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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview: Our Advising Model

Academic advising at the Trinity Washington University College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) delivers proactive, comprehensive advising services to all students enrolled in Trinity’s historic undergraduate women’s college. The overall goal of the office of advising is student persistence, retention, and academic excellence from the first year through graduation. During the Fall 2012-Spring 2013 academic year, this model evolved further as advising developed a case-management/wraparound approach to advising services.

Continuing and Enhanced Programs in the Fall 2012-Spring 2103 Semester

During the past academic year the office of advising focused on several new and continued initiatives. A reduction in advising staff necessitated reorganization of our cohort advising model, which continued for triage, probationary, transfer, UND-E, and special cohort (e.g CSF, DCCFSA, KIPP) students. We were unable to deploy targeted resources for the lowest-accuplacing (“trifecta”), UND-N, and Dean’s list cohorts. Fall 2012-Spring 2013 program priorities included clarification of Triage policies; improving the CAS advising website; a focus on “rolling alert” (early, mid-term, withdrawal) communications/interventions; partnership with the Math Specialist program to enhance outcomes in pre-foundational math, and enhanced special cohort services. We initiated new collaboration with academic services and began weekly standing case management meetings with enrollment services to develop wraparound service plans for students with multiple risk factors.

This report focuses on outcomes for four of these initiatives: probationary advising, CAS rolling alert systems, the advising website, and the Triage program. We also completed some analysis on the UND-N cohort, an important cohort in Trinity’s strategic plan for enrollment growth.

Key Findings

**There is tentative support for the success of advising interventions with probationary students:** Second probations remained flat from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 and academic dismissals remained flat from Spring 2012 to Spring 2013. Given the increase in the overall student body, we tentatively conclude that our interventions had a remediating effect for some students.

**Partnership with specialists works:** Partnership with the Math specialists to enhance student success in pre-foundational courses had an impact on student pass rates.

**Time management and study skills are key areas for student improvment:** As in prior years, early alert data suggest that students struggled most with low performance on exams and quizzes, attendance issues, not completing homework assignments, and other factors related to not managing time or studying efficiently.

**The Triage population is changing:** As compared to prior years, an increased proportion of Triage cases was accounted for by medical emergencies. Regarding academic status, 33% of Triage students were placed on some form of probation after an unsuccessful Fall semester. Triage status continues to present a risk factor for academic standing.

**The CAS to nursing glidepath presented challenges:** Thirty-two percent of CAS students who applied for Spring 2013 nursing admission were admitted (8/25; of these one student was accepted but declined). CAS students represented 23% of the Spring 2013 class of new nursing students (7/30). This represents a decrease in the successful glidepath as compared to prior years, but the result may at least be partly due to new admission policies as described in this report. The average mid-year GPA of the overall CAS UND-N cohort was 2.9.

**Effective collaboration with Academic Services to review probation interventions and to collect and share data should emerge as a best practice:** Meetings with Academic Services revealed the need for more systematized data collection and tracking between our two offices, to ensure that students are following up on advising interventions with meaningful academic support experiences.

**Turnover in advising must be addressed:** While we have determined there are a variety of reasons that may indicate why staff and the position are not a successful fit, we should explore better mechanisms for hiring and retaining talent to establish greater stability in this office. Advisors have requested more opportunities for professional growth and challenge; we hope to seek institutionally viable ways to provide these development opportunities.

Key Recommendations

* Continue to develop and track effective interventions for probationary students, in closer collaboration with Academic Services;
* Promote student attendance at workshops and trainings on time management, going to class, completing assignments, and study skills, again in closer collaboration with Academic Services;
* Increase communication to all constituencies regarding the nature and scope of Triage services;
* Increase communication with faculty regarding the purpose and importance of the CAS alert system;
* Communicate new policies and admission processes to the UND-N cohort, including procedures for assisting students to raise their GPAs and TEAS scores;
* Add professional advising staff as the volume and complexity of the CAS student population grows;
* Enhance advising professional development.

**Introduction**

Academic advising at the Trinity Washington University College of Arts and Sciences provides comprehensive, proactive retention services for all students enrolled in Trinity’s historic undergraduate women’s college, with a focus on the most academically vulnerable. The Advising team forms part of the decanal team overseen by the Dean of the College, and in the past academic year reported to the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Advising liaises between Trinity students and the University’s academic programs and ensures that Trinity students receive the attention they require with regard to academic planning, understanding and complying with administrative policies/procedures, and referral to additional campus support offices as necessary.

