

MINUTES

University Undergraduate Advising Council

1303 Shelby Center

May 27, 2015 (10:30-11:30)

Members Present: Sarah Crimm, Steve Duke, Judith Sanders, Christian Demyan, Kathryn Flynn, Francine Parker, Courtney Gage, Mike Waldrop, Charles Israel, Nancy Bernard, Joni Lakin

1. Members were welcomed and the meeting was called to order by Steve Duke.

2. April 29 meeting minutes were reviewed and approved.

3. Old Business

Continuous Improvement Ideas (Duke, team leaders)

At the April meeting Steve introduced a five-point strategy for problem solving (McMaster Five-Point Strategy: Define, Explore, Plan, Act, Reflect) that the committee will use to create action plans for the two continuous improvement areas that were voted as the highest priority. The two continuous improvement areas were Advisor Training and Transfer Students; committee members were split into two working groups. The working groups met once between the April and May meetings defines the problems and brainstormed issues and solutions.

Reports from each of the teams are attached.

These reports will lay the groundwork for addressing these issues in 2015-2016.

4. There was no new business.

5. Other/Announcements

The next meeting will occur at the start of fall semester.

Steve Duke, 9/22/15

UUAC Continuous Improvement Discussion: Advisor Training

Advisor Training sub-group: Sanders, Parker, Bernard, Israel

At meeting on May 18, 2015, we attempted to define the problems and outline possible solutions. Here is a summary of that discussion.

The Problems

In general, Auburn University lacks:

1. Definition of recognized advisor minimal core competencies
2. A central repository for advisor training resources that is sufficiently recognized, utilized, and current.
3. Coherence in advisor training (and review of training program efficacy) in the minimal core competencies

The Solutions

Our discussion included the following potential solutions, assuming there is agreement on the identified problems.

1. Start with a definition of core advisor competencies that are consistent across campus.
2. Create expectation and mechanism for common training for all new advising hires (and perhaps at stages for advancement to different roles)
3. Create and maintain a repository of training resources. Designate, support, and evaluate the person/entity charged with this task.

Other Discussion

In addition to the above, our discussion / brainstorming exercise also contained the following ideas. I place them here in case they help explain the above or provide us other directions to go.

- Currently, regular training sessions for advisors are offered through (Judy's office) however, participation is voluntary resulting in inconsistency and great variance of effectiveness. The current model does allow for unit variance and customization based on advisor needs and abilities.
- There are models of this type of advising training and evaluation elsewhere. We do not have to reinvent this wheel. Ask who is doing a good job of training advisors whether here or elsewhere.
- We do not have to wait for all of this to designate a repository and begin focus on it as recognized place to direct the campus advising community.
- The idea that advisor training would be customized by needs and timeline of each supervising unit and new hire should be a part of future training plans. Also, there would be expectation of satisfactory attainment of the minimal core competencies.
- Who will define the minimal core competencies?
 - This seems a task for the yet-to-be-hired director of the University Advising. S/he would need to oversee process, and build trust among constituents in the outcome of the process.
- Who approves/blesses these competencies? How to do this in a way that:
 - Maximizes advisor buy-in that these are important and reflect their skills, training, and responsibilities
 - Becomes in some way 'enforceable' for evaluation and promotion of advisors

