

**Analysis of Academic Requirements Committee (ARC)
Petitions 1999-2008**

A Report to the Portland State University Community

**Cathleen Smith, Professor Emerita of Psychology
Janine Allen, Professor of Education
Sarah Drummond Hays, PACE Graduate Student**

December 10, 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is a summary of two separate studies of petitions acted upon by the Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) every year from 1999 to 2008. Study 1 examined a sample of petitions (n = 336) from fall 1999 through spring 2003; these petitions clearly antedated the changes in the advising system brought about by President Bernstine's Advising Initiative and the implementation of the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS). Study 2 examined a sample of petitions (n = 381) from summer 2003 through spring 2008, a period of time during which the changes instigated by the Advising Initiative were taking place and the use of DARS was becoming fully institutionalized. Petitions in both samples were chosen using a random number table. For each petition, we determined the specific requirement the student petitioned as well as the reason the student gave for wanting an exception to that requirement. We paid special attention to reasons indicative of problems with the advising system, i.e., petitions that claimed that advisors failed to inform (*advisor omission*) or misinformed (*advisor commission*), or students didn't know/understand (*student omission*) or fulfill correctly (*student commission*) a requirement.

With the exception of the first year studied (1999-00), the largest group of petitions submitted to the ARC every year concerned University Studies (UNST) and not other university requirements. Almost half the petitions in Study 1, and two-thirds in Study 2, involved UNST requirements, especially the linked middle part of the program--sophomore inquiry (SINQ) and junior cluster courses (17 % in Study 1; 26% in Study 2). Students also petitioned to use a course not designated as a UNST course for UNST credit (12% in Study 1; 15% in Study 2), and to be excused from a UNST requirement (9% in Study 1; 13% in Study 2). Other than UNST and the former general education requirements (which expired after 2004-05), the largest group of petitions every year was from students who petitioned the BA or BS requirements (11% in Study 1; 14 % in Study 2). Typically these students transferred to PSU with 3 credits for math, fine arts, or science classes and needed 4 credits.

There was no decline from Study 1 to Study 2 in the proportion of petitions that involved failures of the advising system. In both studies, approximately 31% of all petitions cited advisor or student error as the reason for the petition. Advising errors of all kinds were more often associated with SINQ and cluster courses than with any other part of the UNST curriculum or any other requirement (the only exception was *advisor omission* errors in Study 1, which occurred more often in conjunction with the BA/BS requirement). The proportion of petitions claiming that advisors had misinformed students (*advisor commission*) remained constant (14% in Study 1; 13% in Study 2), as did the proportion admitting student error, i.e., *student commission* (4% in Study 1; 3% in Study 2). *Student omission* petitions increased from Study 1 to Study 2 (from 7% to 13%), while *advisor omission* petitions declined modestly (from 5% to 2%). With DARS, students may be more likely to realize what they didn't know and advisors more likely to inform students about requirements. Results highlight the need for continued efforts to improve academic advising at PSU, especially with regard to educating students about the linked middle part of the UNST curriculum.

Introduction

In its final report in 2001, the Student Advising Action Council (SAAC) suggested several strategies for the assessment of former President Bernstine's Advising Initiative. One of the Action Council's suggestions was to track over time the number of Academic Requirements Committee (ARC) petitions predicated on misunderstandings of degree requirements. The ARC is a standing committee of the PSU Faculty Senate that adjudicates student petitions regarding such academic regulations as credit loads, transfer credit, and general education and university degree requirements (but not major requirements) for all baccalaureate degrees. SAAC anticipated that, as a result of the changes brought about by the Advising Initiative as well as the concurrent implementation of the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS), the number of petitions for exceptions to academic requirements that resulted from advisor or student error would be reduced.

Even before we began this study, we recognized that there are a number of reasons why students petition the ARC that have little or no bearing on academic advising. Meeting a requirement might pose a hardship for the student in that it would take additional money or time, or might simply involve something the student does not want to do. Or the student, through no fault of his or her own, might have been caught in a system glitch, e.g., needing a required course that was not offered. But there are other reasons that students give for requesting an exception that are clearly indicative of problems with the advising system. One obvious reason is advisor error—the advisor may have failed to tell the student something or given the student wrong information. Perhaps less obviously, *student* errors are also indicative of problems with the advising system.

Some observers might argue that errors made by students are not the fault of the advising system. After all, information about degree requirements is in the catalog or on the website, and students simply need to access it. However, a quality advising system should guide students in accessing and effectively using information to put together a well-sequenced course of study that connects their academic, career, and life goals. A quality advising system helps students avoid mistakes and provides them with opportunities to develop planning, problem-solving, and decision-making skills related to their academic program.

This report is a summary of two separate studies of petitions acted upon by the ARC from 1999 through 2008. Study 1 examined a sample of petitions from fall 1999 through spring 2003; Study 2 examined a sample of petitions from summer 2003 through spring 2008. For each petition, we determined the specific requirement the student petitioned, as well as the reason given by the student for wanting an exception to that requirement. By design, Study 1 included petitions that clearly antedated the changes in the advising system brought about by the Advising Initiative as well as the implementation of DARS. Therefore, it can be considered a baseline against which these changes are assessed. However, the changes instigated by the Advising Initiative took place over a period of years and, indeed, the advising system continues to evolve. Likewise, even though DARS was made available to students and advisors in all departments on May 8, 2003, it took time for the use of DARS to become fully institutionalized. Comparisons between Study 1 and Study 2 should be interpreted with these considerations in mind.

Method

Prior to beginning Study 1, we consulted with Angela Garborino, Assistant Director for Degree Requirements and Veterans Certification, and Veda Kindle, Senior Assistant Director of Admissions, Registration and Records, to better understand the nature of student petitions to the

ARC. We also reviewed a randomly selected group of petitions. We then developed a matrix for analyzing the petitions that took into account the specific requirement the student was petitioning as well as the reason the student gave for wanting an exception to that requirement. The initial matrix included 25 categories of requirements that students petitioned to be waived (a 26th category was added for Study 2) and 7 categories of reasons given by students for requesting an exception. A detailed description of the categories in the matrix is presented below.

In 2003, Smith and Allen, with the aid of Gayle Armstrong, a graduate student in the Postsecondary, Adult, and Continuing Education (PACE) program, conducted Study 1 by analyzing a random sample of 20% of the petitions submitted to the ARC from September 1999 through May 2003. Petitions in the sample were chosen using a random number table. We assigned each petition in the sample two codes: one for the requirement the student was petitioning and one for the reason given by the student for wanting an exception to that requirement. The time frame chosen for Study 1 was critical because it was before any changes to the advising system were made as a result of the SAAC's recommendations and before DARS was fully implemented. Thus, this initial analysis provided baseline data for the assessment of the effects on ARC petitions of the Advising Initiative and DARS.

