# Integrated Advising and Student Supports Readiness Assessment

Following are inquiries about key components of institutional work to redesign and implement integrated advising and student support systems that are fully integrated into guided pathways for students.

|  |
| --- |
| CHANGE LEADERSHIP |
| Criteria | Definition | *Readiness Scale* |
| Not Ready | Minimal Readiness | Moderate Readiness | Ready for Redesign |
| Communication | * We have a robust and detailed communication plan covering the lifecycle of the rollout and adoption of redesigned advising and student supports, fully integrated into guided pathways for students.
* We have a plan for identifying and celebrating small, short-term wins to maintain momentum and motivation for the redesign.
* We routinely use multiple methods for communicating the vision for the redesign.
* Stakeholders feel informed, confident, and excited about the redesign.
* Stakeholders understand the need for the redesign, how they will be impacted by it, and how they will benefit from it.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Structure | * Our advising and academic supports redesign implementation team comprises representatives from different meta-majors, different functional areas of the college and different hierarchical levels.
* The implementation team works as an important part of the pathways design/implementation team and has the authority and resources needed to make decisions.
* Relevant departments have and are aware of clearly defined responsibilities and resources for this redesign.
* We have a clear and robust training timeline and approach to sustain the rollout of the redesign, and that process is fully integrated with design and implementation of pathways at scale.
* We have built a continuous improvement structure that monitors implementations issues and addresses them as they are raised.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Vision | * We have a clear vision for the redesign.
* Stakeholders across the institution and at all levels of the institution know, understand, and buy into the vision for the redesign.
* We have developed and articulated clear goals and outcomes that should be expected from the redesign.
* The vision and goals for the redesign guide decision-making and are fully integrated with our work on pathways reform.
 |  |  |  |  |
| What strengths exist at the institution within this readiness component? |
| What are the barriers to readiness in this component and what opportunities exist at the institution to overcome these barriers? |
| What actions need to be taken and who needs to be involved (and to what extent) to increase our readiness in this component? |

|  |
| --- |
| ADVISING AND STUDENT SUPPORTS ALIGNMENT |
| Criteria | Definition | *Readiness Scale* |
| Not Ready | Minimal Readiness | Moderate Readiness | Ready for Redesign |
| Approach to Advising | * Stakeholders across the institution value the role of advisors in ensuring student success.
* Career counseling and student career goals are at the core of our advising approach and are developed in the context the institution’s identified meta-majors and the specific program pathways within them.
* Information about transfer pathways is provided to all students as they choose a program of study through the advising process.
* Our advisors (professional and/or faculty) engage in long-term, intrusive (proactive) advising.
* Advising is embedded within meta-majors (clusters of academic/career pathways).
* We take a holistic approach to embedding program-appropriate academic and student services supports within guided pathways.
* Policies are in place to ensure students meet with their advisor (in person or virtually) at key points in their educational journey.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Integration of Student Supports | * Student support personnel work with students in a way that builds metacognitive problem-solving skills.
* There is ongoing collaboration between academic advising, career services, tutoring, financial aid, and other support services such that students are seamlessly connected to each of these services.
* We connect students with resources available in the community or from the government as appropriate.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Technology Use | * Our advising approach leverages technology to streamline support to students.
* We provide a balance of technology-based and face-to-face support to students.
* We use technology to identify students in need of interventions and have processes to ensure they connect to those supports.
 |  |  |  |  |
| What strengths exist at the institution within this readiness component? |
| What are the barriers to readiness in this component and what opportunities exist at the institution to overcome these barriers? |
| What actions need to be taken and who needs to be involved (and to what extent) to increase our readiness in this component? |