Trinity’s CAS advising model utilizes high-touch, individualized service delivery to proactively outreach to all students at multiple phases of their academic journeys, with a focus on our most vulnerable students. Our advising philosophy embraces the idea that each student presents with unique strengths that must be nurtured and unique challenges and constraints that must be addressed. With the ultimate goal student of empowerment, we assist students with problem-solving and strategizing around their academic and life challenges, in order to support their academic journeys with resiliency and independence.

These goals are met in many ways. We begin with the development of strong advising relationships grounded in trust and supported by interaction with academic services, student services, health and wellness, enrollment services, campus ministry, resident life, athletics, and all other offices providing holistic, comprehensive services to Trinity’s population of college women. Our mission statement thus reads: “Academic advising at Trinity Washington University’s College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) proactively delivers comprehensive, personalized services to all students enrolled in Trinity’s historic undergraduate women’s college. The overall goal of the office of advising is student persistence, retention, and academic excellence from the first year through graduation”.

During the Fall 2013-Spring 2013 academic year, this model evolved further as we initiated a case-management approach to advising services by instituting weekly case-management meetings with enrollment services, where we focused on wraparound support services for students with multiple identified risk factors. We also established a weekly standing meeting with academic services for weekly review of progress with probationary students.

Specific daily functions executed by CAS academic advisors include:

* Receiving and troubleshooting calls, emails, and visits from new first-year, transfer, and returning students in multiple cohorts
* Coordinating the CAS Triage Program, which entails intensive support for students in emergency or crisis situations
* Assisting faculty in their advising roles, including planning and delivering faculty training workshops, individual consultation, and back-up advising
* Communicating to students, faculty and all stakeholders in a timely manner regarding advising, policy, registration and issues resolution
* Acting as point-of-contact for Trinity advising cohorts and special cohorts such as CSF, CFSA, KIPP, LAYC, Cristo del Rey, HiSCIP, and other cohorts as needed
* “Spot” analysis of transfer transcripts in order to register students in a timely manner, as well as performing transcript evaluations for transfer credits
* Reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of academic standing decisions and graduation audits
* Functioning as part of the decanal team; in particular working with the deans and other decanal staff to review program effectiveness and to collect and analyze advising-related data
* Maintaining the CAS advising website
* Special projects and assignments as needed

In the Fall 2012-Spring 2013 academic year, the office of advising focused on several new and continued initiatives. This past academic year found our office reduced in staff from three professional advisors and the advising manager (the associate dean) to two professional advisors and the manager. This reduction in staff required a reorganization of our cohort model, as well as an evaluation of which cohorts required the most intensive support. In the end, we decided to continue our focus on triage and probationary students, on “special cohorts” (such as CSF), and on education major students, who continue to require intensive support. Our “secondary” cohort of focus was transfer students, as transcript evaluations must continue under all circumstances.

We did see some declines in service delivery as a result of our reorganization. We were unable to provide organized cohort services to UND-N students and to the Dean’s list cohort, which resulted in a drop-off in applications for prestigious scholarships (such as the Truman Foundation Award, for which we last year entered a runner-up finalist). Our UND-N students were largely distributed among the faculty advisors, particularly those with lighter advising loads; our plan was to address the needs of these students through advising workshops for the UND-N faculty. However, UND-N advising ended up a less pressing need than the requirement that we train advisors on the new electronic academic plans, so again, we had to make choices about where to deploy resources. Hopefully in Fall 2013 we will be able to offer UND-N advising workshops, as this cohort continues to be key to Trinity’s growth. Regarding transfer students, we coped with a back-log in transfer evaluations which we are still resolving.