In preparation for Study 2, our follow-up to the initial study, we again met with Angela Garborino and Veda Kindle to discuss any changes to ARC policies and procedures as well as changes in the nature of student petitions. As a result of this meeting, one other requirement was added to the list of requirements that students were petitioning. We then selected, using a random number table, a sample of 20% of the petitions acted upon by the ARC from summer 2003 through summer 2008, and followed the coding procedures used in Study 1. Because a new graduate student in PACE, Drummond Hays, was assigned to code the second group of petitions,

before any coding was done we checked for reliability by having Smith, Allen, and Drummond Hays independently code ten randomly-selected petitions. We discussed any discrepancies in coding and resolved them by consensus.

Once Drummond Hays had coded the Study 2 petitions she re-coded the petitions from Study 1. We made the decision to recode the Study 1 petitions because they had been coded by a different coder (Armstrong) who was no longer involved with the project, and we were concerned about inter-rater reliability. Drummond Hays disagreed with Armstrong's coding of the requirement to be waived in only 9 of 336 petitions from Study 1 (2.7%). However, disagreements with Armstrong's coding of the reason given were more common, occurring with 45 of 336 petitions (13.4%). In all cases, disagreements were resolved by consensus of the authors.

Coding Categories

Requirements petitioned to be waived.

The coding matrix (Appendix A) included 26 categories of requirements that students petitioned to be waived (see rows of the matrix). Eleven categories concerned University Studies (UNST):

1. *Placement in UNST* The transfer student, a few credit hours short of qualifying, petitioned for a higher placement in UNST; or the honors student, switching from the honors program to the UNST program, petitioned for placement in UNST.
2. *Cluster/SINQ substitution* The student took a UNST course, i.e., a course designated by the U registration code following the course number, but the course was from the wrong cluster; or the student took a sophomore inquiry (SINQ) course that was not associated with his/her cluster. In both cases, the student wanted to use the course he/she took and not have to take a new course.
3. *Credit for a no-U course* The student wanted to use a course not designated as a UNST course to meet a UNST requirement; or the student requested UNST credit for a course that was not a UNST course when he/she took it but later became one.

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--|
| 4. | <i>Use of LD course</i> | The student wanted to use a lower division course for a UNST requirement where an upper-division course was mandated. |
| 5. | <i>Use of UD transfer course</i> | The student wanted to use an upper-division transfer course to satisfy a UNST requirement. |
| 6. | <i>Use of 3-credit course</i> | The student wanted to use a 3-credit course for a 4-credit UNST requirement. |
| 7. | <i>Capstone</i> | The student wanted to use work or an internship for capstone credit; or use, as a capstone, a course he/she registered for under the major prefix. |
| 8. | <i>Double-dipping</i> | The student wanted to use the same course to meet requirements in the major as well as UNST. |
| 9. | <i>Waive UNST requirement</i> | The student specifically asked that a requirement be waived rather than, as in above categories, that a course be substituted (typically given special circumstances, e.g., student had moved away or was in the military; or a transferring student arrived with .5 credits short of higher placement in UNST). |
| 10. | <i>Other UNST</i> | The student made a request involving a UNST requirement other than those listed above and requirement 26 listed below. |

One additional UNST category was created for the analyses of petitions in Study 2:

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| 26. | <i>Major course for UNST cluster</i> | The student requested that a UNST cluster or capstone course cross-listed with his/her major be used to satisfy the cluster or capstone requirement instead of a major requirement, differentiating this category from <i>Double-dipping</i> . |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|

Six categories concerned the former general education requirements:

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 11. | <i>Diversity course</i> | The student requested diversity course credit for a transfer course or a course not on the diversity list. |
| 12. | <i>Exclusion list course</i> | The student requested use of a course not approved for general education. |
| 13. | <i>Use of > 2 depts</i> | The student wanted to use more than two departments for the distribution requirement, e.g., science courses from three or four departments. |
| 14. | <i>UD requirement outside major</i> | The student, often a transfer student, lacked upper-division credits in general education and was requesting a waiver of the UD requirement outside of his/her major. |
| 15. | <i>WR 121, WR 323, PHE 295 waiver or substitution</i> | The student requested to use a transfer course or an upper division course to fulfill the WR 121, WR 323, or PHE 295 requirements. |
| 16. | <i>Other old gen ed</i> | The student request involved former general education requirements other than those listed above. |

Finally, there were nine categories that concerned other academic requirements not related to UNST or the former general education requirements:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 17. <i>UD credit requirement</i> | The student, often a transfer student from a community college, requested the use of fewer than 72 upper division credits. |
| 18. <i>Overload</i> | The student, especially in summer term, requested to take more than 21 credits. |
| 19. <i>BA/BS requirement</i> | The student petitioned requirements specific to the bachelor of arts or the bachelor of science degrees, e.g., lab science, math, and fine arts requirements. |
| 20. <i>Residency</i> | The student, attempting to finish his/her degree out-of-state, petitioned for exception from the residency requirement, which is currently 45 of the final 60 credits or 165 of the total credits presented. |
| 21. <i>P/NP</i> | The student requested credit for P/NP courses after having surpassed the pass, no pass credit limit. |
| 22. <i>Maximum credit limitation</i> | The student asked to exceed the maximum credit limitation of 270 credits from all institutions without obtaining a degree. Often students who petitioned this requirement had transferred from multiple schools or switched majors. |
| 23. <i>Bulletin year</i> | Students must graduate within seven years in order to use the academic requirements listed in his/her bulletin year. The student, especially a returning student, or a student taking courses for more than seven years, petitioned to graduate under an expired bulletin year. |
| 24. <i>Accept Ds</i> | The student who transferred with Ds petitioned for D credits to be accepted. |
| 25. <i>Other</i> | The student made a request involving other aspects of academic requirements not listed in above categories. |

Reasons for Petitioning

The coding matrix included seven categories of reasons given by students for petitioning the ARC (see columns in Appendix A). We were interested in the student's perception of his or her experience regardless of how plausible that experience seemed to us. Thus in coding these reasons, we intentionally avoided passing judgment on the merits of the petition, but instead determined the reason based upon the specific language used by the student. Four reasons concerned student or advisor error and thus are directly relevant to the assessment of the

Advising Initiative:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| A. <i>Student omission</i> | The student wrote that he or she did not know about or understand the academic requirement in question. |
|----------------------------|---|

- B. *Student commission* The student wrote that he or she made a mistake regarding the academic requirement in question.
- C. *Advisor omission* The student wrote that he or she was not told about the academic requirement in question or that someone should have told him/her.
- D. *Advisor commission* The student wrote that the advisor gave incorrect information regarding the requirement in question.

In order for a petition to be coded in one of these four advising categories, the student had to specifically write that an omission or error had been made by someone, either the student him/herself or by an advisor. Distinctions among the categories were made strictly on the basis of the language used by the student in the petition.

