



CAMPUS MANAGEMENT TEAM RECOMMENDATION

Process: Academic Advising

Description of Recommendation:

The Academic Advising Issues Task Force, comprised of representatives of each academic unit on the UM-Oxford campus, have developed the following recommendations concerning use of Academic Advising tools in Campus Management.

Deans' offices and ASC will want to have and use Campus Management tools through an SAP GUI in order to have the fullest possible access and flexibility (for full records searches, report-writing capabilities, etc.). It was the consensus of this task force that faculty advisors (and some Deans' office support staff) will need to use a (view-only) web interface. Issues include: the large number of faculty advisors -- at present academic advising for students in Liberal Arts, Applied Sciences and Engineering are assigned to faculty members in these schools for academic advising (266, 35 and 35 advisors respectively, for a total of 336); the varying level of computer experience of these faculty; and the constant turnover of faculty (incl. reassignment of duties, sabbaticals, etc.). For these reasons, which relate to installation and maintenance of SAP on a variety of PCs, as well as issues of training, the task force will recommend a simplified web interface for general use. Note that advising in the schools of Accountancy, Business, Education, Pharmacy and Law is handled centrally (i.e. through the respective Deans' offices). Graduate students are advised in, and in the manner practiced by, the various units that house the respective degree programs.

The task force concurs that "enforcement" of advising will be best accomplished by an "Advisor Hold" in Campus Management. ~~The task force recommends that lifting of the holds be done at the college/school (Dean's office) level and at the departmental level (incl. ASC) -- i.e. by those using SAPGUI -- but not by individual faculty members.~~ "The task force recommends that lifting of the holds be done in the appropriate college/school (Dean's office) level or in the appropriate departmental office (incl. ASC) i.e. by those using SAPGUI but not by individual faculty members." I.e. the appropriate office would verify that the student had indeed been advised, and then the department secretary or appropriate personnel in a dean's office would lift the hold. This is similar to practices of holding PIN cards in the department or dean's office until the student has brought proof of advising (a signed advising worksheet) to the office. Again, this pertains to advisors in Liberal Arts, Applied Sciences and Engineering.

Concerning the timing of placing and lifting holds, the task force was unanimous in the opinion that rolling "windows" of priority registration (based on student classification)

should remain as at present. Relating to this, it was noted that the Advising Hold process in Campus Management should allow the Advising Hold to be set (when advising has been verified) **to be lifted at a future date/time** – specifically, **when the student's priority registration window opens**.

Some schools may not want to require advising for all students. To allow for this, set definitions for lifting of holds for groups of students should include: School; Department; Classification (i.e. freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, transfer, pharmacy student: phar 1, phar 2, phar 3, phar 4, phar 5, phar 6, grad I, grad II, grad III law school: law I, law II, law III); Academic Standing (dismissal, probation, suspension, good standing) Conditional Status (Grad School); Qualifying Status (Grad School); Non-degree. Also, a set definition for students registered in a given Orientation session (e.g. 051, 052, etc.) will be needed.

Deans' offices, as well as the **Academic Support Center**, will need access to "all" records (academic, contact, demographic, etc.) of **students in all colleges/schools**, as a number of students pursue multiple degrees (i.e. double-majors) across different colleges/schools.

Department offices will need access to all records (academic, contact, demographic, financial aid, etc.) of students their respective **departments only**.

Faculty Advisors will need access to records (see following) of their **advisees only**. Further, it was strongly felt by some that faculty advisors should have access to records **only of their advisees**. Should an advisor to whom a particular student is assigned be unavailable, then the department office can pull the info and provide to another advisor in that department. Information advisors will need includes info currently accessed through SIS screens including AD1, AM1, PE1, SI5, SI6, SI7, DD1, DD2 (for English Proficiency), PIN (for Holds e.g. Bursar, Student Health, etc.). The request was made that the academic data for Advisors be displayed in a "virtual transcript" format, and include transfer credit info, and any AP or CLEP credit. (The current paper "History Tape" includes a listing only of courses taken at UM (with grades, semester GPA and cumulative UM hours and GPA.) It was also suggested that the other info (contact, demographic, etc.) data include a display of local contact info (address, phone, e-mail), standardized test scores (ACT, SAT, GRE, LSAT, etc.), Developmental Studies Holds, whether an Honors College student, and whether an Athlete.

Advisors should be assigned by person (i.e. by personnel name/ID, rather than by position). Dean's offices, department offices and ASC should be able to assign advisors to students (in their own college/school or department). Students should be able to learn advisor assignment through a web interface.

