



To: Constance Relihan, Associate Provost
University Undergraduate Advising Committee Members
From: Paul Patterson, Associate Dean
Chair, University Undergraduate Advising Committee
Chair, Academic Advisor Career Ladder Review Committee
cc: Academic Advisor Career Ladder Committee Members
Date: January 3, 2012
Subject: Academic Advisor Career Ladder Committee's Evaluation of the Promotion and Review Process and Rewards Associated with Promotions

On December 13, 2011, the Academic Advisor Career Ladder Review Committee met and discussed the current requirements and compensation for promotions to level II and level III in the academic advisor job family. Based on these discussions the committee identified three action items:

(1) Streamline the Requirements for the Submitted Dossier

The committee recognized that there is a need to re-evaluate the materials that are submitted in the promotion packet for review by the committee. The committee questioned whether there was a need to include certain example materials or artifacts and whether some memos are necessary (e.g. affidavits on participation in the Advisor Caucus). This evaluation could be conducted along with the committee's efforts to make recommendations on how electronic dossiers may be prepared for future reviews. The committee will reconvene to address this matter.

(2) Evaluate Academic Advisor Position

The committee recommends that the structure of the academic advisor position and the associated levels and grades be re-evaluated. Specifically, it was suggested that the step in grade from level II to level III could be increased from the current grade 32 to grade 33 to a proposed 32 to 34. This would give the candidate an opportunity for more compensation for this promotion. This change in structure would coincide with changes in promotion requirements, which are discussed further below.

(3) Promotion Requirements

Specifically, the committee recommends that the requirements for promotion, including the professional development activities and time-in-service requirements, be reconsidered. For example, if the grade increase for a promotion from level II to level III were changed from the current 32 to 33 to a proposed 32 to 34, the required time-in-service at level II would be increased. Furthermore, a careful review of the number of required professional development activities and their demonstrated impact will be conducted for each promotion opportunity. It was proposed that the number of activities required for a promotion from level I to level II might be reduced. However, the demonstrated impact of the professional development activities for a promotion should be more significant, particularly for a promotion from level II to III.

These latter two issues necessarily need to be addressed jointly. The committee would like some direction from the provost's office on proceeding with the development of new recommendations on the position and promotion requirements. As the role of advising is understood to be increasingly related to success in improving undergraduate retention and time to graduation, it is important to incentivize the career ladder process to attract and retain high quality professionals in the advising job family.