Fall 2012-Spring 2013 program priorities included increased clarification of Triage policies; regular updating of the CAS advising website; a focus on “rolling alert” (early, mid-term, withdrawal) interventions; and partnering with the Math Specialist program to enhance outcomes in pre-foundational math courses. We also initiated increased collaboration with academic services and enrollment services. This report focuses on outcomes for four of these initiatives: probationary advising, CAS rolling alert systems, the advising website, and the Triage program. We also completed some analysis on the UND-N cohort, as we wanted to ensure that we did not lose sight of this important cohort

As in previous semesters, advising continued to track retention and persistence by examining multiple data points that may factor into attrition. By collecting data from enrollment services, advisors, faculty, and other campus offices (Dean of Students; Health and Wellness), advising remains engaged in tracking student trends and will utilize these data to plan targeted programs to preventively minimize non-persistence factors. As we move toward the case management approach, these processes will become more centralized and streamlined.

**Advising Loads: A Snapshot in Time**

As the below chart indicates, the mean number of advisees per advisor across the college was 24, ranging from 4 to 86 advisees, at mid-year. This wide range suggests great heterogeneity in the number of advisees per advisor in this distribution. Therefore, we broke out advising into categories: professional advisors, specialists, untenured and instructional faculty (category B), tenured faculty, and Deans (the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of Nursing and Health Professions provide direct advising to CAS students).

Not surprisingly, professional advisors carried the greatest advising loads with a mean of 80 advisees per advisor. Specialists represented the group with the next largest load, carrying a mean number of 35 advisees per advisor, followed by untenured/instructional faculty with a mean of 20 advisees per advisor. The lightest advising loads were carried by the tenured faculty, with a mean number of 15 advisees per advisor.

Table 1: Mean advisees per advisor, as a function of advisor status

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Mean Number of Advisees | Range |
| **All Advisors** | **24** | **4-86** |
| Tenured Faculty | 15 | 8-30 |
| Untenured/Instructional Faculty | 20 | 4-31 |
| Deans | 36 | 9-58 (n=2) |
| Specialists | 35 | 11-58 |
| Professional Advising | 80 | 73-86 |

**Fall 2012-Spring 2013 Academic Standing:**

Table 2: Academic standing comparison, Fall to Fall and Spring to Spring for 2012-2013

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Fall 2011 | Spring 2012 | Fall 2012 | Spring 2013 |
|  | % of students | % of probs | % of students | % of probs | % of students | % of probs | % of students | % of probs |
| All Probs. | 21.4%224/1043 | 100% | 23.8%222/930 | 100% | 29%303/1037 | 100% | 26.6%258/969 | 100% |
| Prob. 1 | 13.4%140/1043 | 62.5%140/224 | 9.1%85/930 | 38%85/222 | 18.7%193/1037 | 63.7%193/303 | 10.3%100/969 | 38.7%100/258 |
| Prob. 2 | 3.6%38/1043 | 16.9%38/224 | 6.1%57/930 | 26%57/222 | 3.6%38/1037 | 12%38/303 | 9.1%88/969 | 34%88/258 |

Of the 1037 students enrolled in the College of Arts & Sciences for the Fall 2012 semester, a total of 303 students were placed on Academic Watch, Probation 1, or Probation 2, representing 29% of the total CAS enrolled student body. (Ten students were dismissed). This represented an increase in total student probations from the previous Fall, when 21.4% of students were not in good academic standing. In Fall 2012, students on academic watch represented 22.7% of all students on probation, or 69/303 students (not pictured on above chart). Students maintaining a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better, although their term GPA dipped below 2.0, represented a larger proportion of probation students than in prior years. This is good news, as watch is the least challenging academic standing designation to remediate.

First probations shifted upward, as the percentage of students on first probation increased from 13.4% of the total student body in Fall 2011 to 18.7% in Fall 2012. The decrease in second probations (predicted by the decrease in first probations last Spring) continued; second probations remained flat across the total student body (3.6% of student body in Fall 2011 and 3.6% again in Fall 2012) and decreased in terms of the overall percentage of students on probation (from 16.9% of all probations in Fall 2011 to 12% in Fall 2012). Fewer first probations last Spring translated into fewer second probations in the Fall. We further note that in Spring 2012, 23 students (2.4% of the student body) were dismissed; just 10 students were dismissed in Fall 2012 (roughly 1% of the student body). Additionally, in Fall 2012, 130 students made the Dean’s list, or 12.5% of the student body.

In Spring 2013, 100% of these students placed on probation received a communication detailing the steps they should take to remediate their status. Our records indicate that in Fall 2012, 43% of students placed on probation the prior year (Spring 2012) met with advising, academic support, or both, and this tracking continued in Spring 2013.

