

Advising Technology Subcommittee – August 7th, 2020

9:00am – 10:30am

In Attendance:

Lauren Sanborn (COE), Co-Chair
Rachel Denmark (Honors), Co-Chair
Lisa Pierce (CEC)
Sandra Varney (Registrar)
Tara George (Registrar)
BJ Beckham (Registrar)
David Osworth (CAS)
Rebecca Boyd (CAS)
Brittain Goff (DMSB)
Emily Longshore (DMSB)

Pickney Epps (OSP)
Valeria Bates (HRSM)
Stephanie Richards (HRSM)
Paige McKeown (UAC)
Heidi Waltz (Nursing)
Alison Harper (PUBH)
Brian Dusel (ex-officio)
Claire Robinson (ex-officio)

Approve July 2020 meeting minutes

Motion to approve: Brittain G., second, Emily L.

Fall 2020 Meeting Dates – all meetings will be held through TEAMS from 9:00am-10:30am

- September 18th
- October 23rd
- November 13th
- December 11th

Please email Lauren and Rachel if these dates do not work.

Goal statement response deadline

- Extended to Friday, August 14th

[UAN Advising Technology Current Usage Survey](#) (Please do not take)

- **Discuss need for current state analysis**

Claire Robinson: Technology prioritization survey was sent out approximately 1 year ago; survey allowed advisors to rank the utilization of advising technology features. To move toward a strategic plan, we need to obtain current data on advising technology usage.

Benefits of survey:

- Can highlight technology features that should be utilized across campus
- Can highlight technology features that should not be promoted for campus-wide use
- Provides opportunity to qualify perspectives

- **Suggestions for additions and/or changes to survey**

- Include Fall 2020 date
- Add identifying information – **faculty advisor, staff advisor, or other**

- There is a need for anonymity
 - UAC has a method to determine department data
 - Should descriptions for advising roles be provided?
 - Years Advising at USC
 - Consensus is to provide year range
 - Advising caseload
 - Consensus is to provide range
- Should the survey go to all (700) advisors or should the scope be narrowed?
 - USC did not administer an advisor survey this though we were due to complete this survey. In theory, advisors would not be feeling “survey fatigue” and perhaps more willing to complete the advising technology survey
 - Approximately 42%-45% of students are advised by a faculty member
 - If we are moving towards a goal of standardization of technology usage, faculty advisors must be included
 - Committee in agreement that administering a survey to all advisors (faculty/staff/other) would provide the best data.

Goal Statements for the Strategic Plan for Advising Technology at UofSC (goals not discussed at the July 2020 meeting)

Goal statement: Ensure advisors have access to reports and appropriate training that facilitate advisement. (i.e. course prediction reports)

- Sandra. V. will investigate current reporting features in DegreeWorks
- Brain D. UAC is already in the process of creating short documents/handouts for Data Warehouse and EAB reporting

Goal statement: Ensure advisors and supervisors can access a summary of each advising appointment with a student.

- All appointments or just those scheduled through EAB?
 - Any appointment scheduled through EAB should have an “appointment summary” note
 - It can be redundant for advisors who use EAB “notes” (notes students can access) for record of advising session
- Suggestion for best practice: Use EAB report summary note to describe the appointment and use SEP for advisement/course registration notes.
- Committee consensus – the goal should specify notes in EAB Navigate

Goal statement: ~~Ensure students have access to and are aware of advisement and registration tools in Self Service Carolina.~~ Empower students to use advising technology. (EAB Navigate, Self Service Carolina, DegreeWorks, My UofSC Experience).

Goal statement: Assist in student understanding and competency when using advising technology.

[Re-envisioning Academic Advising at the University of South Carolina](#) -GOAL 4

***If we were to say that the entire University will be on Degreeworks by December 2021. Yes or No? If not, what are your concerns, threats, challenges, etc.

- Was not discussed during meeting. Rachel and Lauren will summarize committee feedback provided by individual committee members.

Discussion transition to the first goal discussed in the July meeting:

Goal statement: All students and advisors should have access to an accurate degree audit online.

- Committee members agree that an accurate online audit is needed and should be a goal. There is not consensus on the platform that should be used for this audit.
 - SVAD uses a fully digital check sheet that is updated at every appointment and posted in EAB notes so that students can access the worksheet anytime.
 - Individual/department meetings with DegreeWorks team have not resolved accuracy issues
 - DMSB agrees with SVAD – accuracy issues with the DW audit prevent advisors from using this platform
 - Sandra V. – committee members are welcome to send specific examples directly to me at sandra.varney@sc.edu

Technology questions regarding Fall 2020 advising workflow:

- Will the UAC provide suggestions for workflow using TEAMS for advising?
 - Some colleges are posting directions on their main website:
 - EX: CIC has a “Need to contact your advisor” section and this section provides details for downloading teams.
 - CIC will push out communication to students about downloading teams
 - Instructions can be included in the appointment availability in EAB (student would view instructions when making the appointment)
 - UAC is holding 3 trainings this fall related to advising technologies:
 - 8/13, 10-11, Advising Workflow & Appointment Notes
 - 9/2, 12-1, Overview of Advising Technologies
 - 10/5, 12-1, Reporting in EAB Navigate
- Can a TEAMS appointment be created in EAB?
 - No, advisor must call student on TEAMS at the start of the advising appointment (there will not be a “join meeting” button)
- Waiting room feature is TEAMS doesn’t provide the features needed for drop-ins.
 - HRSM uses Zoom for drop-ins