Enhancing Advising
Meeting Minutes

August 20, 2014
Present: Jen Hayes, Angie Sadowsky, Tina Current, Ashlie Schaffner, Kat Masshardt, Pam Schoessling, Rebecca Olsen, Michele Fero, Kristin Roosevelt, Laura Stark, Cindy Piercy, Dorrie Von Kerkvooorde, Alejandra Lopez, Brian Hinshaw, Toby Deutsch, Brian Williams

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 9, 10:30am to 12:00pm
Union Room 143

I. Updates

- **Online Academic Recovery Program Development**: Kate Masshardt and Jen Hayes updated the group about the progress made on the Online Academic Recovery Program. The group is in the process of developing the objectives and content for the modules. Since Keri Duce has taken a new position on campus, Nicole Heinen will be attending meetings to further develop the modules. Nicole helped with developing the new Academic Preparedness Workshops that will be presented at Panther Academic Welcome Days.

II. Discussion/Action Items

- **Consistency of Student Experience (Policy Implementation)**: The goal for the longer meeting was to allow for more time to discuss in what ways schools/colleges differ and for advising units to explain reasons for the way in which policies are implemented in the various units and come to a consensus on what academic advisors at UWM feel is the most consistent way to implement policies. Below is a list of the policies discussed, recommendations for consistency across offices and any future considerations to be made.
  - **Walk-in Hours**: this discussion began focused on why it is that all schools/colleges do not offer walk-in advising. The School of Engineering and Peck School do not offer regularly scheduled walk-in hours because the goal is to teach students accountability and how to prepare for important meetings. While others in the group could understand the perspective, others felt that not having some walk-in advising hours is not student-focused.
    - **Consensus**: all were in favor of having walk-in advising in all schools/colleges for the first 5 days of the semester. Each school/college would determine when the walk-in hours would be and handle coverage for the walk-in hours.
    - **Future Considerations**: post all walk-in advising hours on the “one-stop” website so that students can easily see when walk-in advising is offered in their school/college. The school/college central advising phone number will be posted. There was also discussion about training the people who answer those central lines so that messaging across campus is consistent.
  - **Advising Appointments**
    - **Consensus**: All schools/colleges already have a central phone line used for this purpose. This will continue and in schools like SOE, there will be continued collaboration to centralize the advising appointment scheduling as much as possible.
    - **Future Considerations**: same as above- further training for staff answering phones to provide a more consistent experience to students scheduling advising appointments.
Late adds: discussion centered on why there are differences in schools/colleges on how late students are allowed to add when there are publicized add deadlines. Some reported that there are levels to that appeal, others reported that it was a matter of instructors being ill-informed or uninformed of this policy.

The policy requires an instructor signature only. However, the Registrar’s office added an additional approval from the school/college of the student's major (an added protection to be sure students aren’t added when it does not work in his/her/zir best interest). Many advisors have the school/college authority to sign for these, however not all do and some must be signed by the school’s Dean (who may not have any contact with the student or know the circumstances).

One suggestion that came from Toby was that if an instructor signed the Registration Change form and the advisor disagreed, he/she/zie could follow through on the signature (as it seems the policy does not actually give the school/college authority to override an instructor as currently written) and then add a note in the SSC explaining that the signature was placed merely as a formality and that the student should not have been allowed to enroll after the deadline.

This conversation will need more time in the future as it seems there is more involved—namely that faculty and instructional staff are also following this policy.

- **Consensus:** In general, it was agreed that there is a published deadline from the Registrar’s office that all schools/colleges should follow. After the deadline, the request should go to an appeal committee (although for L&S this would prove difficult with the current structure).
- **Future Considerations:** This policy should be reviewed and possibly a recommendation brought to the AAPC about the school/college approval (as current practice requires, not current policy). A recommendation or conversation should begin with the Education Leadership team on campus to bring this to the attention of faculty and teaching staff at UWM.

Late Drops

- **Consensus:** The registrar’s calendar has the dates clearly posted for the drop deadlines. If a student wants to drop after the withdrawal deadline, the request would automatically trigger an appeal process. Only extreme circumstances should call for a drop after the final deadline, thus a person should have documentation to request such an exception.
- **Future Considerations:** The language on the Registration Change Form needs to be more consistent and less confusing about who the form should be signed by and the process for requesting this exception. It is important to note that not all schools/colleges have a strong appeal process.

Third take/2nd repeat

- The group took time to discuss the process and clarify what each school/college requires and clarified what the policy is at UWM. A third take should be the final take, but there are still a few fourth or more takes happening on campus.
- **Consensus:** The current process is that the student needs to get the following signatures:
  1. Instructor and/or department of the course they wish to repeat for a 2nd time (depends on school college if it is the instructor and/or the department signing).
  2. Approval from the school/college- typically through the advising office. This is where the transcript text is entered.
3. Registrar’s office completes the processing.

- **Future Considerations:** This current process requires students to travel to a minimum of 3 offices on campus. A future consideration would be to create an online form and create the ability for the form to be sent electronically to the entities necessary for signatures.

- In these minutes, it is not detailed the amount of time it took to clarify this policy- it is also recommended that the policy be clearly publicized to ensure that students are aware and again, another conversation should be had to inform faculty and teaching staff on campus of this policy.

- **EAC Structure:** this will be continued at future meetings. The loose idea of the EAC structure will be discussed at the next Advising Working Group meeting. This is a work in progress

- **Unconference update:** Jen, Angie and Pam updated that the date was going to change and provided a quick overview of the vision for that day and will elaborate at the next meeting.

### III. Next Steps

- Next meeting is Tuesday, September 9\(^{th}\) at 10:30am to 12:00pm
  - Discussion about the EA Committee Membership, structure, mission/vision.
  - Discuss the future Advising Professional Development Structure and opportunities.

*Minutes submitted by Jen Hayes, EA Committee Chair on 9/1/14.*