In Spring 2013, a total of 258 students were placed on Academic Watch, Probation 1, or Probation 2, representing 26.6% of the total CAS enrolled student body (up from 222/23.8% in Spring 2012). Twenty-four students were dismissed for academic reasons – 2.47% of the student body (as compared to twenty-three students in Spring 2012, also 2.47% of the student body.) Dismissals for academic reasons therefore remained statistically flat from Spring to Spring.

While the number of students on academic watch is not represented on the above chart, a significant portion of these students – 26.7% of all students on probation, or 69/258 students – were placed on academic watch (in Spring 2012, 26% of students with a standing decision were likewise on academic watch). First probations showed a slight upward trend but remained flat as a percentage of all probations (roughly 38% from Spring to Spring). The percentage of students on first probation increased from 9.1% of the total student body in Spring 2012 to 10.3% in Spring 2013. This suggests that although our student body is growing larger, we are maintaining roughly the same level of first probations.

Second probations continue to be a concern; the number of students placed on second probation increased to 9.1% of the total student body in Spring 2013, up from 6.1% in Spring 2012 (and increasing from 26% of all probations to 34.1% of all probations). **Academic services and advising must continue to outreach to second probation students, who historically have been the hardest to reach and to remediate.**

We are encouraged that academic watch, probation and dismissal rates are remaining fairly constant from Spring to Spring, although our student body continues to increase. We clearly see the need for more intervention with second probation students. This report also indicates the need to continue working closely with academic services to develop more data-informed, targeted programs to assist academically vulnerable Trinity students.

**Early Alert Analysis**

The Early Alert system is an intervention designed to identify students who are in danger of failing a course (or courses) for a variety of reasons which include, but are not limited to, excessive absences, poor test/quiz performance, and missing homework or other assignments. Early Alerts allow faculty, advisors, and other academic support personnel to intervene prior to the semester midterm with strategies that are in the best interest of the at-risk student. When employed appropriately, the goal of Early Alerts is to ultimately support retention by accomplishing the following:

* a reduction in the number of students who receive negative academic decisions (probation, watch, and warning)
* an increase student academic success
* an increase communication between students and support personnel
* an improvement in the visibility and utilization of the academic support services

Early Alerts are often referred to as “rolling alerts” because the advising department receives them past the initial deadline (which is a few days prior to midterm grades) and continuously throughout the remainder of the semester. Timeliness is an issue that may be a contributing factor to determining the efficacy of this intervention. Providing worthwhile assistance to students at risk of failing is a challenge when the Early Alert system is used merely as a form of documentation rather than the first important step toward crafting strategies to protect students’ GPAs and enhance their overall academic performance. Furthermore, the system needs to be used more consistently as the data analysis will show.

Graph 1: Early Alert Comparison, Fall 2012-Spring 2013

In a Fall 2012 to Spring 2013 comparison fewer students received Early Alerts, 22% versus 17% respectively. This can be attributed to the fact that forty-four faculty (including adjuncts) submitted alerts in the fall while only nineteen submitted alerts in the spring. With the reduction in both the number of alerts submitted and the number of faculty submitting, it may be too early to determine how effective the system is.

One hundred and eighty four of the 313 students included in the Academic Standing report pulled from PowerCampus had received an Early Alert; however, about 33% of these students received a negative academic standing decision. The following chart and data analyze the relationship between Early Alerts and CAS Academic Standing for Spring 2013.

Graph 2: Relationship between Early Alerts and Academic Standing

The numeric and percentage breakdown is as follows:

* 26 of 313 students did not receive an Academic Standing decision which represents 8.3%
* 76 of 313 students who received Early Alerts were placed on Probation (either 1, 2, or Continuing) which represents 24.2%
* 12 of 313 students who received Early Alerts were placed on Watch (or Warning) which represents 3.8%
* 16 of 313 students who received Early Alerts were Dismissed from Trinity which represents 5.1%
* Overall, approximately 67% or two-thirds of the students who received an Academic Standing decision did not receive Early Alerts for the Spring 2013 semester

In Fall 2012, faculty and instructional staff contacted the professional advising office with the names of students who were failing their courses within the first 3 weeks of classes. This year, the professional advisors directly contacted 100% of these early alert students. In addition, we added a new initiative: working closely with the Math specialist program to immediately outreach to students who were not fully participating in either the classroom and/or laboratory components of Math 101S. The specialists credited this collaboration in their report on increased pass rates in this key pre-foundational math course.

