

Assessment Cycle 2021-2022

Academic Advising Services

Department – Academic Support

Prepared by: Steve Hicks

Date: 6-16-22

Approved by:

Date:

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution committed to acquiring, creating, and disseminating knowledge through innovative teaching, research, and service. With its certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs, Northwestern State University prepares its increasingly diverse student population to contribute to an inclusive global community with a steadfast dedication to improving our region, state, and nation.

The mission of **Academic Advising Services** is to provide academic advising to undergraduate students, to facilitate a University Studies course (UNIV 1000) for entering first-year students, and to provide academic support services for students, faculty, staff, and external partners.

Methodology: The assessment process for the Academic Advising Services is as follows:

- (1) Data from assessment tools (both direct – indirect, quantitative, and qualitative) will be collected and returned to the unit head.
- (2) The unit head will analyze the data to determine whether the service provider has met the measurable outcomes.
- (3) Results from the assessment will be discussed with the advising team and unit head's supervisor.
- (4) Individual meetings will be held with advisors/instructors.
- (5) With the assistance of advisors/instructors, the unit head will determine if changes are required to meet the measurable outcomes, assessment tools for the next assessment period, and programming changes where needed.

Academic Advising Services

Service Outcomes:

SO 1. Provide quality academic advising to specific student cohorts.

Measure 1.1. General Studies Students

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

On an annual basis, General Studies students who receive advising services from Academic Advising Services (AAS) will be administered a survey to assess their advising experience. The survey has questions that use a Likert scale to assess knowledge, helpfulness, accessibility, and concern for me as an individual. Respondents will select "strongly agree," "agree," "neutral," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." The unit goal is for at least 85% of all students surveyed to respond with "agree" or "strongly agree" to each Likert scale question.

Findings: AC 2020-21 Target was met
AC 2021-22 Target was not met.

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was met as 89% of the students surveyed responded favorably (agree or strongly agree) to this survey administered after early registration.

Based on the 2020-2021 results analysis, the AAC Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. The director administered surveys in both the fall and spring semesters to capture more participants.

As a result of these changes, in 2021-2022, the target was not met. Three of the four Likert scale questions (knowledge, helpfulness, and accessibility) scored 87% for strongly agree or agree. However, only 27/32 respondents (84%) responded with "agree" or "strongly agree" to "My academic advisor shows concern for me as an individual. "Therefore, only one of four Likert scale questions did not reach 85%, by merely one response. The April '22 survey yielded the second-highest response rate to date of 21% (compared to 26% in 2020, 16% in 2019, and 10% in 2018). In addition, 58% of the respondents indicated they were advised by e-mail, 27% by face-to-face appointment, 6% by combination e-mail/F2F, 6% phone-only, and 3% via WebEx/TEAMS.

Decision, action, or recommendation: In AC 2021-2022, the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. The advising team will review Likert scale questions thoroughly and edit for clarity. Using a survey question regarding advisor accessibility as an example, some students may have unrealistic expectations. More specificity will be added to questions to ensure the student's perception is more congruent with the inquiry. Additionally, steps will be taken to increase survey participation's overall low response rates. After the director distributes the survey, advisors will contact their respective advisees and encourage participation. Advisees may be more inclined to respond when participation is encouraged by the individual who assisted them.

Measure 1.2. Pre-clinical Nursing Students (Natchitoches campus)

On an annual basis, pre-clinical nursing students in Natchitoches will complete an advising survey. The survey has five questions that use a Likert scale to assess knowledge, helpfulness, accessibility, concern, and overall quality of experience. Respondents will select strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. The unit goal is for at least 85% of all students surveyed to respond with "agree" or "strongly agree" to each Likert scale question.

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

Findings: AC 2020-21 Target was met
AC 2021-22 Target was not met.

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was met. Over 85% of students surveyed responded favorably (agree or strongly agree) to all five Likert scale questions.

Based on the 2020-2021 results analysis, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. The AAS Director and Natchitoches Nursing Campus Manager coordinated the second largest group advising session (F2F, with WebEx option). AC 2020-21, only 25% of pre-clinical students surveyed were advised by the professional staff advisors in our center, as 47% of respondents obtained advising from their UNIV 1000 faculty instructor/nurse.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2021-22, the target was not met. Four of the five Likert scale questions (knowledge, helpfulness, concern, and overall quality of service) were met with "agree" or "strongly agree." However, only 78% of students surveyed agreed or strongly agreed with the following Likert question "My academic advisor is accessible (available for drop-in advising during office hours, keeps appointments, etc.) and is timely in responding promptly (via e-mail, returns calls in a timely manner, etc.). As a result of these changes, in 2021-2022, the target was not met. Like Measure 1.1, had one additional respondent marked "agree" or "strongly agree," all five survey questions would have met the goal of 85%; thus, the target would have been met.