Three additional reasons given by students for petitioning the ARC do not bear on the advising system:

- E. *Hardship* The student wrote that he or she was unable to complete the academic requirement in question, or if he or she had to complete the academic requirement in question, he or she would suffer.
- F. *System glitch* The student wrote that a course was reclassified or a policy changed that affected the requirement in question. This category was used for policy changes that adversely affected the student but were beyond the control of the student, faculty member, or advisor.
- G. *Student desire* The student wrote that he or she would like the committee to grant his or her request regarding the requirement in question, but mentioned no mitigating circumstances.

Only one reason was coded per petition. When multiple reasons were given by the petitioning student, categories related to advising (*student omission, student commission, advisor omission, and advisor commission*) were given precedence over the categories of *system glitch, hardship, and student desire*. If the student gave more than one reason relevant to advising, *advisor commission* was given precedence over other categories.

Results

Petitions Filed as a Function of Number of Students

Before examining the results from our random samples of petitions, we first looked at the number and percentage of **total** petitions filed each year as a function of fall undergraduate head count reported in the OIRP Student Statistical Portraits for the respective year. As can be seen in Table 1, the percentage of petitions filed each year as a function of fall undergraduate head count decreased from 4.9% in 1999-00 to 1.9% in 2007-08. The fewest petitions (n = 281, 1.8% of fall undergraduate head count) were filed in 2002-03.

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Petitions Filed as a Function of Fall Undergraduate Head Count Reported in OIRP Student Statistical Portraits

	Study 1				Study 2				
Year	1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008
Fall Head Count	11596	12598	14576	15808	16906	17378	17866	18012	18938
Number of Petitions Filed	567	376	416	281	333	402	365	436	362
Percent of Population	4.9%	3.0%	2.9%	1.8%	2.0%	2.3%	2.0%	2.4%	1.9%

Requirements Petitioned to be Waived

We turn now to an examination of the results from our random samples of petitions filed during the years examined by Study 1 (1999-03) and Study 2 (2003-08). Table 2 (at end of report) shows the number and percent of petitions that students filed each year in each of the 26 categories of requirements. With the exception of the first academic year we examined (1999-00), the largest group of petitions to the ARC every year concerned University Studies (UNST) requirements and not the former general education requirements or other academic requirements. Overall, 48% of the petitions in Study 1, and 66% of the petitions in Study 2, involved University Studies requirements. Within UNST, the largest number of petitions in both Study 1 and Study 2 was from students who took a course from the wrong cluster or took the wrong

sophomore inquiry course (*cluster/SINQ substitution*). Moreover, there was an increase in the number of petitions in that category over time, with 56 petitions (16.7%) in Study 1 and 99 petitions (26%) in Study 2. The second largest number of petitions within UNST in both Study 1 and Study 2 was from students who wanted UNST credit for a course not designated as a UNST course (*credit for a no-U course*). Petitions in this category also increased over time, from 40 (11.9%) in Study 1 to 57 (15%) in Study 2. The third largest number of petitions within UNST in both Study 1 and Study 2 was from students who wanted to be excused from a UNST requirement (*waive UNST requirement*). Again, there was an increase over time in the number of petitions in that category, from 29 (8.6%) in Study 1 to 49 (12.9%) in Study 2. Often these students were transfer students who were encouraged to take a SINQ course and then after their credits were officially tallied found out they needed a Freshman Inquiry (FRINQ) course. Thus they were petitioning to have the FRINQ course waived. There was only one other UNST category that garnered more than a negligible number of petitions every year—the category that involved students who wanted to use an upper division transfer course to satisfy a UNST requirement (*use of UD transfer course*). This category increased slightly over time, from 15 petitions (4.5%) in Study 1 to 23 petitions (6%) in Study 2.

In Study 1, a number of petitions (n = 59, 17.6%) concerned students who wanted diversity course credit for a transfer course, or a course not on the diversity list (*diversity course*). Petitions in this category, and in all other categories having to do with former general education requirements, disappeared after 2004-05 because students had to graduate by summer 2005 or earlier in order to use the former general education requirements.

With regard to requirements other than UNST or the former general education, the largest group of petitions in both Study 1 and Study 2 was from students who were petitioning BA or BS

degree requirements. This category increased somewhat over time, from 36 petitions (10.7%) in Study 1 to 55 petitions (14.4%) in Study 2. Typically these students transferred to PSU with 3 credits for math, fine arts, or science classes and needed 4 credits, or wanted to substitute a course previously taken and not automatically accepted for these requirements.

Reasons for Petitions

We turn now to an examination of the reasons students gave for petitioning the ARC (see Table 3 at end of report). It is important to reiterate that we coded these reasons based solely on student language in the petition without judging the plausibility of the reasons given. Taken together, petitions that cited reasons related to advising (*student omission, student commission, advisor omission, and advisor commission*) accounted for 219 (30.5%) of the 717 total petitions. There was virtually no change across time in the proportion of petitions that involved advising: there were 103 (30.7%) petitions in Study 1 and 116 (30.5%) petitions in Study 2. In the next section we examine the reasons given by students for their petitions, with special attention to those reasons that related to advising.

Student omission

Overall, of the 717 petitions sampled, 73 (10.2%) involved *student omission*, where the student indicated that he/she did not know about or understand the academic requirement in question (see Table 3). Petitions involving student omission increased from Study 1 (n = 25, 7.4%) to Study 2 (n = 48, 12.6%). In petitions coded as *student omission*, there was no mention of blame or mistake on anyone's part; instead the student indicated that he/she had come to understand what he/she previously did not know about a particular requirement. Students often indicated omission as the reason for petitioning for a *cluster/SINQ substitution*, e.g., one student wrote, "I was surprised to learn that the class in question 'Women, Writing and Memoir' was not

allowed” (200607043). Students in Study 2 cited the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) as alerting them to their omission: “I signed up for CHLA 399U ‘Working with Latino Youth’ with the understanding that it would count towards my Latin American Studies Cluster. When I ran my [DARS] report it does not show up as counting toward this requirement” (200607062).

Another student commented, “[a]fter applying for my degree audit, I have found that the course I took for sophomore inquiry . . . is not considered a Black Studies class” (200304001).

Other students cited a lack of understanding of the UNST course labeling system: “ENG 363U . . . is [an] English course that has recently been incorporated in the American Studies Cluster. I thought it was already part of the cluster since it appeared in the schedule with a ‘U’”(200506061); “[w]hen registering for these courses under the search box cluster I clicked Black & African Studies cluster- so I was under the impression that I was signing up for classes within the African Studies Cluster” (200708072); and finally, “I was unclear that it needed to have a ‘U’ next to the name” (200405008).

