance, the AAPC will continue to participate in its partnership with the Career Center to present this programming to the CofC community and to assess participation in this programming. It is important to remember that CofC, and institutions around the nation, continued to inch back into a completely in-person environment beginning in the Fall 2021 semester. COVID lag likely continued to impact attendance in Zoom-based events and impact the knowledge, and expectation, of students to find and engage in in-person programming versus virtual programming like “Choosing a Major” workshops. While the impact of COVID undoubtably continues to impact the ability of the AAPC to achieve the target performance for Workshop attendance, the 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 to assess this program as part of its overall assessment plan for the next academic year.

Measure 1b:

The Major and Minors Fair (MMF) is the cornerstone event of the AAPC’s annual public programming for the CofC community. Reestablished as an in-person event in the fall of 2021 and moved to a new location on the green space known as the Cistern Yard on the CofC campus, the MMF met its target performance, but as the methodology above explains, this was easily impacted by several factors concerning the previous year’s event, which was virtual. However, the 2021 event did outperform the previous three-year average of in-person MMF events and with considerations as to how the CofC campus continues to move back toward a fully in-person experience for students, the 2021 MMF total attendance recorded renders a success for the AAPC team. The MMF experience in 2021 engendered a reinvigoration under the leadership of a new Assistant Director and which included new programming elements and its new venue. The event and participation was well received by the AAPC staff and students. Additionally, a new attendance collection method of utilizing student identification cards at strategically placed card-swipe locations within the event, is believed to have improved the ease and accuracy with which student attendance at the event is collected. Furthermore, an exit survey for student participants was administered for a second time during the last two MMF in-person events and, while not part of this formal annual institutional AAPC Assessment Report, the responses to it can begin to provide a longitudinal view of the MMF impact on major decidedness as a result of attending the MMF event. This brief survey asked respondents to indicate if attending the MMF encouraged decidedness; results were aggregated and discussed among the AAPC leadership, again, not as part of the AAPC’s formal assessment but as part of a discussion regarding the MMF event itself. Again, it is important to note this is not part of the submitted AAPC Assessment plan, but it may be in the future as the AAPC leadership determines the need to assess the MMF and its target performance goals. The MMF will continue to be planned and executed in the fall of 2022 with expectations of achieving its target performance for attendance and additional assessment of the
event’s ability to impact attendees decidedness toward a major. The AAPC leadership also views the MMF event as impacting an additional informal outcome of continuing to raise the AAPC’s public profile within the CofC community.

Budget Changes
As has been previously reported by the AAPC in its earlier annual reports, 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. In the meantime, the AAPC will continue to do its best to render as meaningful as possible data that reflects trends toward decidedness in relation to it public programming, like its workshops and MMF.

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 earned.

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

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

Information here was much less patchy than 1.1: it’s complete for almost every individual mandatory advising appointment, and many non-mandatory individual appointments. That still means that information for the Spring 2022 semester, in which mandatory advising was handled through a mix of virtual group, virtual individual, and in-person individual appointments, is challenging to directly compare with data from previous years, in which all mandatory advising was handled in an individual, in-person setting in which it was possible for advisors to evaluate a student’s major decidedness; but with this caveat in mind, it remains possible to use the original, unaltered version of this measure.

**Performance Target:** 75% of students will be identified by the advisor as decided (having 1 identified major) in their spring mandatory advising appointment. (Past assessment cycles have been limited to spring mandatory appointments: future cycles will restore this restriction.)
Results 2.2:

N= 1,890 students eligible to attend a Mandatory Advising appointment at AAPC in Spring 2021. (Spring 2021: 1,918)

n= 1,170 individual mandatory advising appointments in Spring 2021 attended at AAPC (unique students)

68% of students (797 out of 1,170) who attended a Spring 2022 Mandatory Advising appointment with their AAPC advisor were identified by the advisor as “Decided (1 identified major)”. This fails to meet the performance target of 75%.

