

**CCSU Committee on Academic Advising
October 9, 2012**

MEETING MINUTES

Meeting was called to order at 12:20 by the chair, Paul Petterson.

Attendance: Jessica Owen, Karen Santoro, Stephen Cohen, Karen Tracey, Chet Labeledz, Tom Jarmoszko, Kathy Czynnik, Paul Petterson, Yvonne Kirby, G. Gigliotti, Larry Hall, Patrick Tucker, Mary Horan

Special Guest –Paulette Lemma

Approval of the 9/25/12 Meeting Minutes

The minutes, submitted by Gil Gigliotti, were accepted with no changes.

Paul opened the meeting and welcomed special guest, Paulette Lemma.

Paulette gave a brief introduction to the NEASC report which must be completed by August 15. The NEASC report will be our response to a previous review which indicated “areas of concern.” Standard 5.19 outlines criteria for “an effective system of academic advising” which we did not meet.

The Committee on Academic Advising was created to address new strategies to meet this standard. Paulette reported that several strategies have been put in place to address these areas of concern including the formation of CACE and school-based centers for advising. The Committee on Academic Advising (CAA) administered an advising survey in the spring 2012 semester and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) will also conduct an advising survey in fall 2012. Y. Kirby shared a copy of the proposed fall survey which was designed to bring in a general assessment of advising on campus. She reported that the data collected from the survey would be used in making decisions about new initiatives to improve academic advising on campus. P. Lemma explained that the final NEASC report will include data from the survey as well as the strategies which will be implemented as a result of responses from the students.

In discussion about the proposed survey, several members of the committee raised the issue of the phrase “my advisor” as opposed to “an advisor.” C. Labeledz asked what diagnostic information will be available if students report dissatisfaction. T. Jarmoszko suggested that a notation be added to the survey that “all responses will be anonymous.” Y.Kirby recommended that the survey be administered every year to collect trending data and design applications.

- **Update**
Jessica Owen contacted members of the SGA and extended an invitation to the next committee meeting to discuss follow-up to the student forum which was held in the spring.
- **Academic Maps**
S. Cohen raised a question with reference to the recent request for academic maps for each department. He asked if there is a central clearinghouse for all academic advising matters. He recommended better communication among groups working on advising matters.

L.Hall clarified the plan for academic maps saying that they will be reviewed by the curriculum committee and are more of a curriculum issue than an advising issue.

P.Petterson opened the discussion on review of transcripts from interviews conducted last year in the process mapping project.

- **M. Horan presented her summary of themes, ideas and problems addressed in the interviews.**

Themes

Transfer evaluations –frequent errors- how to explain 1XX, 2XX.

Faculty – advising training; incentives for good advising, P&T

Degree evaluation – good tool, fix mistakes

Community colleges – good advising is key

Transfer Guide – great! Send out as email?

Transfer students – unrealistic expectations

Confusion about where transfer students should go

Train faculty and student where to find info on pipeline

Advising more than course selection

Advising day program – smaller, better

Ideas

Printed catalog

Mandatory transfer day (or option)

Advising contract – advising log

Electronic advising system

School-based center - resource, point of entry, common experience, good info./training

Mentor program for transfers

Send out updates on new curriculum, courses, policies etc.

Get pre-requisites into banks

Conduct advising training every semester

Continuous review of transfer course database

Central info page on-line

Problems

Chairs – have access to hyperion; need training.

Correct student misinformation, e.g. pay when you register

Substitutions – process too complicated; streamline, paperless?

Finding advisor

Every school does things differently

Dead zone between accept and confirm, postcard

Late admits

- **Continued discussion on transcripts and related issues**

L.Hall noted that the numbers of transfer students registering earlier in the semester are going up.

P.Tucker announced that his office will conduct workshops for faculty and students on degree evaluations and registration procedures.

G.Gigliotti raised the issue of substitutions being unnecessarily complicated. He asked the group to consider if we really need the signature of the (student's) major chair.

K.Tracey raised the issue of TAP and new articulations.

C. Labeledz suggested “early interventions” to help students on the “way in the door.”

K.Tracey volunteered to share her “updates on curriculum.”

T. Jarmoszko suggested that an “Advising” link be prominently featured on the front page of the university web site.

M. Horan suggested that the registrar send out our link to “Advising for Registration Resources” to all faculty. G.Gigliotti suggested that we send it to students as well.

- **Assignment for next meeting**

C.Labeledz asked everyone to come to the next meeting with “hot items” from the transcripts and recommendations for actions. He added that Tom could help with the process mapping project.

- **Next Meeting**

November 6, 2012 at 12:15 in the Blue and White room.

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Horan