Student commission

Overall, there were 27 (3.8%) petitions involving *student commission*, where the student indicated that he/she made a mistake regarding the academic requirement in question (see Table 3). To be coded as *student commission*, the student had to admit fault or error. Petitions involving *student commission* remained fairly constant from Study 1 (n = 14, 4.2%) to Study 2 (n = 13, 3.4%). As they had in *student omission* petitions, students cited course labeling as a frustration in *student commission* petitions: “I chose the American Studies Cluster. . . I mistakenly took Eng 308U: Topics in Literature and Popular Culture: Politics in the 50’s from the Popular Culture Cluster group rather than Eng 306U: Topics in Literature and Popular Culture: Politics in the 50’s from the American Studies Cluster group” (200304047). “I, by mistake, took EPFA 410

in winter 2004. But I was supposed to take EPFA 410U to satisfy my cluster requirement” (200304180). “When I took Gender and Greek Myth class, I was under the impression that it could be applied to the Classical Greek Civilization cluster...I do not wish to make excuses for my misunderstanding nor do I wish you to grant the petition because of my mistaken assumptions” (200708272).

Advisor omission

Overall, there were 23 (3.2%) petitions involving *advisor omission*, where the student indicated that he/she was not told about the academic requirement in question or that someone should have told him/her (see Table 3). There were somewhat fewer petitions involving *advisor omission* in Study 2 (n = 6, 1.6%) than in Study 1 (n = 17, 5.1%). In petitions coded as *advisor omission*, students indicated that they were not advised: “I was never advised” (200607188). “No advisor notified me that I would go over the credit limits [ROTC credits] and I thought I’d graduate” (200708312). “Was never told to take transfer transition when I first attended PSU in 1996!” (200001019). Students expressed a sense of frustration over taking the wrong course, often as a result of course labeling issues: “[d]ue to the similarities in the course titles, including the very same course number, I feel misled” (200506014). Students found the online registration difficult: “[y]ou need to [label] the classes fully, no matter how specific!!”(200304014).

Advisor commission

Overall, there were 96 (13.4%) petitions involving *advisor commission*, where the student indicated that the advisor gave incorrect information regarding the requirement in question (see Table 3). The number of petitions citing *advisor commission* remained virtually unchanged from Study 1 (n = 47, 14.0%) to Study 2 (n = 49, 12.9%). This category relates directly to misadvising: “I was told by a counselor in the ASKIASC center that the class would fulfill the

requirement for the American Studies Cluster. Several terms after taking the course I realized that the course was actually in the Pop Culture Cluster” (200708038); “I was under the impression that it counted for my American Studies junior cluster course and I believe our professor agreed. I would have taken another course that counted for my UNST requirement if I would have known” (200607025).

Under the *advisor commission* category, we found a number of petitions where professors had suggested to students that a course could be used for cluster credit when in fact the course had not been accepted into the cluster, or paper work for approval was pending or had never been filed. We labeled this phenomenon “working around” the UNST cluster designation system. One student described the phenomenon by stating, “[t]his class was also ‘ok-d’ by the coordinator of the Middle East Cluster ...prior to my enrollment in the class” (200506019). Another noted, “I was informed by Professor [name omitted] prior to taking the class that if I wanted to use [course name omitted] as part of my Classic Greek Cluster, all that I would need to do is fill out a petition for it. Later on, Professor [name omitted] also told me that [course name omitted] was originally supposed to count towards the Classic Greek cluster, but he never got around to filling out the paperwork for it” (200506063). On the same petition, the Cluster Coordinator comments, “Prof [name omitted] told me he intended to get this class listed in the cluster and after discussing it with him I approved of that. But he never did the paperwork. I think this class ought to count for the cluster....” (Cluster Coordinator 200506063).

In other examples of “working around” the UNST cluster designation system, Cluster Coordinators approved courses that were not listed as cluster courses: “I’m requesting that UNST 299...be used to fulfill my requirements for sophomore inquiry. I feel it should be allowed because I selected the course with the approval of [name omitted], the European Studies

coordinator at the time” (200304009); ”Before taking the course, I asked [professor & cluster coordinator, names omitted] if it would satisfy my upper division cluster requirement, they both said yes” (200708001); and finally, “ I noticed that [course name omitted] was identified by [the professor] as a course in a series that would fulfill the Middle East cluster requirements. Upon registering for the course in SP 2002 I noticed that [it] was not listed as a UNST class. I immediately brought the issue to the attention of [professor, name omitted] on the first day of class. He was surprised, but assured me that the course should satisfy the cluster requirements. The following week after having investigated the matter, Professor [name omitted] reassured me that the course would apply and further announced to the class that any students expecting to apply the course to the Middle East Cluster could indeed do so. Shortly thereafter, I personally verified this information with the then Middle East Cluster head [name omitted]. Therefore, I completed the course with the understanding that it would fulfill the university’s cluster requirements and be applied to my Middle East Studies cluster portion of my degree” (200304053).

Students made every effort to ensure that the courses would count for graduation: “I am requesting [an] exemption for a variety of reasons...[name omitted] indicated that he would facilitate having this course accepted as a portion of the cluster when I took it” (200506050); and “I tried to cover my bases and make sure it was ok to take a non-u class before I took it and was told it was ok. This class was taught by [name omitted] who also teaches the Eng-u class” (200506066).

Further, students noted: “I was advised that this class . . . would indeed satisfy part of my cluster...DARS audit revealed that the class I had taken with [name omitted] was not” (200304026). On the same petition the Cluster Coordinator notes, “the Instructor was under the

impression that her class is in the WS cluster and so told the student. The course could have easily been part of the WS cluster but the paper work for adding it was never submitted” (200304026); another student in the course noted on her petition, “Professor said it was included in Pop Culture cluster. It meets criteria”(200304027).

In a post-hoc analysis, we reanalyzed all the petitions previously coded as *advisor commission* to see how many could be categorized in this new sub-category of “working around” the UNST cluster designation system. As Table 4 shows, 17 (17.7%) of the 96 petitions coded for *advisor commission* fit this new sub-category (see Table 4). Moreover, petitions that involved “working around” the UNST cluster designation system were a somewhat larger proportion of the *advisor commission* petitions in Study 2 (20.4%) than in Study 1 (14.9%).