Spring 2022 Major Decidedness

- Decided: 1 identified major (Advanced)
- Exploring: 2-5 identified majors (Proficient)
- Undecided: lots of options (Emerging)
- Very Undecided: no areas of interest (Beginning)

Major Decidedness Since 2017

- 69% (1,204/1,735) Spring 2017
- 70% (969/1,385) Spring 2018
- 71% (1,126/1,583) Spring 2019
- 68% (1,004/1,470) Spring 2020
- 73% (1,103/1,520) Spring 2021
- 68% (797/1,170) Spring 2022
Distribution of Major Decidedness for Students who Attended Mandatory Advising Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Decision (reported by advisors after student attends advising appointment)</th>
<th>Spring 2022 Mandatory Advising Appointments</th>
<th>Spring 2021 Mandatory Advising Appointments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Undecided (no areas of interest)</td>
<td>25 (2%)</td>
<td>17 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided (lots of options)</td>
<td>54 (5%)</td>
<td>51 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring (2-5 identified majors)</td>
<td>289 (25%)</td>
<td>343 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided (1 identified major)</td>
<td>797 (68%)</td>
<td>1103 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (did not discuss)</td>
<td>5 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes 2.2:

- The data source for major decidedness is the 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 the rubric criteria used for SLO #1 (Academic Planning and Progress).
  - Major Decision is a required advisor check-out question for all advising appointments.
  - 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 that N/A was added in Fall 2019 to accommodate meetings in which major decision was not discussed with the student: it has never represented a significant fraction of appointments and is not included in the above pie chart.

- Advisors spent 1.5 hours on 9/10/19 to review case studies to compare and normalize rubric responses across advisors in the office.
- Rubrics are completed only on the same day as the appointment – never retroactively.
- Sample size (n) is the number of appointments marked by the AAPC advisors with appointment Reason “Mandatory Advising”.

---

Academic Advising and Planning Center
Data for Assessment, Fall 2021 – Spring 2022
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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.

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 as General Advising by the advisor. Where this appears to have been violated, information from the later appointment was used.

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 Banner might say about the declared majors of these students.

- This is the fifth assessment cycle looking only at Spring mandatory advising appointments for this assessment measure. Fall 2015-Spring 2016 instead examined all appointments attended at the AAPC.

Use of Assessment Results

Measure 2:

Like many of the measures and results reported during this assessment cycle, there is a concern on behalf of the AAPC Leadership that the results for the major decidedness measure were deeply impacted by the necessity of Group Advising in the fall of 2021. The need to exercise prescriptive advising during Group Advising sessions could, perhaps predicably, impact the ability of the AAPC advising staff to encourage students to meaningfully consider major options and more quickly move to major decidedness. As a possible impact and outcome, the target performance of 75% of students attending a spring 2022 mandatory advising meeting demonstrating major decidedness was not achieved. This is not to say that the achieved 68% is not without merit. Given the circumstances of meeting with students in Group Advising in the fall, some, but not all students, meeting individually in the spring and the fluctuation between meeting virtual and in-person appointments, the 68% decidedness can be commended. Historically this has been a measure of challenge for the AAPC. In fact, as the above graph indicates, the AAPC has not yet met the target performance since measurement began in 2017 for this cohort of students assessed.
through this measure. However, the 68% is historically consistent year-to-year and is with a narrow margin of error, which would indicate the AAPC staff is striving to teach the requisite knowledge base for students to reach a confident level of decidedness regard major selection. While major decidedness is not a requirement of the institution at the end of year one, which would include most of the students assessed in this measure, but rather at the end of year two (60 credits earned), major decidedness and major declaration is frequently referred to by institutional leadership as critical factors in retention. To this end, the AAPC strives to encourage retention and increase graduation rates by re-employing a developmental advising model again through individualize one-on-one advising appointments as we continue to inch closer to the end of the COVID era and its impacts. It is the hope of the AAPC Leadership that with such a return to normalcy the AAPC will find the 75% target performance for this measure can and will be achieved. However, AAPC Leadership and the AAPC Assessment Committee will reexamine the current performance target, consider whether to retire the measure, considering its historical consistency, 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. To be sure, our continued and persistent staff attrition that plagues our office has taken its toll on our performance target in this Measure in particular. In addition to the Fall 2021-Spring 2022 hybrid advising modality, students could have worked with one or more different advisors than the one they were assigned to and/or were assigned a new advisor altogether because their originally assigned advisor had resigned their position. Given this additional dynamic, having achieved 68% is even more impressive and speaks to the consistency of services despite the challenges placed upon the office as this percentage is consistent with past performance under better circumstances. Nevertheless, it is worth reviewing our advising practices in this realm as well in an effort to reach the performance target.

