NOTES FROM OCT 28 ’05 MEETING – SIS Ad Hoc Committee
In Attendance: Mary Parker, Paul Duffy, Amy Wilkerson, Lionel Salinas, Mison Zuniga, Andrew Christie, Loretta Edelen, Tobin Quereau, Linda Kluck, Robert Bermea

AGENDA ITEMS ADDRESSED: Items from the October 28, ’05 Meeting Agenda that were addressed to one degree or another, as reflected in the notes that follow, were items, 1-5 & 7a (partially).

Item 8 on the agenda was addressed when the committee agreed to review the “Consequences and Resources” ideas that Mary compiled along with the grid she constructed in order to email to Mary additional consequences and resources to be included. The grid also will be further developed with the additional contributions of committee members. The grid will illustrate at which points in students’ interface with the college they will receive information about consequences of withdrawal and resources to help them avoid withdrawal.

http://www.austincc.edu/mparker/intervention/listoverview.htm

NOTES

Is online withdrawal a good idea? This remains an unsettled question for many members of the committee.

Any recommendation of this committee ought to address this question with justifications supporting online withdrawal. If the committee does not support online withdrawal, reasons for opposition should be identified and changes to current system recommended.

Some reasons for opposition were identified. They included:
The cost to the student and college of poorly considered withdrawals
The phone system would not allow for withdrawals by phone → unequal access
Students need more information about withdrawal

Practices of Other Texas Community Colleges: Shouldn’t we find out why other comparable community college systems do not allow online withdrawal? Is this because they have not yet attempted to identify the technical aspects of implementation? Or have they already gone through the deliberations where going through and decided against it?

With or Without Online Withdrawal, Current System Needs Change: Changes in the withdrawal system, i.e. implementing some sort of intervention system that ensures that the student’s choice to withdraw is an informed one, is needed. Though online withdrawal has been the impetus for this committee’s efforts, the need for ensuring informed student choice already exists with the walk-in/paper system.

Law and rule changes such as the 150% rule and the Rule of 3 create the need for students to make the withdrawal decision with greater care. This is true regardless of whether withdrawal is done on line or in person with paper forms.
Additionally, many if not a majority of students are unaware that each time they withdraw from a class not only their own money but also public money is wasted. This naiveté alone suggests that ACC students need more information with regard to their enrollment and withdrawal decisions.

A big change for the withdrawal system would be requiring an instructor’s signature.

Maybe we should start with online withdrawal for instructors only.

**Defining the Gate** through which students would be either allowed to access an online withdrawal system, or be denied such access, was the focus we established for the October 28th meeting as we ended the October 7th meeting.

While other topics were addressed in our October 28th meeting, both prior to, and during this gate-defining process, the following points arose regarding which category of students would be allowed to withdraw online and what steps that they might have to take to access an on-line withdrawal system.

Populations that might be prohibited from using the on-line withdrawal system could include Financial Aid recipients, academically At-Risk, i.e. DD, DDD, Academic Warning or Probation, and students seeking to withdraw from all their classes. Ideally students who are in only one developmental class would not be able to withdraw online from that one class because in most cases that would put them out of compliance with TSI law and regulations.

**Datatel Programming Limitations:** By Spring ’06, Datatel will not yet be able to distinguish between categories of students allowing one category to withdraw on-line while disallowing a different category. Further, by Spring ’06, Datatel will not be able to differentially allow or prohibit online withdrawal by different categories of students at different times.

**Information Presentation Intervention:** Discussion ensued regarding pop-up’s through which students must pass to access online withdrawal. Students would have to specifically agree they’ve been notified of the contents of the pop-up before proceeding to the actual on-line withdrawal step.

In determining the content of any such pop-ups, steps must be taken to ensure that the system is not requiring a student to wade through information that is without relevance to his or her decision to withdraw. Withdrawing students will have differences in terms of levels of intervention needed and the kind of information needed. An example of dimensions of difference would be the reasons for withdrawal. Another dimension of the student situation that would require differences in information provided or level of intervention would be the potential negative consequences of withdrawing.