Undergraduate Working Group Meeting Minutes  
October 27, 2015 - 8:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.  
Student Commons Building – SC1401

**Attendees:** Linda Brooker, Krista Busch, Ashby Butnor, Sarah Carr, Kim Clark, Jeff Franklin (chair), Crystal Gasell, Joe Halter, Karin Hunter-Byrd, Sandy Mondragon, Carol Morken, Vanessa Rael, Alicia Roybal, Megan Steelman, David Steward, Mary Baitinger (recorder)  

## 1. Consultative Item – Jeff Franklin: Early Alert Program

**Introduction:** 1) Now that we have an automated first response to alerted students, what is or should be the followup role of the academic advising and student resource offices? 2) What would we like to see as features of an early alert system in Starfish?

**Background:** Early Alert during Fall 2015 used an automated response system with students, but some advising and resource offices did not know what their role was for additional outreach. Another “late” Early Alert was sent to students in the last few weeks, targeting larger-section and high-DFW courses. To what extent and role does the university implement EA and how much student involvement should occur to make it more successful? When Starfish is implemented to replace EA, what tools and platforms should be explored and used with already existing resources?

**Discussion:** Some school/colleges are doing concentrated outreach and use EA as a tool to free academic advisors to triage. No guidelines or best practices are established university-wide of what do with the information. Data would be helpful to measure the success of EA—are students being served by the tenants of the program. The method of contact with students should be explored (i.e., Canvas), as some may not be looking at e-mails. EA should be part of the student culture. An explanation and use of “retention” should also be explored. The wording of EA alerts should be modified, as there may be consequences vis-à-vis international visas and financial aid. Messages to students should be clear that departments and advisors want to help rather than encouraging them to drop. If students seek assistance, resources have to be ready and available (e.g., the Writing Center). Oftentimes, students come for advising but do not indicate receiving an EA. Other schools hold resource fairs (CSU – “U-Turn”). The faculty’s role also needs to be defined. They teach as they did 20 years ago, yet students are at a different level of education and needs. Starfish is in its earliest stages, and there are several modules available to serve students’ needs. When data is collected, no matter the platform (EA or Starfish) it should not slow down or impact the services being offered by advisors and departments.
Next Steps: Offices and units with smaller student populations are generally more responsive to EA alerts (i.e., Trio). Jeff will talk with them about their successes. As Starfish ramps up and more features are solidified, Jeff will share this with the group.

2. Consultative Item – Jeff Franklin: Uniform, campus-wide student withdrawal policy and procedures

Introduction: Is it desirable and possible to: a) Have a common withdrawal deadline across all academic units? b) Institute a permission-number approach that does away with paper-based schedule-adjustment forms?

Background: Dropping and withdrawing from courses has two different meanings in departments and across campus. Students also need to better understand receiving a “W” on a transcript and the reimbursement policy. In play also is withdrawing due to academic dishonesty. There is a lack of consistency with multiple drop dates, the declared or undeclared major, and what signatures (or not) are required.

Discussion: If single-use permission numbers were provided to drop courses once students completed a series of steps, they could do this online rather than by paper. In CLAS, dropping a course is allowed beyond the 10th week due to extreme illness or unusual circumstances such as an accident. In some departments, it is up until the 14th week (Engineering). Signatures from deans are cross checked to prevent fraud. When a student drops, his or her place has been taken from those who may have wanted the course but could not because of attendance caps. The integrity of the degree itself is impacted by the amount of drops a student may elect to take, and some repeat a course in order to eventually earn an “A.” An idea presented would be to create an online module students would need to complete and pass in order to receive a permission code to withdraw from a class. There could be a variety of modules, depending on the type of withdrawal or drop. Whatever decision is reached or implemented, the students’ best interest should be kept in mind that is consistent and not work against their overall academic experience at CU.

Next Steps: Kim Clark will explore how other CU campuses define and implement their drop procedures. Jeff will e-mail all UWG members to ask what policies have in their departments and what they believe would be an appropriate drop date.

3. Informational Items/General Announcements

None.

Next UWG Meeting: Tuesday, November 24, 2015 – 8:30-10:00 a.m. – SC 1401
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1. Is the issue you bring (please circle/highlight one number): 1) consultative; 2) informational.

2. If consultative, could you please state the issue as a question to the group (or as a decision under deliberation that would benefit from consultation)?

3. If informational, could you please state the issue in 3-10 words? Could this be delivered via 1) e-mail or 2) as a printed announcement at the end of the UWG agenda?

4. To which people, units, or offices does this issue most pertain (who should we especially invite to attend the meeting where this issue is discussed)?

5. What’s the immediacy factor on this? (circle/highlight one number): 1) high priority and/or short deadline; 2) medium priority and/or medium deadline; 3) low priority and/or no big hurry.