Advisor Learning Objectives: Jeremy Page and Robin Yens

- Jeremy wanted to introduce the draft of the advising learning outcomes to get feedback from ACN members. He began by discussing the process of how they developed the learning outcomes.
- Asked anyone on campus who was interested in developing these outcomes to serve on a committee. Had good representation from academic advising groups and schools and colleges across campus on committee. (See powerpoint on ACN website for list of committee members.)
- In fall, the committee then did the following:
  - Reviewed resources on advising to consider the language to use
  - Looked at other institutions that had advising outcomes
  - Also looked internally at syllabi used in schools and colleges on campus.
  - Thought about overarching concepts, overarching categories, and then developed language and some sample tasks to think through the application of the learning outcomes.
  - They did a lot of wordsmithing trying to get to a place of common language.
  - Came up with five core outcomes
- In spring the committee then did the following:
  - Met with ASALC and EAC to hear reaction and get feedback.
  - Now presenting at ACN to get feedback.
  - Next step: Will gather feedback and have established outcomes in about a month.
  - Over the summer, advising groups can review and work on ways to integrate outcomes into their practices.
- What are learning outcome?
  - Identify growth in knowing, being, or doing.
  - Could capture knowledge, attitude, and skill.
What do we want our students to know or do when they graduate in terms of academic advising

- Why develop? Reasons for developing them were influenced by the current climate
  - Elevate perceptions of advising on campus—there’s a perception that advising equals telling students what courses to take.
  - Create a way to show impact of advising. We live in era of accountability. It’s important to talk about the way we envision our capacities as academic advisors. Jeremy hopes the outcomes guide our practice and function as vision of what we seek to achieve.
  - Follow the recommendation of Undergraduate Advising Working Group; group recommended that the outcomes be developed.
  - Having outcomes allows us to mobilize to address retention issues—allows us to answer questions such as how do we know we’re being successful? How are we measuring learning?

- Context/Framing considerations:
  - Developing outcomes was not about reducing advising into checked boxes for assessment.
  - Not about gauging advisor performance—it’s aspirational—trying to measure learning of student.
  - Not about the core competencies—they are interconnected but existing in same space—capturing what we do as advisors.
  - Not about creating more work. Instead the outcomes are a way of capturing the work that we do.
  - It may not be possible to get at all the outcomes all the time—they are aspirational goals.
  - Also, the intent is to share these outcomes with students to create shared expectations; that is part of the exchange and relationship-building with students.
  - Can consider how we might talk about them with students during NSO and TASO.
  - Each advising unit should adapt outcomes to their units, given their different students and programs.

- Jeremy then showed the outcomes (see ACN website).
  - First column: Outcomes.
  - Second column: Notations for resources used to develop the outcome.
  - Third column: Sample tasks that would implement the outcome.
  - Fourth column: Empty boxes that could be filled in by each school and college to tailor the outcomes to their practices.
  - Fifth column: Developmental levels.
  - Finally: Means of assessment.

- Robin Jens then noted that they used this outcomes model to start to understand what they do in advising in nursing to find any gaps in their practices.
Discussed with the advisors when they do certain tasks with students. Walked through the first year—what it looks like and what happens when the student then later moves into the professional major. Found that the advisors had a different focus—different tasks—at different times in a student’s path. Found, also, that they didn’t do a good job of tracking what they did at different times and didn’t assess it.

Critical to show how what we do is valuable and how we move retention numbers and how we assign value to our advisors.

The outcomes are not necessarily about doing anything different. They are about trying to identify what we do and how we assess what we do.

Jeremy noted that people like Robin who were involved in the conversation about outcomes are already making use of what they discussed.

It’s not creating more work but capturing measurement.

Sarah Coban commented that so much advising happens that is not in standard advising unit. She sees outcomes as a tool that can be used by others outside advising offices—a potential for campus-wide application for others.

Jenny Klummp asked if the committee asked for feedback from students on what they hoped to learn or get help with from advisors? Would be valuable for us to think about what we want to do, but would also be good to hear what students want to get from advising.

Jeremy: That would be good to have as a long term initiative—to gather info during NSO and tweak as we go the language of these outcomes—as we begin to use them.

Jeremy and committee welcome any feedback written or otherwise and hope to have the feedback incorporated into final outcomes by the end of the month.

UWM Center for Aging and Translational Research: Nicole Gorelik.

Nicole, an incoming junior at UWM, spent the past year as a public relations and social media intern in the Center for Aging and Translational Research. Wanted to discuss the center and a new certificate offered through the center.

Center was launched in 2013. It brings together multiple academic disciplines to focus on aging research, education, training, and community engagement.

Nicole defined the term gerontology—study of aging from a multidisciplinary perspective. Includes the problematic as well as the normal aspects of aging.