Decision, action, or recommendation: In 2021-2022 the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. All Likert scale questions will be reviewed and will be edited for clarity. Using the question regarding accessibility as an example, some students may have unrealistic expectations of what a proper response time should be after e-mailing their advisor. Further details will be added to questions to ensure the student's perception aligns with our inquiry.

Measure 1.3

On an annual basis, all advisees who participate in add/drop transactions (the week before the semester begins thru the last day of add/drop) can complete a 'mini-survey.' This survey link is found above the academic advisor's e-mail signature line. Unlike Measure 1.1 or 1.2, this survey is non-major specific. The survey intends to allow advisees to provide immediate feedback so the director (and all advisors) can troubleshoot within less than a business day, if possible. The unit goal is to ensure 100% of all student inquiries will be answered to serve students best.

Findings: AC 2020-21 Target was not met
AC 2021-22 Target was not met

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was not met. 93% (28/30 students) reported 'that all your advising questions were answered.

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

Based upon the analysis of AY 2020-21 data, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. The director launched the 'mini survey' again. The director, in consultation with Director of Institutional Effectiveness, who helped craft the survey, anticipated more negative feedback from students who had not secured a schedule until the week before (and first week) of the semester. The thought was students attempting to secure classes during this window would be angry and bitter about limited course options, thus it was anticipated a higher percentage of students would respond more negatively. The data and comments were helpful. AY 2021-22 goal will be to more than double participation (60 or more) with a 90% student inquiry / satisfaction rate.

As a result of these changes, in 2021-2022, the target was not met. In 2021-22 the target was not met as 98% (46/47 students) reported 'all of your advising questions were answered.'" An increase of seventeen students participated in this 1-2 minute, quick 'mini-survey.

- 8/47 were advised face-to-face
- 29/47 were advised via e-mail
- 5/47 were advised via phone
- 2/47 were advised via TEAMS or WebEx
- 3/47 were advised via a combination of formats above

The final survey question was to close the loop: "If your advising questions were not answered, please leave your name, phone number, and e-mail address, and the director will reach out to you. Only one student (of 47) indicated that not all of his/her questions were answered. This student opted not to leave his/her contact information. Sixty-four percent (30/47) of all participants provided positive, anecdotal feedback to the final open-ended question, "what can the advisors in this office do to assist you better."

Decision, action, or recommendation: In 2021-2022 the target was not met. Based upon the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, in AC 2022-23, the AAS director will implement the following changes to drive the cycle of improvement. The director will adjust the target to 90%. Additionally, AAS will modify question 6 of the survey so the student can elaborate so the director can determine if it was poor advising vs. the student needing to specific to an outside department to obtain answers to their questions This "mini-survey" is non-major specific and thus can be completed by any student who contacts an advisor in our unit. There is a common misconception across campus that Academic Advising Services advisees all majors. While we do our best to serve and assist any student who reaches out, there are occasions when students contact AAS but need to be referred to their major department to have all their questions answered. A student who participates in the "mini-survey" may be inclined to report that not "all of your advising questions were answered." However, realistically, this was beyond the role/scope of the AAS advisor.

SO 2. Provide a comprehensive UNIV 1000 curriculum to incoming first-year students. Measure 2.1. (NSU-Natchitoches face-to-face cohort)

All UNIV 1000 students had the opportunity to complete the end-of-semester assessment: Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor. The course steward reviewed responses to all 16 questions (a five-point Likert scale), which allowed

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

students to respond and provide feedback regarding both the course (8 questions) and instruction (8 questions). The unit goal is "responses to all 16 questions to have an aggregate mean score of at least a 4.4 (or above) on the five-point scale.

Findings: AC 2020-21 Target was met
AC 2021-22 Target was not met

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was met.

Based upon the analysis of AY 2020-21 data, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. First, the course steward kept the unit goal of an aggregate mean of 4.4 (or above) on all 16 questions. Second, the course steward increased the participation goal to 40% (or more) students to complete the end-of-course assessment. The purpose of this survey is to assess the course and instruction and a higher participation rate will yield more accurate results with a higher response rate.

