University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Work Group for Undergraduate Advising (WGUA)

MINUTES

March 12, 2015 – 3 to 4:30pm
Chapman 211

Called to order at 3:05pm

1. Welcome and introductions
   b. Excused: Rob Smith, Brian Hinshaw

2. Review of WGUA charge
   a. Review of updated draft charged based on UW’s participation in the John Gardner Institute. Discussed the purpose of attending this institute and the attendees representing UWM.
   b. This group will work with the charge from CEMAT (see charge) to explore advising at UWM and if/how the recommendations from the institute could be implemented at our institution.
   c. Several groups (see charge) on campus exist around the area of advising which will be instrumental to inform the work of this group.

3. Review of timeline draft
   a. Current timeline (see charge) focuses the first two weeks to organize the group and the next 5 weeks to seek input from campus stakeholders.
   b. A website is being created to encourage campus involvement into this process.
   c. Incorporating feedback from students should be considered.
   d. What and how has been determined about advising experience.
   e. Higher Learning Commission survey
   f. ASALC is currently discussing overall assessment of the advising experience to attempt to identify what problems exist.
   g. Consider consistency of student experience within advising processes and policies across campus.
   h. EAC worked in August on a list of items that as a group could be done across campus (i.e. standard form, walk-in advising at the start of the semester).
   i. Consider adding to the charge – what problems are we trying to resolve and how? (It is perceived that if we improve academic advising, it will support retention.)
   j. Consider adding a focus group of students to gain input. Must include a diverse range of students. Warren will assist with recruitment and facilitation.

4. Review of support material
   a. ASALC has created documents regarding “what advising looks like” at UWM, “what do advisors do” on campus and “what is expected of advisors” and “what do advisors expect”.
b. Documentation from EAB regarding best practices.
c. EAC developed core competencies for advising which is still in draft form.
d. Mapworks results regarding advising ISQs.
e. Consider pre and post assessment mechanisms.
f. Identify who falls into the “faculty advisor” category.
g. Need to consider best practices (review CAS, NACADA, Penn State and others)

5. Assignment of tasks for next meeting
a. Action Items:
   i. Jennifer and Robin agreed to work on a question set to bring to the next meeting for review and input for both students and campus stakeholders.
   ii. Gesele and Kay to work on a proposed schedule for focus groups.
   iii. Angie, Louis and Gesele to work on completing the notes regarding the advising experience at UWM.
   iv. Gesele to her team begin working on pulling a sample population.
   v. Phyllis and Kay to review and summarize best practices which will then go to EAC for input.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20pm

Future meetings: Thursdays from 3 to 4:30pm