In addition to providing faculty with the names of advisees in danger of failing courses, advising also provided Academic Services with the names of students who received alerts in multiple courses to signal the “high risk” for academic intervention. The design of the early alert form requires instructors to indicate the primary reasons that individual students are not doing well in their courses.

**Of the 290 early alert notices received in Fall 2012,**

* ***25%*** *of instructors who submitted early alert notices indicated that students were failing the course because of “missed assignments.”*
* ***23%*** *of instructors who submitted early alert notices indicated that students were failing the course because they “low performance on exams and quizzes.”*
* ***10%*** *of instructors who submitted early alert forms indicated that students were failing the course because of “poor attendance.”*

Early alert data also revealed that some disciplines are more of a challenge than others for our students. A review of the early alert data in Fall 2012 illustrated that Math is the most challenging discipline followed by English, Psychology, and Philosophy. However, this evidence is strictly anecdotal because the criterion for submitting early alerts is not standardized. Thus, some professors simply submit more early alert forms than others, while some professors do not submit early alert forms at all. This is especially distressing as it indicates that an unknown number of students with failing grades may not have received an early alert, thus, no intervention from professional advisors or academic services. **We need to increase communication and compliance around the importance of early alerts to faculty and instructional staff, particularly adjuncts.**

Early alert data suggests that students are falling behind because they are not completing homework assignments, which would increase their chances of performing well on exams and quizzes. In response, we might experiment with strategies to improve self-guided learning experiences. Increasing tutoring and academic services resources that allow students to independently seek assistance may increase academic skills and decrease test anxiety and related barriers to academic success.

**Triage Program Report**

The Triage Program at Trinity Washington University assists students who have an emergency situation while enrolled in courses and who expect to be absent from classes for an extended period of time. The program assisted 39 students during Fall 2012 (as compared to 47 in Fall 2011). Students were referred to the Triage program through faculty, staff, the Health and Wellness center, online, and by self-referral.

Triage services are classified into four categories:

1. **Medical Emergency:** This category includes absences resulting from physical or emotional health issues.
2. **Family Emergency**: This category involves family illness which may result in the student caring for family members or attending funerals. Family issues include emergencies which require the student to assist family members.
3. **Other Emergency**: This category involves students with a combination of family and medical emergencies.
4. **Personal Emergency**: This category involves personal situations in which the student is unable to attend classes.

Program Case Points of Interest:

 **Fifty-four percent of the Triage cases handled were due to medical emergencies. Of these, a total of 9 students were hospitalized as a result of their condition.**

**Thirty-three percent of students registered in the Triage program were placed on Academic Watch, Probation 1, or Probation 2.**

Chart 1: Reasons for requesting Triage services in Fall 2012

*54% Medical Emergency*

*26% Family Emergency (Caring for family member or death in family)*

*2% Other (combination of family and medical)*

*18% Personal Emergency*

**New Program Initiatives**

This year the Triage program solidified new connections and outreach with other campus departments. By connecting students with Health & Wellness, we were able to gather detailed information to better assist students with academic decisions and to provide support to students with chronic and serious conditions. We were also better informed as to the status of students upon their return to campus.

**Program Issues**

The Triage program experienced an increase in the number of students who requested access for non-emergency related issues. Faculty referrals were sometimes problematic. Triage is a voluntary support service, and although professors were well-intentioned, some students reported feeling pressured into registering with the Triage program in order to receive extensions on assignments. Increased communication with faculty, particularly adjuncts, is suggested.

**Accessing Triage Services**

The students that were referred to the Triage program requested assistance online, via email, phone, or an office visit.

Chart 2: Accessing Triage services

* 18% Submitted an online form
* 20% Office Visit
* 33% Faculty referral
* 12% Health & Wellness
* 1% Dean of Students

**Academic Standing**

Thirty-three percent of students registered in the Triage program were placed on Academic Watch, Probation 1, or Probation 2. Of these, the academic standing breakdown is as follows:

Chart 3: Relationship between Triage status and academic standing

These data indicate that Triage is a risk factor for academic standing. We must develop programs and services for effective academic interventions with these students.