Table 4

Post hoc Analysis of Petitions Involving Advisor Commission: “Working Around” UNST Cluster Designation System

	Study 1					Study 2					Total	
Year	1999	2000	2001	2002	Sub Total	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Sub Total	
Total Number of <i>advisor commission</i> Petitions	17	9	11	10	47	15	6	12	12	4	49	96
Number of “Work Around” Petitions in <i>advisor commission</i>	1	3	1	2	7	3	1	4	1	1	10	17
% of “Work Around” Petitions in <i>advisor commission</i>	5.9%	33.3%	9.1%	20%	14.9%	20%	16.6%	33.3%	8.3%	25%	20.4%	17.7%

Student desire

Student desire was the main reason given for petitioning, accounting for 347 (48.5%) of the 717 petitions (see Table 3). *Student desire* petitions did, however, drop somewhat from Study 1 (n = 179, 53.3%) to Study 2 (n = 168, 44.1%). Petitions coded in the *student desire* category did not involve student or advisor omission/error but instead involved a request for credit or waiver that the student simply wanted. For example, students petitioned to waive the diversity requirement: “I request a waiver of the PSU Diversity Req” (200304053). Other students requested waiver of the science requirement: “I wish to have the one credit hour of science waived, so I can graduate in June 2005” (200304174). Students requested transfer credit for Ds: “would like to use my transfer Ds” (199900046); and “I need the committee to please look at past courses I have received a “D” grade in so that I might get credit for those courses now that PSU’s policy has changed” (199900101). Also, student desire was coded for petitions requesting UNST waiver or substitution: “I completed SP 399U...in spring of 2007. SP399U was added to the junior cluster course options for the media studies cluster in fall 2007” (200708120). In other words, the student was requesting UNST credit for the course after the fact. That is, the student originally took the course knowing it was not a UNST course, but since the course content and syllabus had not changed and the course had become a part of the UNST junior cluster, the student was requesting credit. This situation is distinct from the advisor error categories because there was no error.

System Glitch and Hardship

A total of 42 of the 717 petitions (5.4%) cited *system glitch* as the reason for petitioning (see Table 3). Petitions in this category remained about the same from Study 1 (n = 21, 6.3 %) to Study 2 (n = 21, 5.5%). There were 109 petitions (15.5%) that cited *hardship* as the reason for

petitioning. This category increased from Study 1 (n = 33, 9.8 %) to Study 2 (n = 76, 19.9%) (see Table 3).

Reasons for Petitioning as a Function of Requirement

We also examined the reasons given by students for petitioning the ARC as a function of the requirement that students petitioned to be waived (see Table 5 at end of report). Because the table is complex, we briefly describe how to interpret it here. Consider the category of *cluster/SINQ substitution* under University Studies Requirements; you will note that there were 8 petitions coded as *student omission* in Study 1. These 8 petitions are first presented as a proportion of the total petitions coded as *student omission* (n = 25) in Study 1, i.e., the “% within Reason” ($8/25 = 32\%$). They are then presented as a proportion of the total petitions coded as *cluster/SINQ substitution* (n = 56) in Study 1, i.e., the “% within Requirement” ($8/56 = 14.3\%$).

As can be seen in Table 5, in both Study 1 and Study 2, more advising errors of all kinds (i.e., *student omission*, *student commission*, *advisor omission*, *advisor commission*) were associated with *cluster/SINQ substitution* than with any other requirement. The only exception to this finding was *advisor omission* errors in Study 1, which occurred more often in conjunction with the *BA/BS requirement* than with *cluster/SINQ substitution*.

Some reasons naturally paired with particular requirements. For example, after a policy change that allowed transfer courses with D grades to be counted, 11 students requested credit for transfer courses in which they had received a D. All of these petitions were coded as *student desire*; these requests ended after the new policy went into effect.

Discussion

This report summarizes two studies that examined petitions to the Academic Recruitments Committee (ARC) at PSU from 1999 to 2008. Study 1 examined a sample of

petitions from fall 1999 through spring 2003. This time period predated any changes to advising brought about by the Advising Initiative and the implementation of DARS. Study 2 examined a sample of petitions from summer 2003 through spring 2008. Presumably the changes to the advising system brought about by the Advising Initiative and the widespread implementation of DARS were occurring throughout the time period covered by Study 2.

Frequency of Petitions over Time

We first examined whether there had been any change across time in the percentage of petitions filed each year as a function of student head count. We found that this percentage declined from 4.9% in the first year we examined (1999-00) to 1.9% in the last (2007-08). However, the decline began early in the time period examined by Study 1 and thus cannot be attributed to the Advising Initiative or DARS implementation.

Requirements Most Frequently Petitioned

Next, we examined which requirements students petitioned. With the exception of the first year we studied (1999-00), more petitions every year—almost half the petitions in Study 1, and two-thirds in Study 2—involved University Studies and not other requirements. In particular, the linked middle part of the curriculum—sophomore inquiry and junior cluster courses—presented students with the most trouble. Petitions requesting *cluster/SINQ substitutions* accounted for 17% of all petitions in Study 1 and over a quarter of all petitions in Study 2. Also increasing from Study 1 to Study 2 were petitions requesting UNST credit for a course not designated as a UNST course (*credit for a no-U course*) and petitions from students requesting a waiver of a UNST requirement (*waive UNST requirement*).

In addition to University Studies, there are other on-going systematic challenges, especially for transfer students. In particular, many students petitioned BA/BS requirements

because they came to PSU with 3 credits for math, fine arts, or lab science and needed 4 credits. Students found it difficult to obtain single credits in these disciplines.

Reasons for Petitioning

Contrary to expectations, there was virtually no change from Study 1 to Study 2 in the percentage of petitions that involved a failure in advising (i.e., that were coded as involving *student omission*, *student commission*, *advisor omission*, or *advisor commission*). In both studies, about 31% of all petitions involved student or advisor error.

While the overall proportion of petitions related to advising issues did not change appreciably from Study 1 to Study 2, the proportion resulting from *student omission*, where the student indicated that he/she did not know about or understand the requirement in question, actually increased (from 7% to 13% of all petitions). One explanation for this increase is the introduction of DARS into the advising system. On an advising survey administered in winter 2006 (Allen & Smith, unpublished data), 87.3% of the 731 participants indicated that they had used DARS, and the percentage who used it increased with class level (see Table 6). Those students who used DARS agreed that it was helpful (assigning it an average rating of 4.7 on the 6-point scale). In the current study, students noted on their petitions that they were unaware they had taken a wrong class or were not meeting a requirement until they met with an advisor and/or ran their DARS report.

Table 6

Number and Percent of Students at Each Class Level Who Have and Have Not Used DARS

Spring 2006 Inventory of Academic Advising Functions: Student Version "I have used the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS)"				
Class Level		Yes	No	TOTAL
Freshman	Count	20	28	48
	% within Class	41.7%	58.3%	100%
Sophomore	Count	65	26	91
	% within Class	71.4%	28.6%	100%
Junior	Count	159	24	183
	% within Class	86.9%	13.1%	100%
Senior	Count	393	15	408
	% within Class	96.3%	3.7%	100%
Total	Count	638	93	731
	% within Class	87.3%	12.7%	100%

"If yes, indicate your level of agreement with the following statement—DARS is helpful in the understanding of academic requirements at PSU and tracking progress toward my degree" (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). Mean rating = 4.73 (sd = 1.38).

In contrast to *student omission* errors, the proportion of petitions involving *student commission* errors, where students acknowledged that they had made a mistake regarding the academic requirement in question, remained fairly constant from Study 1 to Study 2. This category represented a relatively small proportion of the total petitions overall (about 4% in Study 1 and 3% in Study 2).