Budget Changes
As was previously reported, 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 remains a recommendation that the College consider revisiting this software and purchase a different product that has the capacity to generate reports and aggregate data from various data points. Until such a time, the AAPC’s assessment measure regarding major decidedness will have to continue to be an indirect measure. Until more robust and comprehensive software, capable of producing more meaningful data in this area or until 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. The AAPC itself will continue to strive to use its limited resources for ongoing staff training and development for the purpose of encouraging student decidedness, while continuing to encourage the institution to invest greater resources in professional staff development.
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.

This measure was temporarily dropped from the Assessment rubric as a result of offering Virtual Group Advising services during the Fall 2021 staffing crisis. It will return in the 2022-23 Assessment cycle.

When this occurs, the Performance Target set in 2020-21 will continue to be a 17% increase in rubric score assessing student knowledge of academic policies and procedures from Fall to Spring.
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 1:** 60% of students quizzed on the number of credit-hours to graduate and the deadline to declare a major will get both questions right.  
**Performance Target 2:** 90% of students quizzed on the above two questions will get at least one of them correct.

This data comes from the same checkout survey used in SLO #1, Measure 2, and has many of the same issues with response rate, which are discussed in greater detail on page 17. It also has the same saving graces; the fact that measures are being taken that are expected to substantially increase response rates in future semesters, as well as the fact that the population size is large enough that a 9% response rate still yields enough of a sample from which to draw conclusions.

**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 2021 and Spring 2022 survey dates (unique students per semester). Of these, 39% or 1,300 students (n) responded to the two survey questions about policies/procedures.

- N= 3,838 mandatory semester advising appointments (according to advisors) during survey dates, 9/1/2021 to 12/6/2021 and 1/20/2022 to 4/25/2022.
- n= 334 responses to survey questions (by students who reported their visit was for mandatory advising). These survey questions were required to complete the survey.

57% of respondents (190 students) correctly answered questions about two policies/procedures related to academic advising in Fall 2021-Spring 2022. This fails to meet the performance target of 60%.

33% only answered one policy/procedures question correctly (111 students), and 10% did not answer any correctly (33 students). Combined with the students who answered both policies/procedures questions correctly, this successfully meets the performance target of 90% of students answering at least one such question correct.

Compare 2020-21’s 63% correctly answering two questions and 32% answering only one.
Notes 3.2:

• N: 3,838 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:** students may be confused about whether an appointment counted as their mandatory advising appointment for the semester.
  - Fall mandatory during survey dates, 9/1/2021 to 12/6/2021: 2,076
  - Spring mandatory during survey dates, 1/20/2022 to 4/25/2021: 1,762

• 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, AAPC mandatory advising appointments were completely virtual/online until throughout the fall 2021 in a group advising setting. As discussed in greater detail on page 17, this required a change in the method of survey administration, from a Qualtrics survey administered on a tablet in the AAPC lobby as a student left their appointment to the same survey distributed by E-mail after the appointment. This change is expected to be permanent, as student response to the availability of virtual appointments has been positive.

• The 2020-21 assessment cycle’s change of this survey question from free-response to multiple choice- to enable us to show the correct answer to the student if they got it wrong- continued into the 2021-22 assessment cycle. The previous year’s pilot results are not comparable and have been excluded from the comparisons presented here. They will be left unmentioned in all future Assessment reports.
Use of Assessment Results

Measure 1:

SLO #4, Measure 1 will return in the coming 2022-23 Assessment cycle with the reinstatement of the rubric question it uses.

Measure 2:

While this measure is still relatively new to our assessment measure, in year two of employing this measure we are already finding historical consistency in response rates and reaching desired performance targets. Very much like earlier measures that were impacted by the advisors’ ability to encourage knowledge growth in students requiring mandatory advising, so too is the ability for advisors to stress policy knowledge when utilizing the virtual-environment, prescriptive Group Advising. Nevertheless, it can be commended that the AAPC advising staff was able to encourage 90% of respondents to successfully identify at least one of the critical policies needed for responsible ownership of academic planning on the part of the student cohort. 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. As with previous measures, this high rate of success was achieved despite strains on staffing levels, the challenges of inconsistency in advising practices from fall to spring semester with regard to teaching within differing modalities and environments. The AAPC Leadership and Assessment Committee will determine the Performance Target for the next assessment cycle and continue to strive to achieve the Performance Target with thorough ongoing training of staff and continued emphasis in new advisor onboarding and training. It is worth mentioning that the combined result of 90% of one policy identified does not distract from AAPC’s Leadership’s desire to achieve higher than the target performance of 60% in identifying two policies, specifically the total number of credits needed to graduate and credit thresholds for declaring a major. It is the desire of AAPC Leadership that students demonstrate knowledge of two policy areas, in excess of the target performance, which is believed to encourage ownership and self-authorship of the student’s academic plans and which can encourage persistence and degree completion.