In AC 2021-22, the target was not met. Not all 16 questions had a 4.5 (or above) mean. The target was almost met, but not quite. Below are several significant findings:

- Note 31% of 861 traditional and face-to-face students participated (without bonus pts. being awarded)
- The benchmark target of 4.5 (or higher) was met in 14 of the 16 questions, scoring an aggregate mean score of 4.5 or higher.
- Below are the two questions that did not carry a mean score of 4.5 (or higher):
 - This class was intellectually stimulating (4.38 mean, class question #7).
 - Consider this course: Overall, I would rate this course as: "extremely poor," "poor," "fair," "good," or "superior" (4.28 mean, class question #8).

The two above questions were specific to the course. Eighty percent (210/263) of the students who evaluated the course marked "usually" or "always" intellectually stimulating. However, the other 20% who responded affected the mean (selected "never," "occasionally," or "sometimes"). The student feedback about the instruction (final eight questions) had a mean average of 4.73. Additionally, the open-ended, anecdotal comments regarding instruction were very positive.

Decision, action, or recommendation: In 2021-2022 the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. With UNIV 1000 being a first-semester seminar class, all instructors must promote full participation in end-of-course assessments, which helps establish a culture of student participation for other end-of-course assessments. Based on the results of this data, in 2022-23, the course steward will propose that all instructors award bonus points (incentive) so students will complete this end-of-course assessment. A higher participation rate will yield more accurate results. For this reason, a response rate of 40% has been set, along with a 4.5 mean score (or higher) for AC 2022-23.

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

Measure 2.2. (Online-only cohort)

All UNIV 1000 students had the opportunity to complete the end-of-semester assessment: Student Evaluation of Course and Instructor. The course steward reviewed responses to 16 questions (a five-point Likert scale) which allowed students to respond to the assessment and provide feedback on both the course (8 questions) and instruction (8 questions). The unit goal is for all responses to all 16 questions to have an aggregate mean score of at least a 4.4 (or above) on the five-point scale.

Findings: AC 2020-2021 Target was not met.
AC 2021-2022 Target was not met

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was not met. It was speculated that a significant number of fall '20 students did not desire to enroll in UNIV 1000 as an online-only or Hy Flex student in the fall '20. However, due to limited classroom space, they had to deal with COVID-19 social distancing limitations.

Based upon the analysis of AC 2020-21 pilot year data, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. The steward opted not to change the target based upon additional students being shifted to other formats. However,

In AC 2021-2022, the target was not met. AC 2021-22 results were very close to the target. The target was not met because only one (of 16 total questions) did not reach the mean score of 4.4. The question with a mean of less than 4.4 are listed below:

- Consider this course: Overall, I would rate this course as "extremely poor," "poor," "fair," "good," and "superior" (4.36 mean).

Only 33% of eligible students participated in this assessment, and ninety percent of the respondents to the above question responded with good or superior. The other 10% affected the mean enough not to yield the target score of 4.4. Student feedback about the instruction/instructor (the final eight questions) had a mean average of 4.63. Like measure 2.1, the open-ended, anecdotal comments regarding instruction were very positive.

Decision, action, or recommendation: In AC 2021-22, the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. With UNIV 1000 being a first-semester college class, all instructors must promote full participation in this end-of-course assessment, which helps establish a culture of student participation for other end-of-course assessments. Based on the results of this data, in 2022-23, the course steward will drive continuous improvement by encouraging all instructors to award bonus points (incentive) so students will complete this assessment. A higher participation rate will yield more accurate results. For this reason, a response rate of 40% and 4.4 mean for all 16 questions has been set for AC 2022-23.

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

Measure 2.3

All University Studies 1000 students complete a pre-UNIV 1000 quiz each fall semester in the first week. At the end of the course, they complete the same assessment (post-quiz). To measure student learning, the unit goal is to demonstrate a 10% increase in score for each question (pre- vs. post-quiz).

Findings: AC 2020-2021 Target was not met.
AC 2021-2022 Target was not met

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was not met. The data revealed gaps in student learning and pockets of poor content instruction. Several subject areas should have been taught more in-depth. In general, students did enhance their post-quiz results.

Based upon the analysis of AY 2020-21 data, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. During the UNIV early August '21 faculty development session, the director shared the above results, along with other several other findings to emphasize several important content areas to focus on. This new pre- and post-quiz assessment was a first-year effort, switching from SurveyMonkey to the Moodle quiz to collect data and grades more efficiently. The course steward will better educate instructors, who in turn, will prioritize and focus on the most important content. The unit goal has been adjusted for students to demonstrate a 20% overall increase score from pre-test to post-test.

