

Members Present: Sarah Crim, Charles Israel, Judy Sanders, Bob Karcher, Ruthie Spears, Mary Brownlee Couch, Regina Conradi, Anna Burchett, and Nancy Barnard

1. Welcome & Introductions –

2. Minutes –

- February 24th – Judy motioned – Ruthie seconded, all approved

3. Updates from and Discussion of Working Group Projects –

a. Professional Development / Advisor Training – Ruthie Spears

Ruthie passed out the UUAC AD Hoe Committee Summary Report for Professional Development (please see attachment). The Committee was comprised of Ruthie Spears, Nancy Bernard, Judith Sanders, Christian Demyan, and Bob Karcher. The issues discussed that 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, and 3) Consistency in advisor training and development (and review of training program efficacy) in the minimal core competencies. Ruthie provided a chart of solutions for Action Step, Updates and the Work in Progress.

There will be two orientations that consist of 2 half day workshops and an online canvas course of resources and modules. The first orientation will take place May 9 & 11, 2016 and currently 25 advisors are signed up. Upon completion of orientation advisors will receive a certificate and recognition that they attended the workshop.

An advising network drive has been created to share advising resources across colleges/schools. The network drive will be built and managed by the Exploratory Advising Center with the support of the Alliance for Professional Development. Nancy raised the question if there is a strategy to updating and adding documents to the network drive. Judy mentioned a there is a strategy to implement additions and changes to the documents. There is also a strategy to add resources for not only for new advisors but developing advisors and experienced advisors. Charles suggested that we add Associate Deans to the online canvas course.

Assessments will be built in into each module in the canvas courses. Advisors will be assessed at the completion of the in person orientation workshops. NACADA Consultant recommended small group attending NACADA Assessment Institutes after all stages have been implemented.

Everyone applauded Ruthie and her team for all their GREAT work and management for Professional Development.

b. Transfer Student Sub- Committee – Sarah Crim

Sarah provided a report summary per the committee members; Anna Burchett, Walker Byrd, Regina Conradi, Mary Brownlee Couch, Sarah Crim, Jack Feminella, Courtney Gage, Kristin Maas, with the assistance of Taylor Kamin and Laura Ann Forest. The report discusses

the unique challenges that transfer students face. The committee identified the current support that transfer students have available. The committee also contacted each college and school as to what their protocol is for transfer students (please see summary report).

Dr. Relihan has pulled together a task force of representatives from each academic unit along with many support units. There is defiantly a need for support for transfer students as they are an important and unique group to Auburn's population. The committee referenced providing an orientation course like a UNIV course dedicated to this cohort. In addition, the committee recommended having a transfer center available to meet the transfer student's needs.

Charles stated that UUAC needs to stay engaged with this matter as there is certainly a need for this group. Anna said the committee was a great start as it initiated the discussion for a need. Charles thanked everyone on the committee.

c. Advisor Compensation – Charles Israel substituting for Jack Feminella

Charles indicated that the committee comprised of four Associate Deans, a few Director of Student Services, Academic Advisors and Ruthie. The committee is making good headway with HR. HR will be coming to Academic Affairs this afternoon. The Deans and Provost are on board. The challenge is figuring how the funding is going to happen? Rod Kelly in HR needs to compare the career ladder with what existing advisors undergo and evaluate the performance management piece. There will be a meeting next week with Director of Student Services, HR and Associate Deans to compare anomalies with the performance evaluation and career ladder. They will decided what how it will modify the career ladder. There may be a career ladder committee, hopefully in place by the end of the year.

Nancy asked if the professional development / advisor training process will play a role in the promotional process. Charles agreed that this was a great recommendation. He said that we need to resources the incentives to continue to be active with the advisor compensation process. He questioned how do we maintain the career ladder idea?

Bob asked if the advisor compensation will influence student coordinator positions. Should we include student coordinators into the discussion? Charles said that this would be a reasonable conversation to have with HR. Student coordinators are not easily connected to advising but there is a profound incentive. He questioned what the percentage of advising is related to the position. He wants to examine the details in each college to measure if we would want to include student coordinator to the advisor compensation.

Judy stated that they have invited student coordinators and administrative assistants to the advisor training.

Charles said he is working on details for a timeline for promotions before the year is over; calendar year (December 2016).

Sarah asked if there were ideas of level duration for promotions. Charles responded that each college is going to provide an incentive for the move into the promotion ladder.

4. New Business –

Judy provided an update on the Advising Survey. The survey closed April 22. Judy is thinking about how the reports are to be used. The next couple of weeks she will be able to build a report. The reports have been printed with comments removed. She wants the committee to reassess the survey. She said there were 1700 responses April 22. She is concerned because she normally receives 2,200 responses. She said there needs to be a conversation about the amount of surveys the students are receiving. Regina mentioned consolidating the surveys. However, how do we go about that when there are so many surveys being sent?

Judy also suggested that we may want to condense the survey questions. Her graduate assistant stated that the length of the survey was time-consuming.

Sarah mentioned providing incentives for students to fill out the survey. For example 25% off bookstore?

Judy noted that there has been a positive direction from the first survey conducted to the present survey. She said that there has been a lot of good decisions made from the data collected.

Meeting adjourned at 11:29 am.

Next meeting reconvenes in the fall