Chart 4: Reasons for requesting Triage services in Spring 2013

Triage was developed to provide extended advising support to students in times of personal emergency or crisis. These emergencies are categorized as medical, family, personal or other.

*60% Medical Emergency (17% of this total were a result pregnancy related complications)
7% Personal Emergency (domestic violence and homelessness)
33% Family Emergency (combination of care giving and death)
0% Other*

Chart 5: Comparisons of services requested in Spring 2013 by class level

Medical emergencies were the top reason for students requesting access to the Triage Program. Of the 42 total participants, 2 students were repeaters from Fall 2012 due to sickle-cell disease.

Chart 6: Triage services request comparison from Fall 2012 to Spring 2013

The Triage Program enrolled 81 total participants in Fall 2012 to Spring 2013, which resulted in an increase of medical and family emergencies. Examples of medical emergencies were influenza (flu), seizures, sickle-cell disease, surgeries (biopsies, oral and maxillofacial), automobile accidents, etc.

Chart 7: Academic Standing Awards

Fifty-two percent (52%) of students registered in the Triage Program in Spring 2013 were placed on Academic Warning, Academic Watch, Probation 1, Probation 2, or Academic Dismissal.

Chart 8: Fall 2012 to Spring 2013 academic standing comparisons

The number of participants receiving no academic award decreased in Spring 2013. This was due in part to students taking a more proactive role in communicating with their professors regarding their extended absence, submitting missed assignments, and working with Academic Services to receive tutoring assistance. Participants were also able to make clearer decisions to request an incomplete, or to withdraw from some or all classes.

Chart 9: Triage Case Referrals

The students that were referred to the Triage Program requested assistance online, via e-mail, phone, or an office visit. In Spring 2013, there was an increase in the number of students referred by either their peers, parents, or partnership schools (i.e. TEAM Academy Charter, KIPP affiliated) as compared to Fall 2012.

**New Program Initiatives for Spring 2013**

* The Triage administrator sent email confirmations to participants once they were enrolled in the program. The message provided the dates of enrollment along with a listing of their course schedule to show which professors would be notified of their extended absence.
* Midterm grades were included on the master Triage Program Cases Report, which was distributed weekly to the deans and Health & Wellness.

Program Improvements

* Requested by Dean Child to survey participants at end of semester; will begin this process in fall 2013.
* Update online request form to include participant’s Trinity email.
* Copy participant’s academic advisor on enrollment confirmation.

Program Issues

* Reiterate to faculty and adjuncts that they have the discretion to deny participants the right to make up missed assignments/exams. There were several occasions where students were directed to the Triage administrator for extension approvals and to reschedule exams.

Recommendations

* The Triage program will need to increase its web visibility and accessibility. Faculty and staff should encourage students to submit online Triage request forms. The forms provide up to date information on how to contact the student, the nature of their emergency, and the last date the student attended class. Moving forward, the Triage program will provide online faculty referrals to make it easier for professors to alert the Office of Advising of students who may be in crisis.
* The program needs solid structures and next steps to help students come back to class and re-adjust to the classroom. Moving forward, the program will need to set guidelines on acceptable amounts of time to miss courses in regards to grief periods.
* Managing expectations of students became increasingly difficult. The program will work to ensure that students understand their role and responsibility in the process.
* The program will coordinate an outreach plan to inform students of important dates such as midterms, last date to withdraw, and finals.

The CAS UND-N Cohort

On July 26, 2012, new admission policies for Trinity’s Nursing Program were announced. These new admission policies included:

* A reduced number of admitted students to 60 per year;
* All pre-requisite math, science, and social science courses must be completed at Trinity;
* No prior credits more than two years old will be accepted to fulfill general education requirements.

All students admitted for the Fall 2012 semester and who paid the deposit fee after the July 26, 2012 memo were subjected to these new admission policies.