The proportion of petitions involving *advisor omission* errors, where students wrote that no one told them or they should have been informed about the academic requirement in question, dropped from Study 1 (5.1%) to Study 2 (1.6%). This decline may be related to the increase in the proportion of petitions coded as *student omission*. Students who meet with advisors and/or run their DARS report could not claim that no one told them.

The proportion of petitions involving *advisor commission* errors, where students indicated that advisors gave wrong information regarding the requirements in question, remained about the same from Study 1 (14.0%) to Study 2 (12.9%). This apparent lack of change across time in *advisor commission* errors is somewhat deceptive, however. We discovered a number of

petitions involving cases where faculty had told students that a course could be used for cluster credit when in fact the course had not been formally accepted into the cluster or paperwork for approval was pending or had never been filed. We called this phenomenon “working around” the UNST cluster designation system. Although this phenomenon might be attributable to the growing pains of an emerging curriculum, our post-hoc analysis showed an increase from Study 1 to Study 2 in the proportion of *advisor commission* petitions that described this “working around” phenomenon.

One concern about this phenomenon of “working around” the UNST cluster designation system is that not all students have the same degree of understanding about how to use the ARC petition process. Some students were aware of the process or were told about it, and thus were successful in petitioning for credit. In other cases, students were savvy enough to request credit when the course formally became part of the cluster. However, it is likely that many students who found out through DARS that they did not take the right course did not know about the petition process and assumed that they had no other recourse than to take another course to fulfill the cluster credit requirement.

Implications for Policy

The pattern of results presented in this report has some clear implications for policy. The fact that the proportion of petitions involving advising errors did not decline from Study 1 to Study 2 highlights the need for continued efforts to improve academic advising at PSU. The linked middle part of the UNST curriculum—SINQ and the junior cluster courses—presents particular challenges for students and thus should be a special focus of advising efforts. UNST is an award winning, connected, and cohesive core curriculum experience; however, the vast majority of PSU students including native freshmen and most transfer students will not have

encountered a linked core curriculum before arriving at PSU. In other words, the middle part of UNST is a new system that students must understand in order to persist toward graduation. Adding to the challenge of selecting the correct linked courses is the fact that the course offerings change. Professors can add and remove courses from the cluster lists, making the program relevant but adding to the difficulty for students to anticipate and select the correctly linked courses that fit their schedules. It can be difficult for commuting students to fit courses into a particular time of day. Some students indicated on their ARC petitions that they switched their cluster to one with more diverse course offerings so that they could accommodate their schedules and proceed to graduation. Professors attempted to support students by recruiting them to courses that did not have the appropriate UNST cluster designation in an effort to accommodate students' need for particular courses in various clusters. Students were able to petition for credit after the fact, but this fix was short-sighted and did not take into consideration the students who did not know about or understand the ARC petition process.

The increase from Study 1 to Study 2 in *student omission* petitions and the decline (albeit modest) in *advisor omission* petitions are consistent with the supposition that DARS and meeting with advisors helped students to understand their graduation requirements. It is likely that DARS and advisors also helped students identify potential errors, such as taking a course expecting it to fulfill a UNST requirement and finding that happens only through petition. Students who submitted petitions were coached by advisors about the appropriate paperwork and process for petitioning. There were probably many more students who were denied graduation and forced to take additional credits at additional expense because they were not coached by advisors and were unaware of the petition process. Clearly students should be introduced to DARS early in their

college experience and encouraged to use it often. Student should also be encouraged to seek advising early to avoid self-advising errors.

Finally, this study represents the concerns of students who were aware of and participated in the ARC petition process. Students must learn about this process on their own or through their advisors, instructors, or the Degree Requirements staff. Students disenfranchised from the advising system have little opportunity to learn about the petition process and are therefore less likely to avail themselves of it and thus to benefit from it. One obvious solution is to make sure that all students are aware of the petition process, but this strategy might result in overburdening the petitioning system. A more reasonable way to address the issue is to eradicate in the first place the root cause for those petitions that involve advising errors. It is reasonable to expect that continued efforts to improve academic advising will eventually reduce students' need to petition for exception.

Table 2

Number and Percent of ARC Petitions for Each Requirement by Academic Year and Study

		Study 1					Study 2					Total	
Requirements		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	Sub Total	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	Sub Total	
University Studies (UNST) Requirements													
Placement in UNST	n	0	2	0	2	4	0	2	1	1	0	4	8
	%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	3.1%	1.2%	0.0%	2.5%	1.4%	1.1%	0.0%	1.0%	1.1%
Cluster/SINQ Substitution	n	9	12	21	14	56	19	18	25	20	17	99	155
	%	8.0%	16.0%	25.3%	21.5%	16.7%	27.5%	22.5%	34.2%	23.0%	23.6%	26.0%	21.6%
Credit for a no-U course	n	8	7	15	10	40	8	12	7	14	16	57	97
	%	7.1%	9.3%	18.1%	15.4%	11.9%	11.6%	15.0%	9.6%	16.1%	22.2%	15.0%	13.5%
Use of LD course	n	2	0	3	4	9	0	0	1	1	0	2	11
	%	1.8%	0.0%	3.6%	6.2%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.5%	1.5%
Use of UD transfer course	n	3	2	5	5	15	2	8	4	4	5	23	38
	%	2.7%	2.7%	6.0%	7.7%	4.5%	2.9%	10.0%	5.5%	4.6%	6.9%	6.0%	5.3%
Use of 3-credit course	n	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
	%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%
Capstone	n	2	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	%	1.8%	2.7%	1.2%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Double-dipping	n	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	3
	%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.4%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%
Waive UNST requirement	n	10	6	3	10	29	9	5	14	17	4	49	78
	%	8.8%	8.0%	3.6%	15.4%	8.6%	13.0%	6.3%	19.2%	19.5%	5.6%	12.9%	10.9%
Other UNST	n	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	2	2	5	7
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	0.6%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	2.8%	1.3%	1.0%
Major course for UNST cluster	n	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	10	10
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	3.4%	5.6%	2.6%	1.4%
UNST Subtotal	n	36	31	48	47	162	41	46	55	62	48	252	414
	%	31.9%	41.3%	57.8%	72.3%	48.2%	59.4%	57.5%	75.3%	71.3%	66.7%	66.1%	57.7%
Old General Education Requirements													
Diversity course	n	23	18	12	6	59	4	2	0	0	0	6	65
	%	20.4%	24.0%	14.5%	9.2%	17.6%	5.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.57%	9.1%
Exclusion list course	n	4	6	1	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
	%	3.5%	8.0%	1.2%	1.5%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
Use of >2 depts	n	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
UD requirement outside major	n	0	2	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
	%	0.0%	2.7%	3.6%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
WR 121, WR 323, PHE 295 waiver or substitution	n	6	1	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
	%	5.3%	1.3%	2.4%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Other old Gen Ed	n	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
	%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.5%	0.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.6%
Gen Ed Subtotal	n	33	30	18	8	89	6	2	0	0	0	8	97
	%	29.2%	40.0%	21.7%	12.3%	26.5%	8.7%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	13.5%