With that goal in mind, AAPC Leadership will consider articulating performance targets that reflect the desire to have student demonstrate an elevated knowledge of institutional policies and, once staffing levels are stabilized, designing Academic Advisor onboarding and ongoing training that reflect that goal.

Budget Changes

Like previous measures in this report, this measure can be viewed as a success in achieving the desired Student Learning Outcome (SLO) Performance Target. The AAPC will continue to stress the need for increased staffing levels and retention of staff by continuing to encourage institutional
leadership to increase its financial commitment to the AAPC. When an SLO can be achieved with this level of success under these conditions, then AAPC Leadership can comfortably infer that the same or increased results can be extrapolated across a greater number of students to a higher degree of success with a greater number of available professional advisors to provide meaningful, developmental advising. Further, greater resources committed to the ongoing training and development of professional advising staff can then again infer the same or greater success in teaching resource knowledge, transferable skills and an understanding of institutional systems to the AAPC cohort.
Data Sources and Documentation for Student Learning Outcome Measures

NOTE: AAPC’s shared “Advising” folder underwent reorganizing in late April 2020. Much of this documentation may have been moved to new locations in the shared folder.

- **General AAPC Assessment file folders:**
  - \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22
  - \pitt\data1\Advising\Data Coordinator Files\Assessment

- **AAPC usage summary:**
  - “All AAPC Appointments in This Assessment Cycle.xlsx” in \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22

- **General:**
  - Assessment Database used in past Assessment years but not yet this year: \mcleod\access_db\acad_adv\AAPC_AssessmentData2016.accdb
  - Backup versions of the database are archived in this folder, including backups with older data deleted from the most current database version: \mcleod\access_db\acad_adv

- **Assessment SLO #1, Measure 1 (rubric):**
  - The rubric questions (not the data from responses) answered by advisors for this measure are given in \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Abbreviated Rubric.PNG
  - AAPC visit data initially from Appointment Manager Walk-In Analytics by Reporting Line; edited for consistency. Specific alterations made to each version of the dataset are typically given at the top of the spreadsheet in \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation, Data. See:
    - SLO 1, Measure 1- Most Restrictive Case (1.1.0)
    - SLO 1, Measure 1- Least Restrictive Case (1.1.1)
    - SLO 1, Measure 1- Intermediate Case (1.1.2)
    - Fall 2021, SLO 1, Measure 1 Intermediate Case Advisee Type Count
    - Fall 2021, SLO 1, Measure 1 Least Restrictive Case Advisee Type Count
    - Spring 2022, SLO 1, Measure 1 Intermediate Case Advisee Type Count
    - Spring 2022, SLO 1, Measure 1 Intermediate Case Advisee Type Count

- **Assessment SLO #1, Measure 2 (post-appointment survey, campus resources):**
  - Survey results data from Qualtrics, including BPE annotations and highlights:
    - \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation, Data, Checkout Survey 1-5.
  - Summary of survey to present to AAPC staff: \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation and Charts

• Assessment SLO #2, Measure 1 (programming):
  o Choosing a Major Workshop: \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation, Data\Presentation and Charts\Choosing a Major Workshop Attendance.xlsx
  o Majors and Minors Fair: \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation, Data\Presentation and Charts\Majors and Minors Fair Attendance.xlsx
    ▪ Student sign-in list and department lists Excel workbook located in \pitt\data1\Advising\COMMITTEES\Majors & Minors Fair\2021\Excel Lists

• Assessment SLO #2, Measure 2 (major decision reported by advisors):
  o Data exported from Appointment Manager: \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation, Data\SLO 2, Measure 2 - Report Version
  o Version used for Assessment presentation is \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation, Data\SLO 2, Measure 2 - Report Version\Reference - appointment number for SLO 2, Measure 2. Based on a slightly-misunderstood version of the SLO, fails to redact a handful of appointments which should have been scrubbed.

• Assessment SLO #4, Measure 2 (student-reported knowledge of policies/procedures):
  o Survey results data from Qualtrics, including BPE notes: \pitt\data1\Advising\Assessment\2021-22\Presentation, Data, Checkout Survey 1-5