TECHNOLOGY- ENABLED ADVISING CONDITION COMMITTEE REPORT
Date: May 11, 2022

Section 1: Executive Summary

The EAA Technology Enabled Conditions Committee met regularly through the spring 2022 semester to analyze UVU's current state of advising technology. The committee gathered information through discussions, surveys, and interviews with key stakeholders. The committee found that UVU is successful in many ways such as having a degree audit system (Wolverine Track), student responsive appointment scheduler, the willingness to take feedback and suggestions from advisors and create advising technology trainings.

As we gathered data, we identified some opportunities for improvement. These include the creation and implementation of a technology and communication plan, development of ongoing sufficient advisor technology trainings for both students and staff. We also noticed our technology may not be geared to ALL students, and encourage the technology to be looked at through an *equity and inclusion* lens. Lastly ensuring that when processes changes with technology that adequate communication and training is shared with ALL advising stakeholders, including students.

As the EAA Technology Enabled Conditions Committee we agree that UVU stakeholders could benefit from the university utilizing technology in the most efficient way to positively impact student success and student retention.

Section 2: Condition Committee Membership

The Technology Enabled Conditions Committee consists of advisors/counselors from various colleges/departments, as well as key staff in digital transformation and enrollment management.

Name	Title	Committee Role
Shalece Nuttall	Director of Academic Advising - College of Health and Public Service	Committee Chair
John-David Sorensen	Academic Advisor I - School of Arts	Committee Co-Chair
April Kirk	Academic Advisor I - College of Humanities and Social Science	Member
Arlene Arenaz	Academic Advisor II - College of Engineering and Technology	Member
Becca Pond	Academic Advisor I - College of Humanities and Social Science	Member
Chad Ostler	Assistant Director - Academic Counseling Center	Member
Chris Jones	System Design Engineer - IDM Automation	Member
Clint Moser	Program Manager - Advisement Training and Assessment	Member
Derek Kent	Program Director - Enrollment Management	Member
Douglas Watson	Counselor - Pre-Health	Member
Fatou Konate	Student Employee - Peer Advisor	Member
Hannah Azar	Counselor - First Year Center	Member
Jason Hill	Director - Learning Systems	Member
Kari Gary	Business Systems Analyst II - Student Success	Member
Kris Clayton	Assistant Registrar	Member
Megan Stanley	Academic Advisor I - College of Engineering and Technology	Member
Mike Duffin	Director - Automation / Integration Services	Member
Mindy Swenson	Academic Advisor I - College of Health and Public Service	Member
Scott Childs	Academic Advisor II - Woodbury School of Business	Member

Section 3: Narrative on General Situation and Findings

Data for all KPIs were found by talking with key stakeholders (Kari Gary, Jason Hill, Chris Jones, Mike Duffin, and Clint Moser), as well as advisors across campus. As we looked at the KPI's for Technology Enabled Advising, faculty/staff and student surveys, and in the data collections we feel that UVU advising is doing well in the following areas:

Selection and Use of Technology

- *has appointment scheduling for student-responsive academic advising;*
- *has a degree audit for academic advising that allows all students to select appropriate courses based on university, college, and program requirements;*
- *has a degree audit for academic advising that has all degree-granting programs coded;*
- *has an electronic advising notes component that students have access to;*
- *has an ability to identify students' risk factors that affect academic performance and persistence;*
- *has an early alert warning system to identify students in academic difficulty;*
- *offers students robust and responsive technology alternatives to face-to-face advising appointments*

  Evidence: 1, 3a, 4a, 4b, 9, 10

Integration of Technology

- no KPIs identified where we are doing well

Evidence: 2

User Training

- *all types of advisors access to advising technology;*
- *all students access to advising technology;*
- *all advising staff who interact with students access to appropriate advising technology;*
- *student employees access as appropriate to advising technology;*

Evidence: 1, 3b,

Use of Technology for Student Success Initiatives

- no KPIs identified where we are doing well

Evidence: 2

We found areas in which advising at UVU are lacking or could improve on. These are as follows:

I. Selection and Use of Technology

- *involves advisors in the selection process for advising technology;*
- *provides a process for advisors (Stakeholders) to provide continual end-user suggestions; understands the purpose of the technology utilized and communicates that purpose to the institutional community;*

- *has an established communication plan regarding the advising technology;*
- *systematically evaluates the technology-enabled advising process (for Stakeholders and from institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion goals);*
- *has an electronic advising notes component that students have access to; (need to define how students have access to these)*
- *allows technology access for the different advising roles;*
- *provides students with information regarding various student success initiatives;*
- *uses program requirements to create a detailed sequence of courses by term;*
- *establishes processes for updating curricular requirements;*
- *integrates roadmaps with degree audit tools;*
- *uses learning management systems and e-portfolios to advance advising as an intentionally constructed, scaffolded curriculum;*

Evidence: 1, 2, 3a, 3c, 3d, 3e, 6, 10

II. Integration of Technology

A. Technology Plan

- *has a technology plan that includes advising technology with a focus on inclusivity;*
- *integrates advising technology with other relevant campus technologies including primary student information systems and learning management systems;*
- *has a plan to ensure equitable access to advising technology for all stakeholders and, in particular, students*

Evidence: 2

III. User Training

A. Stakeholder Access

- *all types of advisors ongoing training for advising technology;*
- *all students ongoing training for advising technology; (where do students get this information and who is responsible for training)*

Evidence: 2, 3b,

UVU currently has a lot of technology and data for advising. One thing that is missing is the identification of how data is being collected, shared, and communicated with the advising community and administration. We have the catalog which pulls information from Courseleaf, however, key elements that advisors/students can use (i.e. the semester in which classes are taught) are missing. We have systems, such as wolverine track, that will pull information from Courseleaf to assist students in degree planning, however, we lack training for students on how to use and understand Wolverine Track unless they meet with an advisor to do so. We feel that there are areas in which additional training/investment in advising technology, that will improve advising, which includes:

- Early alerts- supporting faculty in submitting them, find a system that will pull early alerts without faculty insight
- Ongoing technology training in Banner, Civitas, etc.

