Committee on Academic Advising Minutes
03/13/2012
Minutes taken by Jason Sikorski
Meeting called to order at 12:15pm

Attendance: The attendance sheet was not returned to me after the meeting

Announcements:
- **Thank you to Karen for editing our survey for BETA testing**

Discussion:
- Karen stressed that only transfer students this semester should complete our survey
- There was a discussion about changing some items on the survey to a scroll down menu….Karen agreed to make these changes
- Ken raised a question about the language of some questions and how it relates to our definition of what a transfer student is. In addition, our decision about who a transfer student is also has implications for who will be sent our survey this semester, and ultimately who will be completing the survey
- Some questions about individual survey questions
  - #5 – Have we properly eliminated multiple answers?
  - #6 – Underscore faculty or staff advising
  - #7 – Get rid of not applicable – Instead of leaving a blank, it was decided that we would have an option for "have not sought this type of advice"
    - Change CACE to CACE Advisor
    - Mary – Thought that maybe we could add CCSU Curriculum Sheet as one of the options and find out where they got the form from somehow. Others noted that the sheet is available through multiple avenues and that it would be better to just have the student note WHERE they actually turned for advising
  - #12 and #13 – It was advised to eliminate any word caps on the responses

Survey Mechanics – Mary Pat
- Mary Pat spoke with Matthew from the registrar. Matthew indicate that he could email someone with everyone who registered and fit parameters for transfer student within a specific timeframe but that he would not send out our transfer student email asking them to fill out the survey.
  - The question becomes when we want to send out the email….every week? Every day? Every month?
    - Sending it every couple of days would ensure that the students have registration and advising fresh in their minds. Sending out an email as a one shot deal saves us time and energy in coordinating the process
      - COMPROMISE SUGGESTED – Send it out once per week for the next several weeks

- What information do we want to obtain from Matthew for crosstabs and data summaries?
  - Name, ID, Email, Registration Date, school, department, # of credits going in, etc…
    - Ken noted that this information was available from the Master Report and that we would then just have to request the date of registration and from what school they transferred from
- Are there concerns about identifying specific individuals as "problem advisors"???
  - There was a discussion about whether we should strip information about individual advisors. Instead, the committee agreed to assign a unique number to each academic advisor and then enter these numbers on our spreadsheet to protect privacy
- Question – Who will send the email?
  - Mary Pat will contact the computer technology department so that we can get an email created to send the survey to transfer students. Our hope is to call the email address…Academic Advising
- Question – Who will draft an initial email to send to students?
  - Jason agreed to craft an email to send to students. Mary agreed to send this email out to the committee for their feedback
    - Some stressed the importance that the email not identify students as transfer students….the email should be simple and note that the student just registered here at CCSU and that we want their feedback
- Question – Downloading Survey Data
  - Many members noted their perception that downloading the data from survey monkey was a simple process….where you download the data to Microsoft Excel and then right into SPSS for data analyses

<u>Chet's Status Report</u>

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

Jessica piloted our survey with a couple of transfer students. She intends to distribute the survey to a greater number of students during the week following Spring Break. Please see the student feedback below:

- In short, the students provide a mixed type of feedback – perfect length, keep open ended questions, have lots of little prizes instead of just one, stressed that prizes help, stressed how important it is for the university to make student advising better, one student noted that academic advising should be a separate office at the university, one saw the survey as clear, one noted that the survey should be shorter and/or include a component where students could actually interact with a human being and offer their thoughts to a real person during a forum instead of completing a survey

- Jessica noted that there was a Whats wrong with CCSU: Blockade to Graduation event that was being held for students to have an open forum to discuss problems with student advising. It is open to students only. Jessica offered to take notes on this meeting and share them with the committee. Some committee members suggested that this would be a very bad idea and would represent a betrayal of student trust. Jessica indicated that she would not provide the committee with any details about the meeting but would ask the students if they wished to draft a position statement to share with the committee

Provost and Advising

- Mary Pat invited Dr. Lovitt to our next meeting on the 27th. The committee then tried to come up with some potential questions that they might ask to Dr. Lovitt when he attends the meeting. Those possible questions are listed below:
  - Can we help in coordinating, planning or funning meetings held across campus in regard to student advising? Is there room for collaboration? Are their thoughts on a model that we could create to coordinate the process of providing advising services across campus?
  - Some members thought that we should update him on our hard work as a committee and get his ideas about our work, his definition of student advising and his thoughts on how the context of academia can impact the work of student advisors in a negative fashion
  - Aimee wondered whether the work of our committee is to "use numbers to make a culture change or a practice change"?
    - Larry indicated his belief that Carl would likely describe his goals and the goals of this committee as doing both

Reminder:
- **Please post your interviews online when you can!!!**
- **Take a look at the Advising Resources for Registration Page to see if there are still errors**

Next Meeting
March 27th – 12:15pm – Blue and White Room of Student Center