In AC 2021-22, the target was not met. Four questions (of 25) did not show 10% or more improvement. However, the post-test score average of 80% was four percentage points higher than a year before. Note these crucial findings below:

- The pre-test average was 55%, while the post-test average was 80% (compared to 76% post-test score in AC 2020-21).
- Each test question (all 25) had higher post-tests results than their corresponding pre-test scores.
- 21/25 questions had a 10% (or higher) improvement of scores from pre-test to post-test.
- The 4 questions that did not increase by 10% or higher in post-test had pre-test scores of 75% (question 14), 80% (question 18), 90% (question 21), and 90% (question 24).
- There were 12 (of 25) post-test response scores with less than an 80% (questions 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 22 and 25).
- On the post-test, there was a 52% post-test score on question 16 and a 53% post-test score on question 22.

Decision, action, or recommendation: In AC 2021-22, the target was not met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. Not every post-test question response increased by 10% points. However, the pre-test and post-test assessments have experienced progress over the last several assessment cycles. Based on the results of this data, in 2022-23, the course steward will drive continuous improvement by

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

editing several response options to provide more rigor. For example, four test questions were too easy, as noted by pre-test scores in the 80% category. Additionally, the course steward will educate the faculty during the fall '22 in-service by highlighting the most challenging questions and discussing strategies to address these topics. As a result, 2022-23 will be a post-test average of 82% or above for all students.

SO 3. Provide academic support services for students, administration, and external partners/constituents.

Measure 3.1.

Every fall and spring semester, all AAS professional staff advisors will make a minimum of four separate contracts with their assigned advisees. The first is a general welcome e-mail that shares office hours, contact information, link to student resources, etc. The second contract involves the early warning system grades (five-week grades). The third contact involves mid-term grades. Finally, the fourth contact promotes visiting with the advisor before early registration for the upcoming semester.

Regarding the second and third contacts, AAS advisors will immediately act by contacting all 'at-risk' advisees for five-week and midterm grades. Response time is critical for student success (access to tutoring and other resources, awareness of add/drop deadline after mid-term, etc.). The unit goal for every AAS advisor is to contact 100% of his/her advisees at least four times a semester and within two business days of receiving both five-week and midterm grade reports.

Findings: AC 2020-21 Target was not met
AC 2021-22 Target was met

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was not met. In fall semester '20, the director edited the three required contacts with advisee per semester to four required contacts per advisor. This strategy generated more activity and thus more opportunity for intrusive advising.

Based upon the analysis of AY 2020-21 data, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. The Director of Academic Advising made an updated checklist that will include a monthly timeline, with specific checkboxes, to document all fall and spring advisor contacts.

In AC 2021-22, the target was met All seven professional advisors on staff made their respective four mandatory contacts for fall '21 (28/28) and spring '22 (28/28). Additionally, their 5-week and midterm grade correspondence were within the desired two-day time frame.

Decision, action, or recommendation: In AC 2021-22, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-22, the target was met for the first time in three cycles. Based on the analysis of the results, the director will help new and returning advisors. Within the last calendar year, the center has welcomed two new advisors. Updating the timeline visual aid (one-page advisor checklist of contacts for each advisor each semester) will help better monitor

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

advisor/advisee contacts. Additionally, the director will partner with the newly appointed acting Director of Enrollment Management to pilot the text platform housed in recruiting to better connect and communicate with our target audience.

Measure 3.2.

Academic Advising Services serves as a clearinghouse for suspended undergraduate students and facilitates all readmission contracts. At the end of each fall and spring semester, AAS completes an end-of-semester report for the VP of Academic Affairs and Academic Deans. The administrators mentioned above must have this report in hand, especially in December, in preparation for the onset of the spring semester. The unit goal is two-fold: 50% or more of students under contract will earn a 2.00 semester GPA or above, and this end-of-semester report will be completed and disseminated each fall and spring within three business days after final grades has been posted.

Findings: AC 2020-2021 Target was not met.
AC 2020-2021 Target was met

Analysis: AC 2020-21, the target was not met. There were unique barriers in AY 2020-21 as significantly less students were enrolled in 'face-to-face' (F2F) classes due to social distancing, COVID, etc. A readmitted student is high-risk and often they will have a stipulation of F2F only classes. This could not be the case for most fall '20 classes.