US is getting older—By 2050, more than 90 million adults will be 65 + years old and 19 million will be over 85. The number of older adults living at home is increasing.

More need for remodeling homes to meet the needs of these older adults.

More injuries related to aging, more hospital and doctors’ visits.

An estimated 900,000 plus jobs will be in gerontology and aging in the coming years. From website:

There’s a problem, however: the fields in gerontology are shrinking and students are not going into these fields.

Center wants to call this to attention and encourage students to go into fields.

Who can pursue? Sociology, nursing, pre-med, architecture, pre-law, etc.
• So many people will be older, so this Undergraduate Certificate in Healthy Aging will help.

• What is certificate:
  o Designed to provide students with knowledge and skills to meet the needs of an aging population in a variety of fields.
  o Basic goals—foundational knowledge in the processes of aging, issues related to aging and the opportunities and challenges of older adulthood.
  o Requires a total of 18 credits. Credits can be used to also fulfill GERs.
  o Required course: Social Work 300; as part of class, students meet with older adults at St. John’s on the Lake.
  o Have to have 6 credits from core curriculum to cover biological, psychological or social dimensions of aging.
  o Also have to complete three credits of a practicum, internship or service learning.

• More information is available on their website here: http://uwm.edu/catr/academics/undergraduate-certificate-in-healthy-aging/

**Dr. Phyllis King**

• Dr. King thanked everyone for their work with students to get them successfully through another semester.

• Yesterday the Chancellor’s Enrollment Management Action Team (CEMAT) met to talk about how to use the $3 million UWM received from System effective in June. Want to prioritize retention and primarily focus on advising.

• Not a lot of decisions were made, but they discussed advancing the Undergraduate Advising Working Group’s recommendations. Have some money now to act on some of the recommendations.

• First discussed new position—whether to make it a director versus coordinator of advising, permanent versus interim, internal versus national search. Now that we have the funds, it may be a national search with a director that reports directly to the provost. Want this position to be an instrumental position that can affect change on campus.

• Secondly, discussed technologies related to advising.

• Also discussed technologies such as CourseLeaf, a course scheduler, and the degree audit. Discussed technologies that are going to help us and the students look at their programs of study, design them, and do some self-help on the student’s part.

• Also discussed that the $3 million is only for three years, and we need to have measurable outcomes—that’s a short time to get technology, have everyone learn it, and then have measurable outcomes.

• Thirdly, discussed academic support for students, including supplemental instruction.

• Also discussed finding ways to identify students who are close to graduating but can’t finish due to finances. How do we get students to graduate if they have a good
record but do not have money to finish? Want to look at those who have a year or semester left and help them get to the end.

- In terms of SI—discussed an expansion of SI offerings. We have a list of gateway courses with high D/F/W rates. Looking at causes and what we can do to support students. Causes could be instructors, students not coming to class, pedagogy, etc. However, increasing SI might account for some gains for students—something that we can put into place immediately for fall and see measurable results.
- Again, much discussion, but no permanent decisions. In the next couple of weeks, more definite decisions will be made.
- Question: Jen Hayes: Just to clarify—the position the provost said would be an internal one, at 25%—will it now be 100%? It will be 100%.
  - Also, as CEMAT is discussing this, is there a voice representing advising? Advisors are expressing concern about additional technologies. We are now rolling out SSC and learning it and feeling comfortable. We want to be sure that if there is conversation about additional tools, that they are vetted through advising, so the tools complement what we do and don’t add more to what we are already doing.
- Dr. King noted that the offices represented on CEMAT are primarily financial aid, the Registrar, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, CIE, Honors, and Admissions, but before any decisions are made about software and other aspects that affect advising, it will be discussed with advisors.
- Brian Hinshaw noted that some of the systems, such as Courseleaf, would be used by departments or people in the Registrar’s Office.
- Dr. King noted that it’s not just buying technology; we also need to have sustainable upkeep of whatever we get. Have to think about that.
- Question: Has there been a conversation to use some of that money to replace advisors that are leaving?
  - Dr. King: Yes
- Question: James Hardy: In regards to the director—how will reporting lines go? Would advisors report to assistant deans or the director?
  - Jen Hayes noted that she’s on the committee charged with developing a position description. She said that the committee met last week, but they couldn’t really work on the position description until the conversation on funding happened.
    - We know the position will be a direct report to the provost, but we didn’t have enough information to discuss that other line of reporting.
    - After we have the description, it will be vetted by EAC and others to have buy in.
- Dr. King noted that we want to have something that someone can step into and be successful. That it would be something that would unify us and make advising more efficient.
- Hayes listed a few people on the committee but said the members are not finalized. Will share the list of members once it’s finalized.
- Dr. King: The money we received is really to enhance and support advising.
- Advising is really in the spotlight not only on this campus but all campuses.
Presentation of ACN Advisor of the Year Award: Toby Deutsch and awards committee