Table 2 (continued)

Number and Percent of ARC Petitions for Each Requirement by Academic Year and Study

		Study 1					Study 2					Total	
Requirements		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	Sub Total	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	Sub Total	
Other Requirements													
UD credit requirement	n	5	1	4	0	10	0	4	3	1	2	10	20
	%	4.4%	1.3%	4.8%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	5.0%	4.1%	1.1%	2.8%	2.6%	2.8%
Overload	n	4	1	0	1	6	1	2	0	2	2	7	13
	%	3.5%	1.3%	0.0%	1.5%	1.8%	1.4%	2.5%	0.0%	2.3%	2.8%	1.8%	1.8%
BA/BS requirement	n	10	7	10	9	36	8	9	11	17	10	55	91
	%	8.8%	9.3%	12.0%	13.8%	10.7%	11.6%	11.3%	15.1%	19.5%	13.9%	14.4%	12.7%
Residency	n	6	1	0	0	7	0	0	1	0	2	3	10
	%	5.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	2.8%	0.8%	1.4%
P/NP	n	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
Maximum credit limitation	n	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
Bulletin year	n	5	2	2	0	9	9	14	3	2	8	36	45
	%	4.4%	2.7%	2.4%	0.0%	2.7%	13.0%	17.5%	4.1%	2.3%	11.1%	9.4%	6.3%
Accept Ds	n	11	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
	%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
Other	n	3	2	1	0	6	3	2	0	3	0	8	14
	%	2.7%	2.7%	1.2%	0.0%	1.8%	4.3%	2.5%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	2.1%	2.0%
Other Requirements Subtotal	n	44	14	17	10	85	22	32	18	25	24	121	206
	%	38.9%	18.7%	20.5%	15.4%	25.3%	31.9%	40.0%	24.7%	28.7%	33.3%	31.8%	28.7%
Total	n	113	75	83	65	336	69	80	73	87	72	381	717
	%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3

Number and Percent of ARC Petitions For Each Reason by Academic Year and Study

		Study 1					Study 2					Total	
Reason		1999-2000	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	Sub Total	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	Sub Total	
Advising Reasons													
Student Omission	n	5	3	10	7	25	10	7	10	10	11	48	73
	%	4.4%	4.0%	12.0%	10.8%	7.4%	14.5%	8.8%	13.7%	11.5%	15.3%	12.6%	10.2%
Student Commission	n	1	3	6	4	14	3	7	0	2	1	13	27
	%	0.9%	4.0%	7.2%	6.2%	4.2%	4.3%	8.8%	0.0%	2.3%	1.4%	3.4%	3.8%
Advisor Omission	n	6	4	6	1	17	2	0	2	2	0	6	23
	%	5.3%	5.3%	7.2%	1.5%	5.1%	2.9%	0.0%	2.7%	2.3%	0.0%	1.6%	3.2%
Advisor Commission	n	17	9	11	10	47	15	6	12	12	4	49	96
	%	15.0%	12.0%	13.3%	15.4%	14.0%	21.7%	7.5%	16.4%	13.8%	5.6%	12.9%	13.4%
Advising Subtotal	n	29	19	33	22	103	30	20	24	26	16	116	219
	%	25.6%	25.3%	39.7%	33.8%	30.7%	43.5%	25.0%	32.9%	29.9%	22.2%	30.5%	30.5%
Other Reasons													
Hardship	n	9	9	6	9	33	10	23	15	12	16	76	109
	%	8.0%	12.0%	7.2%	13.8%	9.8%	14.5%	28.8%	20.5%	13.8%	22.2%	19.9%	15.5%
System Glitch	n	7	4	7	3	21	5	4	5	5	2	21	42
	%	6.2%	5.3%	8.4%	4.6%	6.3%	7.2%	5.0%	6.8%	5.7%	2.8%	5.5%	5.4%
Student Desire	n	68	43	37	31	179	24	33	29	44	38	168	347
	%	60.2%	57.3%	44.6%	47.7%	53.3%	34.8%	41.3%	39.7%	50.6%	52.8%	44.1%	48.5%
Other Subtotal	n	84	56	50	43	233	39	60	49	61	56	265	498
	%	74.3%	74.7%	60.2%	66.1%	69.3%	56.5%	75.0%	67.1%	70.1%	77.8%	69.5%	69.5%
Total	n	113	75	83	65	336	69	80	73	87	72	381	717
	%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 5

Reasons Given by Students For Petitioning the ARC as a Function of the Requirement that Students Petitioned to be Waived

University Studies Requirements																	Total
Requirement to be Waived	Study 1 (1999-2003)								Study 2 (2003-2008)								Total
	Student Omission	Student Commission	Advisor Omission	Advisor Commission	Hardship	System Glitch	Student Desire	Sub Total	Student Omission	Student Commission	Advisor Omission	Advisor Commission	Hardship	System Glitch	Student Desire	Sub Total	
Placement in UNST	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	8
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	4.8%	1.1%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.0%	1.1%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Cluster/SINQ Substitution	8	6	3	16	6	4	13	56	27	11	3	15	11	9	23	99	155
% within Reason	32.0%	42.9%	17.6%	34.0%	18.2%	19.0%	7.3%	16.7%	56.3%	84.6%	50.0%	30.6%	14.5%	42.9%	13.7%	26.0%	21.6%
% within Requirement	14.3%	10.7%	5.4%	28.6%	10.7%	7.1%	23.2%	100.0%	27.3%	11.1%	3.0%	15.2%	11.1%	9.1%	23.2%	100.0%	100.0%
Credit for no-U course	2	4	1	7	2	7	17	40	10	2	1	5	5	7	27	57	97
% within Reason	8.0%	28.6%	5.9%	14.9%	6.1%	33.3%	9.5%	11.0%	20.8%	15.4%	16.7%	10.2%	6.6%	33.3%	16.1%	15.0%	13.5%
% within Requirement	5.0%	10.0%	2.5%	17.5%	5.0%	17.5%	42.5%	100.0%	17.5%	3.5%	1.8%	8.8%	8.8%	12.3%	47.4%	100.0%	100.0%
Use of LD course	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	11
% within Reason	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	3.9%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.5%	1.5%
% within Requirement	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	77.8%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Use of UD transfer course	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	0	6	0	17	23	38
% within Reason	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.8%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	10.1%	6.0%	5.3%
% within Requirement	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	93.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.1%	0.0%	73.9%	100.0%	100.0%
Use of 3-credit course	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
% within Reason	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%
% within Requirement	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Capstone	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
% within Reason	0.0%	7.1%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
% within Requirement	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Double-dipping	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Waive UNST requirement	4	1	1	7	9	0	7	29	2	0	1	11	6	2	27	49	78
% within Reason	16.0%	7.1%	5.9%	14.9%	27.3%	0.0%	3.9%	8.6%	4.2%	0.0%	16.7%	22.4%	7.9%	9.5%	16.1%	12.9%	10.9%
% within Requirement	13.8%	3.4%	3.4%	24.1%	31.0%	0.0%	24.1%	100.0%	4.1%	0.0%	2.0%	22.4%	12.2%	4.1%	55.1%	100.0%	100.0%
Other UNST	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	7
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	1.2%	1.3%	1.0%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Major course for UNST cluster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	6	10	10
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	1.3%	0.0%	3.6%	2.6%	1.4%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	10.0%	0.0%	60.0%	100.0%	100.0%
UNST Subtotal	16	13	7	31	19	12	64	162	42	13	5	34	29	19	110	252	414
% within Reason	9.9%	8.0%	4.3%	19.1%	11.7%	7.4%	39.5%	48.2%	16.7%	5.2%	2.0%	13.5%	11.5%	7.5%	43.7%	66.1%	57.7%
% within Requirement	64.0%	92.9%	41.2%	66.0%	57.6%	57.1%	35.8%	100%	87.5%	100.0%	83.3%	69.4%	38.2%	90.5%	65.5%	100%	100%