Based upon the analysis of AY 2020-21 data, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. The Director assigned all professional advisors, the AAS graduate student and several ASC graduate students (with their Director's consent) to this student cohort, thus providing a better mentor/mentee ratio for all tracking and various contacts. This change provided mentors with more time with these high-risk students.

In AC 2021-2022 the target was met. Data revealed 29/85 (34%) of readmitted students earned a 2.00 semester GPA. AC 2021-22, the target was not met as 62/202 (31%) students earned a 2.00 GPA in their respective semesters of suspension. The end-of-semester reports were disseminated to the VPAA/Provost and his deans less than 48 hours after the final grade submission deadline.

- Fall '21 - 35/131 (27%) readmitted students earned above a 2.00 in December '21
- Spring '22 – 27/71 (38%) readmitted students earned above a 2.00 in May '22

It was anticipated that Fall '21 would have more high-risk students under contract, partially attributed to 'debt-forgiveness' of students with outstanding balances in summer '21, prior to readmission for fall. Instead, fall '21 was a record semester of readmitting students with an academic contract (n=131).

Decision: In AC 2021-22, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results, the AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. The Director will improve strategies to work more closely with the readmitted students. This will be done through a collaborative effort to mentor and monitor the academic progress of these high-risk students, including documenting three contacts each semester. The Academic Advising Director, the director of the Student

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

Success Center (SSC), his assigned graduate assistants, and several designated professional advisors, will participate. A one-page checklist will be created to better monitor and document progress. Additionally, the Director of Academic Advising will partner with the newly appointed acting Director of Enrollment Management to pilot an NSU text platform to communicate more effectively with these readmitted students.

Measure 3.3

On an annual basis, Academic Advising Services will assess the Associate of General Studies dual enrollment advising partnerships, which involves collaborating closely with our high school constituents (LSMSA, Vernon Parish Schools, Pineville High School, etc.). The unit goal is for 100% of all schools with eligible graduation candidates to participate in at least one spring semester in-service to enhance program knowledge and strengthen the rapport between each designated NSU advisor and their DE AGS high school constituents.

Findings: AC 2020-2021 Target was met.
AC 2021-2022 Target was met

Analysis: In AC 2020-21, the target was met. All 11 DE AGS high school counselors with AGS graduating seniors participated in one spring semester in-service. Communication lines became more practical and processes more streamlined.

Based upon the analysis of AY 2020-21 data, the AAS Director made the following changes in 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement

- In July '21, a new NSU hire accepted the Dual Enrollment AGS Coordinator role. In addition, he expanded an existing TEAMS file to track this cohort of DE students more effectively.
- In August '21, the director assigned four (4) advisors to be designated points of contact with 15 participating high schools that had summer '22 candidates. In preparation for the final spring '22 semester, these advisors performed audits during fall '21 and immediately after fall final grades were posted.
- In spring '22, a private mid-semester in-service was administered to each of the 15 high school counselors (all DE AGS schools with August '22 candidates) to ensure information, procedures, and graduation applications were e-mailed.

As a result of these Changes, in AC 2021-22, the target was met. In addition, 87 dual enrollment students fulfilled requirements from a record number of 15 high schools. As a result, the spring '22 high school seniors will have their NSU AGS degrees conferred later this summer (August 22).

Timeline, High Schools with AGS graduates

2022	15 high schools	87 DE AGS graduates
2021	11 high schools	76 DE AGS graduates
2020	9 high schools	46 DE AGS graduates
2019	8 high schools	27 DE AGS graduates
2016	1 high school	1 DE AGS graduate

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

Decision: In AC 2021-22, the target was met. Based on the analysis of the 2021-2022 results. The AAC Director will implement the following changes in 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. The administration anticipated an increase in HS DE AGS participation. To this end, AC 2021-22 was the first complete academic year an advisor was designated as "Dual Enrollment AGS Coordinator. "It is anticipated that the DE AGS program will continue to grow this coming 2022-23 academic year. Based on the data analysis, in AC 2022-23, the director and DE AGS Coordinator will drive improvement by implementing new strategies to communicate more often with all stakeholders. The outgoing coordinator will create a month-by-month activity timeline/checklist of critical duties. This resource will help to provide a seamless transition for July when he moves to a faculty position across campus. This timeline/checklist will allow the incoming coordinator to check off, document, and date necessary activities.

