

Enhancing Advising Meeting Minutes

July 24, 2014

Present: Jen Hayes, Pam Schoelssling, Jason Anderson, Kate Powers, Rebecca Olsen, Seth Zlotocha, Brian Hinshaw (Skype), Brian Williams, Michele Fero, Kate Masshardt, Angie Sadowsky, Cindy Piercy, Laura Stark, Kathy Barnes, Dorrie Van Kerkvoorde, Alejandra Lopez, Joel Spiess, Gesele Durham

Next meeting: Wednesday, August 20, 9:00am to 12:00pm
Union Room 340

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 developing the program has met every other week and has developed the module titles and objectives and will now use their meetings to develop what each module will include for content and assignments/assessments.
Keri Duce has been involved in the meetings and has assisted the group in understanding the considerations to be made when developing a test group and how to ensure accurate measures and metrics are in place to provide structure and validity to the results. Because the group wants to develop recommendations based on the pilot program, the test group must be large enough. Therefore, the first pilot will be run after spring 2015, during the summer 2015 session. After that initial pilot, the pilot that will be used to make recommendations will be implemented after fall 2015 grades during the Winter/Spring 2016.

II. Discussion/Action Items

- PAWS Online Notes: Seth Zlotocha and Brian Hinshaw from the Registrar's office joined us to talk about how Advisors currently use online notes on campus and gather insight about what they would like to see when PAWS begins offering the notes feature. Below outlines the discussion that took place:
 - Use of advising notes across campus is inconsistent
 - Using PAWS would have functionality to share notes across campus and sometimes with students, with differing levels of permission so that not all employees would have access (e.g. student workers would not have the same level of access as advisors).
 - The Registrar's office would benefit from online notes to better understand how advising is being utilized and get better metrics about the advising offices and how students are accessing advising offices for reporting purposes.
 - How are online notes being used in schools/college advising offices:
 - SOIS: uses a CRM for the student files and notes to have electronic advising and no longer use paper files- use notes for important information; do not note about drop-in or short check-ins with students. Login for any administrative/advising actions and uses CRM to document those actions. CRM has reporting feature- SOIS has focused on simple reports of students to follow up on. Restricted access to advisors and admission coordinator. CRM does not duplicate work of PAWS or other systems. SOIS will be looking to the future in how the CRM will be used given that the SSC is active.
 - SOE: uses Cattrack for advising notes.

- PSOA: Using paper files for notes. Not using MAP-works because of the detail of notes being shared from non-advising employees on campus.
 - AOC: Desires to see Cattrack go away and have a more streamlined approach to keeping notes and use an electronic file system.
 -
 - Other considerations:
 - Privacy/levels of permissions will be a control in PAWS notes. We want to be sure that very private or sensitive notes would not be public.
 - *Advising offices need to be sure they understand that notes can be requested by students to be seen at any point (FERPA) so that should be taken into consideration as advisors make notes in general.*
 - A concern that was shared is that it may be possible that the work of advising may be misperceived by administration if they use the PAWS notes metrics and look only at the number of student contacts.
 - There was discussion about how some units on campus are looking to move to electronic files- ImageNow. Could this be rolled into PAWS?
 - There was a request to have options for check boxes if the appointment is brief and not in need of notes (e.g. meeting about enrollment and has no need for extensive notes).
 - As the group discussed all the systems Advisors are expected to use, Seth added that it is true that some systems may go away, but we will need a system like PAWS for student data- so it would be good to attach notes to our current system.
 - A request for a feature was to have an email logging function.
 - Seth shared that the timeline for PAWS notes is that it will be delivered at the earliest in February (fall semester will be testing environment).
 - Any future ideas or suggestions should be sent to Seth.

- Consistency of Student Experience (Policy Implementation): Cindy Piercy and Laura Stark joined us to revisit the responses that were gathered during their first visit. The goal in coming back was to discuss whether or not we can come to an agreement about what procedures can be streamlined and consistent across campus.

During this discussion it was shared that the other reason Laura and Cindy were still meeting with us, given that the Advising Retreat was cancelled, is that the work that was started is going to continue. Gesele Durham joined us at that point in the discussion and shared that the goal in this process is to ultimately create a report with recommendations to the campus administration, specifically the Academic Leadership Council in hopes that there will be serious consideration of making positive changes on campus in regards to Advising.

The discussion about the policy implementation across campus continued and it was concluded that it will be a difficult task to get all schools/colleges in agreement about how to implement policies. Angie asked the question then, in references to the differences on late add procedures, what is the point of having deadlines or policies if everyone will do what they want and aren't following the University Policy? Seth also pointed out that some schools/colleges were in direct violation of the policy with their procedures for drops after the deadline.

There were many examples that were discussed to highlight why a procedure was in place and Cindy added to the discussion a notion about the "power" an Advisor has by having autonomy vs. using committees to make decisions.

The group did not come to any consensus about best practices to implement across campus. Gesele added that instead of asking ourselves what the best way is to implement these policies, we should instead ask ourselves what the exceptions are that need to be considered and then

decide how to handle those. Basically, each different approach may be there for a reason, so as a group we need to decide the merit of approaching our procedure one way over another.

- Therefore, Jen asked that each school/college review their current procedures for the policies in the handout from Laura before the next EAC meeting and bring back:
 1. Decide whether or not the procedure used violated the existing University policy
 2. Provide a rationale for the approach that school/college uses in implementing University Policy.
- Jen also asked that this list of policies and current procedures be sent to the Advising Working Group (Assistant Deans and Supervisors) for the exact same review process so that both levels are looking at these processes and making decisions together on what to recommend.

III. Next Steps

- Next meeting is **Wednesday, August 20 from 9:00am to 12:00pm**. The objectives for the next meeting are:
 - Discuss what the consistent procedures should be for application of policies in schools/colleges across campus.
 - *COME TO THE MEETING PREPARED TO DISCUSS, WE WILL NOT REVIEW THE DOCUMENT LAURA SENT TO THE GROUP. SCHOOL/COLLEGE ADVISING UNITS ARE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE THEIR TASKS PRIOR TO THE AUGUST 20 MEETING.*
 - Discussion about the EA Committee Membership, structure, mission/vision, charge- to align with the Advising Working Group and ACN structure.
 - Discuss the future Advising Professional Development Structure and opportunities.

**Minutes submitted by Jen Hayes, EA Committee Chair on 7/25/14.*