For those in Dean's offices, department offices and ASC, training to use SAP – Campus Management will be needed. For faculty advisors, training to use (log-on, retrieve info etc.) with a simplified web interface, as well as an overview of FERPA issues will be needed.

With regard to the process for authorizing advisors for system access, Dean's offices should make the decision and submit (via memo, e-mail or electronic form?) names, etc. of those needing system access, indicating what role (entailing mode and level of access) the individual should have.

Underlying Opportunities and Pros Supporting the Recommendation:

Access to the present (SIS) database is not made available to faculty advisors. A (view-only) web interface as described above would allow faculty advisors access to the appropriate and current information on their advisees. On-line access to all information needed for academic advising would be more cost- and time-effective than the current system of distributing limited advising information via paper (e.g. History Tapes, PIN cards).

Currently, one must use FOCUS (exec) procedures to write reports using data in SIS, i.e. selected info (e.g. demographic info, contact info, standardized test scores, enrollment data, grades, academic standing, etc.) on selected students, and procedures to identify students according to certain criteria (e.g. major, academic standing, etc.), which often requires combining data from more than one FOCUS exec to create a single report (e.g. one to identify a group of students according to certain criteria, and others to then pull selected info on those students). Offices which don't use FOCUS, or which need to create reports using (SIS) data not loaded into the FOCUS database must request IT staff to create such reports. Further, data in reports pulled by FOCUS are not "real-time" but are "snapshots" of data when selected files were last loaded in FOCUS. Thus, care must be taken to coordinate with IT staff that certain files are loaded (the night) prior to creating certain reports with FOCUS. An integrated database of the appropriate student academic and demographic data, which allows for ease of information retrieval and for relational report-writing capabilities will be extremely useful for staff in deans' offices and in the Academic Support Center, and other academic units.

Allowing lifting of the holds at the college/school (Dean's office) level and at the departmental level according to set definitions as described above will allow these units to determine the method of and extent of "enforced" advising that best serves their needs.

Issues, Concerns, or Currently Unresolved Aspects of the Recommendation and Cons Against the Recommendation:

Issues include: the large number of faculty advisors in Liberal Arts, Applied Sciences and Engineering (students in these schools are assigned to faculty academic advising -- 266, 35 and 35 advisors respectively, for a total of 336); the varying level of computer experience of these faculty; and turnover of faculty (incl. reassignment of duties, sabbaticals, etc.). For these reasons, which relate to training, as well as installation and maintenance of SAP on a variety of PCs, the task force will recommend a simplified web interface for general advisor use.

One unresolved aspect of access to student information concerns the advising process during undergraduate (freshmen and transfer) Orientation sessions. A method to allow undergraduate (freshmen and transfer) Orientation advisors (selected faculty in each college/school and staff in deans' offices) access to *all* new students (across college/school/department divisions) will be needed – e.g. perhaps a generic advisor profile – with "windows" of access open before each undergraduate (freshmen and transfer) Orientation session and remaining open for some time after. The reason for this that we have found that students' majors are often incorrectly identified (in SIS) at

the time of Orientation, because they have either changed their mind about a major prior to arriving on campus (and have either not communicated that, or have not communicated it in a timely manner), or “decide” upon a (new) major upon arrival for Orientation. It is therefore not feasible to pre-assign incoming students to particular advisors, or even to particular colleges/schools or departments. Further, pertinent to the recommendation above that students learn advisor assignment through a web interface, some wording explaining the difference between orientation advisor assignment and “permanent” advisor assignment will be needed.

The task force notes that there will likely be a limit to the amount of the aforementioned desired data requested for advisors than a web interface will allow, or more than the Campus Management Technical Team can reasonably accommodate.

Several task force members have remarked to the effect “We don’t want to lose any current capabilities” (i.e. in terms of information available through current SIS “screens” and read/update privileges, as well as through (FOCUS) report-writing capabilities.

Date Submitted: October 21, 2002

Submitted by: Campus Management - Academic Advising Issues Task Force --

Dr. Charles Gates (ASC), Ms. Catherine Anderson (ASC), Ms. Barbara Leeton (LIBERAL ARTS), Mr. Billy Rhodes (ACCOUNTANCY), Ms. Gloria McGregor (APPLIED SCIENCES), Ms. Sue Hodge (BUSINESS), Dr. T. P. Vinson (EDUCATION), Dr. Stacy Holmes (ENGINEERING), Dr. Marvin Wilson (PHARMACY), Dr. Judith Cole (GRADUATE SCHOOL), Ms. Connie Parham (LAW)