A comprehensive summary of the critical evidence of improvements based on analysis of results:

- AAS has maintained comprehensive advising logs for three calendar years. AY 2021-22 (August thru May) AAS advisors experienced over 7,420 separate, individual documented contacts (*note: one separate contact per day counted, even if student e-mailed 2-3-4 times that given day*). The monthly average was 824 students, equating to 29 students served per week (compared to 28 students per week previous AY). It should be noted that only 323 of the 7,424 contacts were face-to-face advisees in our center, which equates to 4% of advising sessions being in-person.
- With significant support from his advisors and other content experts, the director updated an excellent fall '21 UNIV 1000 course shell. Like Fall '20, all face-to-face UNIV 1000 traditional seminars typically held in the SU Ballroom (i.e., Title IX, Fin. Aid, etc.) remained in the smaller classroom settings to adhere to and honor social distancing.
- The silver lining is that takeaways do exist from setting target goals. Most were not met in this cycle (7 of 9 not met, but so close). AAS launched major-specific surveys with General Studies with three (of four) Likert scale questions reaching the target goal, with the fourth and final Likert question missing by one mere response. Same with the Pre-clinical advising survey with four (of five) Likert scale questions reaching the target goal, with the fifth Likert question missing again by one mere response (see action plan section for follow-up).
- AAS launched a 'mini-survey,' a non-major specific in both fall '21 and spring '22. This link was placed above all professional advisors' e-mail signature lines to provide students the opportunity to give immediate feedback on the session. Spring '22 (the entire month of April) yielded great results - 35/36 students had all their questions answered. The 36th student stated that not all questions were answered, but he/she did not leave his name and contact information.

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

- The Director of Advising and the NSU-Natchitoches Nursing Campus Manager facilitated a November '21 group advising WebEx with a combined 35 face-to-face / online attendees. An AAS advisor modified the 30–35-minute session into a 10-minute recording and sent it out to approximately 250 pre-clinical advisees.
- UNIV 1000, in its second year of implementing the 25-question pre-test and post-test assessment in Moodle (fall '21), experienced a 4% growth in post-test results (76% in fall '20 to 80% in fall '21).
- In Mid-spring '22, three NSU units (Academic Advising, Enrollment Management, and Dual Enrollment) began ongoing collaborative meetings to manage better, communicate and troubleshoot dual enrollment topics. Positive progress was made, and meetings will continue in fall '22.
- August '22 will highlight **87** DE AGS students **from 15 high schools** in our service region and beyond who have AGS degrees conferred. Within the last four years, we have tripled the total number of DE AGS graduates (27 in summer '19) and almost doubled the participating high schools (8 HS in '19) who had graduated.

Plan of action moving forward:

- On July '22, the director will work to onboard the newly appointed Academic Advisor, Instructor, and DE AGS Coordinator.
- The advising team will thoroughly review general studies and pre-clinical advising surveys and edit for clarity.
- Our “mini-survey,” which we place above our e-mail signature line during peak advising times, will remain non-major specific. We will re-align our expectations to the question “all of your advising questions were answered”; therefore, we will 100% to 90%.
- Course steward of UNIV 1000 will promote student participation in the end-of-course assessment by encouraging all instructors to award bonus points (incentive) so students will complete this end-of-course assessment.
- Course steward of UNIV 1000 will edit pre-and post- questions/responses to provide more rigor, as four test questions were too easy, as noted by pre-test scores in the 80% category. Additionally, the steward will educate the instructors during the fall '22 in-service by highlighting the most challenging questions and discussing strategies to address these topics.
- For the director to monitor the required four advisor contacts more effectively to advisee each semester, a new checklist will be created to document, date, and confirm that all fall '22 and spring '23 advising campaigns were implemented.
- Effective August '22, a collaborative effort among Academic Success Center

Assessment Cycle 2021-22

(ASC) and Academic Advising Services (AAS) team members to mentor and monitor the academic progress of every readmitted student (who has signed academic contracts). This collaboration will actively participate in mentor and retention outreach (e-mail, meetings, pilot texts, phone, etc.).

- Director will partner with the acting Director of Enrollment Management to pilot NSU's text platform (Mongoose/Cadence), which has been used solely in University Recruiting. AAS will be the first to pilot this resource to connect better and contact student cohorts.
- The outgoing DE AGS Coordinator will create a month-by-month activity timeline/checklist of critical duties and initiatives learned during his tenure. This resource will help to provide a more seamless transition for July '22 (and beyond) when he leaves AAS to move to a faculty position across campus.