|  |
| --- |
| TECHNOLOGY |
| Criteria | Definition | *Readiness Scale* |
| Not Ready | Minimal Readiness | Moderate Readiness | Ready for Redesign |
| IT System Capacity | * Our institution has robust IT staffing that can manage the implementation and end-user training necessary for the redesign.
* Our institution has the resources necessary for providing robust end-user training and ongoing support.
* We have the server and network capacity to handle the increased load from new technology or adaptation of existing technology.
* We have or have budgeted resources for any software and hardware needed to support the redesigned advising and academic supports.
* We have form strong working relationships with technology vendors so that technology appropriately supports redesigned student experiences.
 |  |  |  |  |
| IT Adoption | * We have a high end-user (faculty, advisor, other student support staff, and student) adoption of current technology platforms across the institution.
* End-users would feel confident in learning a new technology.
* There is widespread understanding of the utility of technology in addressing issues of student success.
* We have clearly articulated the roles and responsibilities of faculty and staff in using the technology.
 |  |  |  |  |
| IT Compatibility | * We have had successful experience(s) integrating new and existing technology.
* We are making technology decisions based on student experiences redesigned in accord with institution-wide pathways implementation.
* Our existing and planned technologies are compatible.
* Compatibility is a high priority when selecting new technology.
* The technology selection process includes student, faculty, and staff testers.
 |  |  |  |  |
| What strengths exist at the institution within this readiness component? |
| What are the barriers to readiness in this component and what opportunities exist at the institution to overcome these barriers? |
| What actions need to be taken and who needs to be involved (and to what extent) to increase our readiness in this component? |

|  |
| --- |
| DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND REPORTING |
| Criteria | Definition | *Readiness Scale* |
| Not Ready | Minimal Readiness | Moderate Readiness | Ready for Redesign |
| Data Collection Capacity | * We have strong collaboration between IT and IR for data collection.
* We have robust IR staffing that has the capacity and skill set to manage a (potentially) high influx of new data from the new technology systems.
* Our IR department is fully prepared to effectively and creatively use the influx of data from the new technology systems to improve our approach to student success.
* We have experience collecting a variety of qualitative and quantitative data, including surveys and focus groups.
* In particular, we are collecting and regularly reviewing data depicting student progress through guided pathways.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Data Analysis and Reporting | * Our IR staff understand all data collected by existing technology systems.
* Our IR staff use a significant portion of the data from existing technology systems.
* We regularly share and explain data to stakeholders.
* We use dashboards to visually convey data, including elements that are specifically aligned with the pathways model.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Culture of Data Use | * Senior administrators use data regularly in decision-making.
* Faculty and staff have access to data that impact their work.
* Faculty and staff are comfortable analyzing and using data to inform their decisions.
* Data are used proactively to inform comprehensive design and implementation of pathways at scale.
 |  |  |  |  |
| What strengths exist at the institution within this readiness component? |
| What are the barriers to readiness in this component and what opportunities exist at the institution to overcome these barriers? |
| What actions need to be taken and who needs to be involved (and to what extent) to increase our readiness in this component? |

|  |
| --- |
| INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF CHANGE |
| Criteria | Definition | *Readiness Scale* |
| Not Ready | Minimal Readiness | Moderate Readiness | Ready for Redesign |
| Behaviors and Attitudes | * Our campus culture embraces change and stakeholders regularly seek improved ways of doing their job.
* All stakeholders understand the need for change and how the redesign of advising and student supports fits within their work on implementing pathways at scale.
* All stakeholders understand the new practices, behaviors, and attitudes that are expected as a result of the redesign.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Planning and Strategy | * We have a plan for ongoing support (resources and training) to sustain and scale the adoption of the redesign.
* We have a plan and budget for incentives to ensure adoption of the redesign among diverse stakeholders.
* We have a strong evaluation plan for the redesign, including milestones, short-term metrics of adoption, and leading and lagging indicators; evaluation is integrated/aligned with overall evaluation of pathways reform.
* We have considered how this redesign supports and/or leverages other student success initiatives being implemented or planned at our institution.
 |  |  |  |  |
| Ongoing Resources and Support | * Administrators recognize that this redesign requires whole systems, structures, and processes to be redesigned.
* We have committed resources to strengthen functions across the institution to enable institutionalization of the redesign.
* This redesign is clearly articulated and supported in the institution’s strategic plan.
 |  |  |  |  |
| What strengths exist at the institution within this readiness component? |
| What are the barriers to readiness in this component and what opportunities exist at the institution to overcome these barriers? |
| What actions need to be taken and who needs to be involved (and to what extent) to increase our readiness in this component? |