

Committee on Academic Advising
September 25, 2012
Student Center Philbrick Room

Meeting was called to order at 12:16 pm by the chair, Paul Petterson.

Members in Attendance: Mary Pat Bigley, Stephen Cohen, Kathy Czynnik, Gil Gigliotti, Yvonne Kirby, Kevin Oliva, Jessica Owen (student), Paul Petterson, Ken Poppe, Karen Santoro, Karen Tracey. Guests: Chet Labedz.

Approval of 9/11/12 Meeting Minutes

The minutes, submitted by Poppe, were moved by Gigliotti, seconded by Czynnik, and accepted after adding Karen Tracey to the “Members in Attendance” list.

Special Report on Transfer Student Survey

Y. Kirby gave the committee a detailed walk-through of eight pages of the numbers and statistical analysis from the surveys given to transfer students between April and July 2012.

After initially including some students outside the transfer target group (i.e., first-year and graduate students), the surveys offer good information. Y. Kirby suggested however that, since the sample, a total of 280 responses, is small (and, therefore, that some identification of survey participants is possible), the results should not be posted on a public site but should be for committee use only.

There followed a wide-ranging discussion of many of the questions, conclusions, and specifics of the survey results. For example:

How many answers were permitted for some questions?

Why would there be multiple sources for a student’s PIN in a given semester?

Do we need to offer more specific responses for some questions (e.g., “Never,” “Less than once a semester,” and “At least once a semester” in the “Use of degree evaluation” question) to get a better sense of how students use it?

The breakdown according to GPA seemed not to be an informative tool.

How many errors in a degree evaluation are “acceptable”? How many errors are, in fact, errors? It was suggested that, regarding the question about errors in the degree evaluation, students be asked “Was there resolution?”

What does it mean that those students who did not participate in Transfer Day had higher GPAs than those who did? Students who register on time have higher GPAs, but only a small percentage of this population is doing that.

A “no response” to questions should not be read as suggesting anything positive or negative.

What was the response rate?

After Y. Kirby finished with the numbers, M.P. Bigley briefly presented the comments offered in the qualitative questions of the survey (#s 12 and 13): What were the one or two “biggest challenges...in academic advices” and the “best advising experiences”? All of the responses are on the Committee Blackboard page, and all committee members should read through the responses to glean what patterns they can see.

In the end, the big questions were: While certainly valuable, was the survey valuable enough to be repeated? Is it even necessary to repeat it? The short answers were: We need to look at the results more carefully and see what other areas this committee might need/want to examine (in light of what surveys the Provost’s Council might be doing). If the committee does do another survey, however, it was suggested to limit the focus of the students’ answers to the only most recent semester.

The possibility of another student forum was also discussed, and J. Owen will be speaking with the President of SGA about arranging that. The idea will be to help correct misconceptions *before* registration. Members of the committee may be asked to attend (in some rotation) to help answer student questions.

Next Meeting

October 9, 12:15pm in Vance 106.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:22 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Gil Gigliotti, Meeting Secretary