

**Committee on Academic Advising Minutes**  
**03/27/2012**

**Minutes taken by Jason Sikorski**  
**Meeting called to order at 12:17pm**

**Attendance: J. Sikorski, K. Poppe, K. Oliva, M. Horan, M. Bigley, J. Owen, C. Labeledz, J. Bishop, A. Pozorski, K. Larsen, L. Hall, K. Tracey, K. Santoro, C. Lovitt**

**Chet's Status Report to Dr. Lovitt**

- Chet provided Dr. Lovitt with an update on our process mapping and thanked him for the funds he offered to support our work
- He intends to send a link to Dr. Lovitt regarding our work
- M. Horan described our work as a data based approach to learning about the advising process.
- K. Larsen noted that suggestions for change have been offered and organized
- Aimee noted how there appear to be both structural and procedural problems present beyond any need for a culture shift relating to advising
  - Related to this note, Chet indicated that there are unique problems for different schools and different departments. Further, there are also unique problems for specific students.
  - K. Tracey noted the importance of getting our data out there for people to observe so that they are able to make changes and adjust
- C. Lovitt described the advising issue as a black hole and that he thought the work of our committee was “great” and also suggested it was timely

**Discussion of Magna Videos**

- Dr. Lovitt asked for feedback on the magna videos/trainings.
  - K. Poppe noted that best practice knowledge would be great but wondered whether the fact that this information was coming from a community college made a difference or not
  - K. Larsen noted that the sample video was not at all impressive, nor eye catching
    - The overwhelming number of comments noted similar beliefs

**Training in Advising**

- M. Horan noted that having training is important and that the nuts and bolts of the advising process could work better
- M. Bigley noted her perception that changes could be made at the chair level
- J. Owen provided a student perspective in noting that students might want any trainers to come from Central because the students go to Central
- J. Sikorski noted that the timing of any suggested changes in advising and any future implementation of additional training opportunities fits perfectly with changes coming to the General Education curriculum. In short, we can provide education about new advising issues and the process of advising as a whole in the same meeting.

- Dr. Lovitt raised questions about what the next steps might be. He asked, “what does it mean for an institution to enrich the advising that faculty do? “
  - Advising was described as a murky issue because it is not evaluated for promotion and tenure
  - We know that there are outstanding advisors and terrible advisors through anecdotal data. We just don’t really know what exactly happens in actual advising sessions
- K. Poppe noted the need to look for best practices presenters outside of CCSU. He indicated that there are teams of individuals from different campuses who train/advise well. He described groups from Southern Maine (Developmental Advising) and Laguardia College (Peer Advising) that provide excellent training.
- Dr. Lovitt asked whether we should systematically train advisors or should we talk about advising training as part of the faculty orientation session? Further, he wondered aloud how we can evaluate faculty advising?
  - C. Labeledz noted that training might be provided more continuously
  - Other wondered whether everyone should be doing advising. K. Larsen questioned whether some faculty should even be allowed to advise? Having people who value advising doing our advising represents a real opportunity to make a difference in the culture
  - A. Pozorski wondered whether it would be useful to add language to the Promotion and Tenure guidelines to increase value for advising
    - Dr. Lovitt suggested to bring the idea to the Senate with language to achieve this goal
  - J. Bishop wondered whether departments should have sub-committees on advising.
  - K. Larsen noted how trying to judge the quality and quantity of academic advising really complicates the assessment picture
  - C. Lovitt noted that the goal is for students to get the best advising they can. There are multiple places they can go now. Mary also stressed that there are multiple avenues to pursue in order to get effective advising.
    - M. Horan indicated that students should probably have multiple advisors for multiple roles
    - K. Larsen and M. Bigley noted how important it is for advisors to empower students to be their own advocates

### **Evaluating Advising**

- C. Lovitt noted that the Provost’s Council is working on a survey to distribute to all students that can’t be linked to individual professors. We want to know WHY students are or are not satisfied.
  - K. Tracey noted that selecting participants who go to advising may result in a sampling bias where we only have motivated students. She indicated we should sample from student clubs, CASE and classes.
- C. Lovitt indicated that we could even keep an electronic record of who advises students and when. These systems are available and CASE could start the file for students.

- K. Poppe and L. Hall wondered about how well BANNER would work in this process and offered thoughts that it could work. They also noted their perception that a BANNER consultant would help with the process of getting things off the ground
- K. Tracey wondered how many faculty use BANNER...not many. K. Poppe wondered whether J. Estrada could help us get things moving in the coming weeks and months.

### **Closing Announcements**

- Information on Advising Resources for Registration page. Some errors were discovered and efforts underway to correct those errors.
- T shirts are printing to broadcast issues with advising.

### **Next Meeting**

**April 10, 2012 in Barnard 222**