Table 5 (continued)

Reasons Given by Students For Petitioning the ARC as a Function of the Requirement that Students Petitioned to be Waived, Continued

Old General Education Requirements																Total	
Requirement to be Waived	Study 1 (1999-2003)								Study 2 (2003-2008)								Total
	Student Omission	Student Commission	Advisor Omission	Advisor Commission	Hardship	System Glitch	Student Desire	Sub Total	Student Omission	Student Commission	Advisor Omission	Advisor Commission	Hardship	System Glitch	Student Desire	Sub Total	
Diversity course	3	0	2	0	2	0	52	59	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	6	65
% within Reason	12.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	29.1%	17.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.6%	0.0%	1.8%	1.6%	9.1%
% within Requirement	5.1%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	88.1%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100%
Exclusion list course	4	0	1	4	1	0	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
% within Reason	16.0%	0.0%	5.9%	8.5%	3.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
% within Requirement	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%	33.3%	8.3%	0.0%	16.7%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Use of >2 depts	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
UD requirement outside major	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
% within Reason	4.0%	0.0%	5.9%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%
% within Requirement	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
WR 121, WR 323, PHE 295 waiver or substitution	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%	4.5%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Other old Gen Ed	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100%
Gen Ed Subtotal	8	0	4	6	5	1	65	89	0	0	0	1	3	0	4	8	97
% within Gen Ed	9.0%	0.0%	4.5%	6.7%	5.6%	1.1%	73.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	37.5%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100%
% within Reason	32.0%	0.0%	23.5%	12.8%	15.2%	4.8%	36.3%	26.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	3.9%	0.0%	2.4%	2.1%	13.5%

Table 5 (continued)

Reasons Given by Students For Petitioning the ARC as a Function of the Requirement that Students Petitioned to be Waived, Continued

Other Requirements																	Total
	Study 1 (1999-2003)								Study 2 (2003-2008)								
Requirement to be Waived	Student Omission	Student Commission	Advisor Omission	Advisor Commission	Hardship	System Glitch	Student Desire	Sub Total	Student Omission	Student Commission	Advisor Omission	Advisor Commission	Hardship	System Glitch	Student Desire	Sub Total	
Upper division credit requirement	0	0	2	3	2	0	3	10	0	0	0	3	6	0	1	10	20
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	6.4%	6.1%	0.0%	1.7%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	7.9%	0.0%	0.6%	2.6%	2.8%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	30.0%	20.0%	0.0%	30.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	30.0%	60.0%	0.0%	100%	100%	100%
Overload	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	7	13
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	4.8%	2.2%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	1.8%	1.8%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	16.7%	66.7%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	85.7%	100%	100%
BA/BS requirement	1	1	4	3	4	6	17	36	1	0	0	7	14	1	32	55	91
% within Reason	4.0%	7.1%	23.5%	6.4%	12.1%	28.6%	9.5%	10.7%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	18.4%	4.8%	19.0%	14.4%	12.7%
% within Requirement	2.8%	2.8%	11.1%	8.3%	11.1%	16.7%	47.2%	100%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	25.5%	1.8%	58.2%	100%	100%
Residency	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	10
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	3.0%	4.8%	2.2%	2.1%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.8%	1.4%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%	100%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	100%	100%
P/NP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	100%
Maximum credit limitation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.1%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100%	100%
Bulletin year	0	0	0	3	1	0	5	9	2	0	0	2	22	1	9	36	45
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.4%	3.0%	0.0%	2.8%	2.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	4.1%	28.9%	4.8%	5.4%	9.4%	6.3%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	11.1%	0.0%	55.6%	100%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	61.1%	2.8%	25.0%	100%	100%
Accept Ds	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	1	0	1	0	2	0	4	8	14
% within Reason	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	1.8%	2.1%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	2.4%	2.1%	2.0%
% within Requirement	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100%	12.5%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100%	100%
Other Requirements Subtotal	1	1	6	10	9	8	50	85	6	0	1	14	44	2	54	121	206
% within Reason	1.2%	1.2%	7.1%	11.8%	10.6%	9.4%	58.8%	100%	5.0%	0.0%	0.8%	11.6%	36.4%	1.7%	44.6%	100%	28.7%
% within Other Requirements	4.0%	7.1%	35.3%	21.3%	27.3%	38.1%	27.9%	25.3%	12.5%	0.0%	16.7%	28.6%	57.9%	9.5%	32.1%	31.8%	100%
TOTAL	25	14	17	47	33	21	179	336	48	13	6	49	76	21	168	381	717
% within Reason	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
% within Requirement	7.4%	4.2%	5.1%	14.0%	9.8%	6.3%	53.3%	100%	12.6%	3.4%	1.6%	12.9%	19.9%	5.5%	44.1%	100%	100%

Appendix A

ARC Coding Matrix

REQUIREMENT TO BE WAIVED	Student Omission	Student Commission	Advisor/Staff Omission	Advisor/Staff Commission	Hardship	System Glitch ²	Student Desire
University Studies Requirements							
Placement in UNST							
Cluster/SINQ Substitution							
Credit for no-U course							
Use of LD course							
Use of UD transfer course							
Use of 3-credit course							
Capstone							
Double-dipping							
Waive UNST requirement							
Other UNST							
Major course for UNST cluster							
Old General Education Requirements							
Diversity course							
Exclusion list course							
Use of >2 depts							
UD requirement outside major							
WR 121, WR 323, PHE 295 waiver or substitution							
Other old Gen Ed							
Other Requirements							
Upper division credit requirement							
Overload							
BA/BS requirement							
Residency							
P/NP							
Maximum credit limitation							
Bulletin year							
Accept Ds							
Other							