- Toby Deutsch and members of awards committee shared excerpts of nomination letters for advisor of the year award. The following people were nominated. **Nominations letters can be found on the ACN website:**
  - Celeste Clark
  - Sarah Coban
  - Tina Current
  - Jennifer DeRoche
  - Gabriella Dorantes
  - Jen Hayes
  - Joel Spiess
  - Alejandra Lopez
- Alejandra won the award. Congratulations, Alejandra! 😊

ACN Election Results

- Ashlie Schaffner announced the results of the ACN elections.
- Alejandra was elected to the awards committee but was also on it by default since she won the award (the winner serves on the committee). Two others were elected—Bill Mueller and Kelsey Stockton. Congratulations to Alejandra, Bill and Kelsey!
- The new ACN Co-chairs are James Hardy and Sarah Terry. Congratulations to James and Sarah!
- The transition in ACN leadership will happen in July. Until then, continue to direct all ACN matters to Ashlie and Pam.

Announcements

- **Panther Academic Welcome Day (PAW’D) Brian Hinshaw:**
  - PAW’D will be the Friday before Labor Day Weekend. All entering freshmen will come for an afternoon session of Mission Possible and Common Read. Brian sent out an email recently requesting volunteers. This year the Common Read will be an academic article.
  - Mission Possible is now in its third year. Great data from last year shows it has had an effect. **Students who came had a 13% rate of probation as opposed to the historical 20% rate of incoming freshmen going on probation.** Students who didn’t attend had a 19% rate of probation. Other changes in math, etc., may have helped our probation rates as well.
- Advisors are perfect facilitators for Mission Possible
- It’s a direct benefit to students. Not a lingering committee—one afternoon of the year that saves you 5 to 6 conversations with students who went on probation because they didn’t know how to adapt to college academics.
- See Brian’s recent email requesting volunteers. Contact Brian for more information.

- **Enhancing Advising Committee: Jen Hayes:** Jen gave her last report before turning the reigns over to Brian Hinshaw and Angela Sadowsky, the new co-chairs of EAC. **Will put the Unconference summary on the ACN website.**
  - Tried to capture themes that came out of the conversations at the Unconference. Lots of conversations circled around same themes. Shared the summary with ASALC last month, and Jen feels good about how it was received.
  - ASALC is taking it seriously that we are having these conversations--so much so that they are following up on two issues in the summary. One is that advisors need to be recognized and have other people on campus recognize them. They took it to heart, and there will be more to come on that. The other issue was professional development. We’ve been doing some grassroots efforts by going to conferences and hosting things here. We asked for further investments from other parts of campus. Jeremy Page suggested having a committee to create a program for professional development for advisors.
  - Jen also gave a professional development update. This summer we will be busy with NSO and acclimating to using SSC on campus, so EAC decided to hold off on professional development programming this summer. However, it will send out a survey to campus advisors to get a sense of what they need for professional development.
  - Lastly, Jen expressed deep gratitude to the people she has worked with on the EAC. She said it was an honor to serve on committee and she is looking forward to seeing how it will continue its work.

- **Student Success Center: Kelsey Stockton:** The SSC is hiring an MKE Success Coach as part of the MKE College Success program. Have a grant to support the hire. Closing date was Thursday, May 19.
  - So far, have 1,349 students registered for NSO and 216 for TASO. Yesterday SSC sent a full list of students to the NSO and TASO listservs. Closer to June, they will send more program-specific lists.
  - In PAWS, under the campus community events tab, you can see if a student is registered for NSO. If you have questions about where/how to see this on PAW or other questions on NSO and TASO, contact Kelsey.
• **CIE: Sarah Coban:** The name change and courses for EAP have passed the final committee. The courses should be in PAWS today or this week.

• **Registrar: Brian Hinshaw:** The process for 3rd attempts of courses: L&S and Business require departmental approval for third attempts. Some of the departments in L&S are now establishing individual guidelines for approving third attempts. He is loading that information onto the Enrollment policies page on One Stop.

• There was some inaccurate information sent out about how math course transfers work; ultimately it is NOT ideal for students to repeat a math class elsewhere since the grade at UWM will not be pounded out.

• **Accessibility Resource Center: Jason Anderson:** Jason is a counselor for the deaf and hard of hearing in ARC. After July 1, ARC will be coordinating requests for ALL speech-to-text translation services. They are trying to streamline the process and facilitate campus requests. Jen Hayes noted that offices on campus would often called agencies off campus to request services and had different rates for services. The new process will have all requests go through ARC and reduce costs.

• **PASS: Mary Knasinski:** Mary is in charge of summer tutoring. PASS will be offering the same level of tutoring this summer as they have had in the past. Open Monday through Thursday 11:30 to 2. During the second 8 weeks of summer, open 11:30 to 3:30. Also have online tutoring available.