

UUAC Meeting Minutes, January 18, 2017 - APPROVED 2/15/2017

Members present: Jack Feminella, Michael Lee, Regina Conradi, Suzanne Hunter, Nancy Bernard, Ruthie Spears, Amy Wright, Norman Godwin, Mary Brownlee Couch, Cary Curtiss, Anna Burchett

1. **Prior minutes and today's agenda** handed out by Jack.
2. **Minutes** –
 - a. 11/16/16 meeting approval. Motion to approve by Ruthie, seconded by Cary. Approved unanimously.
3. **Schedule** –
 - a. Proposal to reschedule March meeting to March 22 to avoid spring break when some people may be gone. Approved.
 - b. Final list of note-takers for the meetings – handed around.
4. **Advising Survey.** (Ruthie)
 - a. update on our conversation of whether to move the timing of the advising survey that goes out to students. We are now planning to keep the timing the same.
 - b. During a conversation with Dr. Relihan, Dr. Relihan stated her opinion that the purpose of the advising survey is to help determine whether advising at Auburn is helping students with their Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) - Ruthie then asked their student worker to do some mapping about the current survey and how it maps onto the advisor learning outcomes. A lot of the student survey ends up being a lot more procedural and doesn't effectively address the learning outcomes. This gives us a different way to approach the survey and what content would be best to include in it.
 - c. Do we need to engage in an exercise to narrow down our advisor learning outcomes? Currently we are using those from CAS. Is this sufficient?
 - d. Brief discussion about how to effectively integrate the learning outcomes with the format of a student survey (i.e. – if the learning outcome is for students to be aware of and actively working toward their plans of study, then we could ask questions such as “Are you aware of and comfortable with your plan of study?”).
 - e. Ideally, some of the best questions may replace many of the current questions rather than adding to them. Also, we are able to get much information about utilization of services from other sources (e.g., Advise Assist) so we should be able to reduce those types of questions.
 - f. Is this too ambitious to complete this year?
 - g. One option for moving forward: we could focus on problem areas from last year and also on learning outcomes to revamp the survey.
 - h. What have we been using the survey for already? –
 - i. Most just informational... a way to check in on students' reactions to current services; also for professional development, and some annual checking in on new initiatives.
 - i. Norman pointed out that this level of revamping may be too much for this year. Also, that the current survey focuses on improvement and thus sets up a platform for complaints. He suggested it may be good to reword.
 - j. Amy pointed out that the new Quality Assessment Plan for Auburn, spearheaded by the Provost, which asks many questions on SLOs. If we ask questions with the same information-gathering goals in mind, it may be possible to turn the survey results into data useful in reporting to the QAP for departments and colleges.

- k. A total reworking of the survey may be too ambitious for this year, thus we should focus on one or two SLOs this year.
 - i. Kristin suggested we focus on the SLO re: whether students are aware of, and are working toward, their plan of study.
 - 1. **Action item:** Ruthie's group will incorporate questions addressing this SLO for this year's survey.
5. **Professional Development/Advisor Training Working Group Update (Ruthie) –**
- a. We met and divided up the duties into sub-groups. All of those groups will have data back to me by Jan. 25 and then it will be incorporated into the Canvas course by a graduate student worker.
 - b. We will meet again for a final review after the changes are implemented.
 - c. **Action item:** We are turning in our feedback to Ruthie by Jan. 25.
6. **Transfer Student Support Working Group Update (Kristin) –**
- a. Judy has been working on identifying a group of transfer students who underperformed this fall, and will relay that group to Kristin and Jack. Judy suggested making a group to track on Advise Assist. The working group also will recruit students from that target group to give feedback and participate in roundtable discussions. Jack will talk to Dr. Relihan about enticements for student participation. When a similar type of attempt was made with other students (e.g., graduating seniors) through the Provost's office, it was indeed difficult to get broad student participation.
 - b. **Action item:** Kristin will work with the Provost's Transfer Working Group to decide what exactly to ask focus groups and create a timeline. UUAC can help create/modify questions.
 - i. Jack added that we need to understand student awareness of resources and where they turn to help when needed. We also need to look at transfer "success stories": what are they doing that *is* working? What are successful transfer students doing differently? He also thought that input from these achieving students in focus groups would help inform the data-gathering process on transfer student needs. [Another question raised: How to separate out transfer students vs. transient students?]
7. **University Advising Infrastructure Working Group Update (Jack) –**
- a. Passed out advising infrastructure survey draft. Designed to go to directors, advisors, counselors, assoc. deans, and others who can add information on how their units do advising.
 - b. Who all should this go to? Which offices?
 - i. Definitely include secondary offices and faculty advisors in addition to the people named above.
 - ii. Amy asked – who should actually fill out the survey?? Perhaps only the director of student services for each college have the information necessary.
 - c. Jack reiterated the goal of the survey was to assist in creating an infrastructural map (e.g., organizational chart on how advising is being done at AU) and to identify gaps in advising connections between units.
 - i. Both Amy and Norman reiterated how helpful an infrastructure map would be, both on an administrative level, and also to show students.
 - ii. Can the organizational chart also include information about how students utilize the services?
 - iii. Some advising infrastructure is already provided and on the Academic Affairs website. And doesn't caucus have something about percentages of walk-ins and appointments, etc.?

- d. **Action Item:** Jack and Working Group would examine the above the infrastructural information already collected by other units and would decide how to modify the survey to send to administrators. We would also need to address the functions of the secondary units (e.g. role of Admission, Register, VA, AU Global, FYE, Career Center, etc.) in advising functions on campus.

8. Other business

- a. Mary Brownlee gave out a handout from Laura Ann Forest...things for consideration at a later UUAC meeting, including wait-listing misconceptions, repeat policy, TBA reports, PINS, graduation fees, and GAPS. No discussion on any of this yet.

9. Meeting adjourned.