**Goal #2: Pre-Nursing and Undecided Nursing Cohort**

The 2012-2103 goal was to communicate new policies and admission processes to the students in this cohort, including procedures for assisting students to raise their GPAs and TEAS scores. The recent changes to the nursing program admission policy continue to impact resident and transfer CAS students. As of July 26, 2012,

* The reduced number of admitted students to 60 per year (30 each semester) made the overall process more competitive
* All prerequisite math, science, and social science course must be completed at Trinity has resulted in transfer students having to retake courses
* No prior credits more than two years old will be accepted to fulfill general education requirements affects students who may have to take a break from school for a number of reasons

*Progress:* A total of 67 CAS, SPS, and NCAN students applied for admission for the Fall 2013 term. Of that number, 13 (19.4%) represented the College of Arts and Sciences, down from 31% and 28% for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 respectively. While the number of CAS students accepted into the program increased from six to seven for Fall 2012, it remained constant for Spring and Fall 2013. This constant represented an increase in the overall percentage of CAS students accepted (23% for Fall 2013, up from 20% for Fall 2012).

Figure 1:Nursing Cohort Acceptance Rates

Twenty-five CAS students applied for admission for Fall 2012 and Spring 2013; that number dropped to 13 for Fall 2013. The drop in the number of CAS students applying for admission to the nursing program may be attributed to the recent policy changes.

Here is a complete breakdown for Fall 2013:

* 30 of 67 students were admitted into the program represents 44.7% of all students who applied
* More than half or 55.2% of those students who applied were denied admittance into the program
* 54% of the CAS students who applied were admitted (7 of 13)
* 46% or 6 of 13 were denied
* CAS students represent 19.4% of all students who applied (13 of 67); additionally they represent 23% of all students who were accepted (7 of 30)
* 7 CAS students who gained admittance in the program of the total number of 67 students who applied represents 10.4% of the total number of accepted students

**Goals for 2013-2014**

* Continue to communicate with the faculty regarding the purpose and importance of appropriately employing the Early Alert system as a viable intervention
* Collaborate more effectively with Academic Services to craft strategies to support those at-risk students identified through Early Alerts
* Continue to partner with the School of Nursing and Health Professions to promote student awareness regarding policy and procedural changes including creative and personalized approaches to improving students’ GPAs and TEAS scores

**The Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 NURS admitted cohort: Data and analyses**

* Number of CAS students who applied to the Nursing Program for Fall 2012 admittance:
	+ Of 81 total student applications, 25 were from CAS (31%);
	+ Of 30 admitted students, 6 were CAS students (2%).
* Number of CAS students who applied to the Nursing Program for Spring 2013 admittance:
	+ Of 88 total student applications, 25 were from CAS (28%)
	+ Of 30 confirmed students, 7 were from CAS (23%)
* With regards to academic standing:
	+ There were no UND-N advisees with midterm alerts.
	+ The average GPA of the UND-N professional advising cohort is 2.9.
* Conclusions:
	+ We need to increase the average UND-N GPA to 3.0 – 3.5 to be competitive with SPS
	+ We need to increase the average TEAS score to > 80%
	+ We need to inform students of all academic support systems
	+ CAS students must be better prepared regarding expectations of the Nursing program

**Overall Conclusions and Recommendations**

 CAS Professional Advising is constantly striving for effective, accurate, wrap-around advising with the goal of student persistence and success in multiple measureable ways. Better tracking and outreach in our “rolling alert” system, enhanced procedures in our probationary advising services, improved Triage practices, the cohort advising model, and faculty and advisor development will be continuing initiatives. We will also consider enhancing collaboration with the specialists, as the math specialist program credited these advising initiatives with helping to foster an increased performance in pre-foundational math courses in Fall 2012.

 Challenges in advising continue to center on the expanded array of functions advising is called on to perform. The addition of new University programs and services leading to increased enrollments is a most welcome campus development. At the same time, we acknowledge that this positive and necessary expansion puts increased pressure on advising in terms of higher student loads, more complex advising protocols, and the presentation of students with complex advising issues, including multiple transfer transcripts, differentiated advising needs, and an elevated spate of academic, personal, financial, medical and life challenges. Advising has rallied to meet this challenge with stream-lined, more efficient procedures and a collaborative case-management approach which we will continue to examine, assess and improve. We do foresee that as our student population continues to grow in numbers and complexity, our professional advising staff must keep pace in numbers of staff positions and enhanced professional development and training opportunities.