In looking at the student survey, students look to advisors to help with registration, wolverine track, and how to navigate myuvu. They feel that this is one of the key elements of academic advising. In looking at the faculty/staff survey, advisors would like to see ease of use with multiple systems that they use as well as having the systems communicate well with one another. Additional items that would assist advisors include training in data literacy and how to leverage the data to assist the students more fully in their caseload. Identifying data accuracy (i.e. different systems show different numbers with their advising caseload and they don't know which system to believe) and having ongoing training and support on how to get the data that they need for an outreach to students (understanding of their own caseload and the persistence buckets and how to reach out to them).

Commented [EL1]: Provide a specific example of the caseload variance as a piece of evidence.

Section 4: Recommendations for Action

The Technology-Enabled Advising condition committee makes the following recommendations in four different categories. The committee has prioritized these recommendations as they appear.

Training

1. Enhancement of on-going peer advising training and support for peer advisors and supervisors. (High priority) Evidence: 1, 2, 8
2. In coordination with advisors, create "institutional" training videos for students, on how to use advising technology such Wolverine Track, Banner's registration menu, Canvas, etc. We recommend that these videos are created, maintained and housed by University Advising (with assistance of OTL) and can be hosted in an ongoing Canvas course/website for students. These training videos would need to be looked at through the Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity lens. (High priority) Evidence: 1, 2, 11
3. Creation of ongoing data literacy and technology literacy training for advisors on advising technology (i.e., banner, Civitas, Tableau) that impacts retention and completion. (High priority) Evidence: 1, 3b, 7
4. Recommendation for faculty to input grades into Canvas in a timely manner that will allow advisors to utilize CIVITAS data pertaining to Canvas data. (Medium priority) Evidence: 1, 2, 9

Key Performance Indicators

1. Creation of a sub-committee to identify guidelines and performance KPIs for what constitutes "advising data" and how this data will be collected, used and shared with stakeholders. This includes, but not limited to, data found in:(High priority) Evidence: 1, 3b, 3c
    a. After appointment survey data
    b. Advisor Dashboard data and reasons for visit explanations
    c. Civitas Inspire data usage, notes, and how these impacts at risk students
    d. Advisor retention and completion numbers

2. Creation of a dashboard for advisor and advising directors to view the advising KPIs data. This includes, but not limited to, data found in:(High priority) Evidence: 1, 3b, 3c
    a. After appointment survey data
    b. Advisor Dashboard data and reasons for visit explanations
    c. Civitas Inspire data usage, notes, and how these impacts at risk students
    d. Advisor retention and completion numbers
3. Creation of student learning outcomes for advising, specifically on how technology can support students critical learning in supporting student success and persistence. (High priority) Evidence: 2, 3c

Creation of Plans

1. Create an advising communication plan in coordination with campus-wide efforts to improve student communication. This should include identifying who is responsible for communicating student success initiatives and program changes to advisors and students. (Recommend to the Communication/Collaboration Condition) (High priority) Evidence: 2
2. Creation of a sub-committee to establish a technology plan and a technology-training plan, including representation from Digital Transformation, University Advising, advising, Accessibility Services, and other stakeholders. The technology plan should look at the current systems and if they are meeting the needs of the advisors and students. If not, what technology needs to be added, removed or modified to meet the need. The technology-training plan should include how to train advisors and students on the use of technology. This should include basic and advanced training on Banner, Civitas, and other advising technology. (Medium priority) Evidence: 2, 3a, 3c

Access to Technology

1. A written procedure of how to gain access to Banner, Civitas, and other advising technologies, for advisors (primary, support, peer), faculty, and other staff, that can be easily accessed. *(Low priority but a Quick Win) Evidence: 2, 9*

Section 5: Sources of Evidence

Evidence #	Description	Location
1	Technology Enable KPI Working Document	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965551877717
2	No evidence of a technology, training, or communication plan	
3	Faculty/Staff Survey	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965547191601
4	Student Survey	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965542451501
5	Difference in advisor caseload by system	https://uvu.app.box.com/folder/164197594583
6	Banner Access form	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965548700742
7	UVU Advisor training course	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965549628200
8	UVU Peer Advisor Training course	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965547521881
9	Civitas access	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965548793228
10	Courseleaf Courses and Programs, and catalog	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/965548143513
11	Canvas Tour	https://uvu.instructure.com/courses/559479/modules#module_1366814

Commented [EL2]: You'll want to include additional sources of evidence. You mention gathering evidence from key collaborators (Kari, Kris, Clint, etc). Consider adding these personal correspondence as evidence (or even notes from conversations).

Commented [SN3R2]: This has been resolved in evidence 1

Commented [EL4]: The sources of evidence are not included in the Box folder. This is the folder link: https://uvu.app.box.com/folder/154079310324?s=mphvq0euef4nyz2f2t4h9u8v7ar0yqou

Commented [EL5]: What specific items in the two surveys informed your recommendations?