

**Committee on Academic Advising Minutes**

**2/14/2012**

**Minutes taken by Jason Sikorski**

**Meeting called to order at 12:17pm**

**Attendance: J. Sikorski, Y. Kirby, M. Bigley, L. Hall, K. Tracey, K. Poppa, J. Owen (student), A. Pozorski, J. Bishop, C. Labedz, M. Horan, K. Santoro**

**WE ADDED SOME ADDITIONAL MEETING TIMES IN ORDER FOR US TO GET ALL OF OUR WORK DONE**

**February 28 12:15 – 1:25**

**Barnard 222**

**March 27 12:15 – 1:25**

**Blue & White Room, Student Center**

**April 24 12:15 – 1:25**

**Blue & White Room, Student Center**

**Chet's Status Report**

Right	19 targets	10 interviews posted
Middle	12 targets	4 interviews posted
Left	8 targets	0 posted

We are shooting for a 70% response rate. The goal is 15 interviews in the next 75 days.

- Please submit your blackout calendars and post your interviews if you have yet to do so
- Look for invitations to conduct interviews in the coming weeks
- We may begin evaluating what we have for the right side interviews in subsequent meetings
- Future Additional Meetings for our important work:

**February 28 12:15 – 1:25**

**Barnard 222**

**March 27 12:15 – 1:25**

**Blue & White Room, Student Center**

**April 24 12:15 – 1:25**

**Blue & White Room, Student Center**

General feedback from the interviewers:

Mary – We can learn a lot from interviews with people from different perspectives, even though the task of fitting all the pieces together is daunting. Results should be useful at every level

Ken – Seeing some common themes across the interviews – need for a catalog, the process is much better than just relying on our memory of private conversations. He is beginning to see potential targets emerge

Aimee – Talked about how the articulation agreement issues may not be a good idea based on observing some of the interview transcripts. She sees an opportunity to get chairs and faculty involved with articulation, not just the “higher beings”. Aimee can see the potential power and impact of our group and wonders if we came late to the party.

Larry – talked about the variation in department chair involvement with advising and noted that the articulation language is old language with common themes that have not been carried out. He wondered how things can improve if the people involved with carrying out important tasks are not involved and noted that the articulation agreement is probably going to take much more time than has been mandated.

### **The Process Mapping Themes**

- 1) Mini-systems, Cottage industries – How will standardization be received  
...may be heavily invested in their systems
- 2) How to make faculty involvement a reality??? What will standardization mean to the faculty?
- 3) Getting transfer students here sooner? Is there a capacity issue? Electronic interfaces? Time, cost, effort???
- 4) Do we need different questions for left column stuff
  - a. Are there questions that we can add or subtract from the existing list?
- 5) Are degree evaluations accurate? How can we use this measure as a teaching tool? This could be the beginning point for declarative work and accountability
  - a. Larry noted that CAP is the basis for the degree evaluation.  
Articulation may be a problem because our normal process is flawed.  
Cleaner and easier is not always right.
  - b. Chet wondered whether it would be wise for students to receive their final registration letter from the registrar (where the classes they need to graduate are noted 2 years before graduation instead of one
- 6) Student survey
  - a. Yvonne mentioned several things: Find out what other people have done? Get a timeline from the functional office? Get a timeline from the registrar? Should we have a focus group for students?
  - b. There was lots of discussion about getting a feel for where students are from as a guide for process mapping

The general plan:

This year = Data collection

Fall 2012 = Data analysis and process mapping plus recommendations

Spring 2013 – help to implement recommendations that do not require further action

Fall 2013 – assess results, adjust, etc.

### **Chet and Jason have worked on a Transfer Student Survey**

- Mary Pat, Yvonne, Chet and Jason met separately to work hard on this survey and simplify the process
  - Discussion regarding how best to implement the survey procedure is ongoing. It looks like there will need to be some communication with the Human Subjects Council and the Registrar to determine the feasibility of sending the survey to people right after they register

### **Provost and Advising**

Aimee asked a question that generated some discussion

- Why isn't our committee involved in planning and running the Provost's advising talks? Should we talk to Dr. Lovitt about this? Should we try to get involved?
  - Mary Pat noted that she would check on this?

### **Next Meeting**

**February 28<sup>th</sup> at 12:15 in Barnard 222**