

University Undergraduate Advising Council

January 18, 2012

Minutes

Members and Guests Present: Krysta Diehl, Kathryn Flynn, Gail Holmes, Rob Kulick, Beth Ann Mabrey, Nels Madsen, Mycla Palmer, Paul Patterson (Chair), Constance Relihan, Jenny Schuessler, Mary Ann Taylor-Simms

1. Advisor's Professional Career Ladder/Promotion Evaluation Committee—Constance Relihan/Paul Patterson

- Following a meeting of the Promotion Evaluation Committee, a draft memo was presented to the UUAC that summarized the committee's recommendations regarding changes to the advisor career ladder:
 1. **Recommendation 1:** Streamline the requirements for dossiers. The committee felt the excess number of documents required was not necessary, and a summary report could be provided. A summary report could also be useful as we transition to making the dossiers electronic.
 2. **Recommendation 2:** Many advisors currently at an Advisor II reported they don't see the cost-benefit in seeking the promotion to Advisor III. From their perspective, the increase in pay does not equate to the requirements. The committee recommends that the professional development activities be weighed more heavily in the criteria to Advisor III.
 3. **Recommendation 3:** The committee recommends the step increase for promotion to Advisor III go from a 32 to a 34, with an increase in the required service time. This process more closely aligns with Auburn's current HR process.
- Dr. Relihan suggested the document be shared with the Associate Deans at the next Academic Affairs meeting.
- It was clarified that the step increase from an Advisor I to an Advisor II would not change (31 to 32).
- It was suggested that the requirements for promotion from I to II are too arduous and should be revised.
- The question of where student recruiters fall was asked; because student recruiters aren't evaluated based on performance evaluations by supervisors.
- Additional questions asked included: (1) How are supervisor evaluations compared to peer evaluations?, (2) Who establishes the standards for promotable performance, and (3) will those advisors who were promoted to Advisor III under the previous system be promoted to a 34?
- It was agreed that supervisor letters should be more prominent in the promotion dossier.

2. Professional Advisors Retreat Summary—Gail Holmes

- Survey results from the retreat indicated participants overall found the sessions to be beneficial and worth their time.
- The session on students as customers was the least popular among all of the sessions, and participants indicated they preferred a non-structured lunch over a keynote speaker.
- The recommendation was made to continue hosting the Advisor Retreat in 2012.

3. Communication of Competitive Programs

- Following a meeting of the Enrollment Management Council, the Provost requested information on how prospective students are informed of those programs that remain competitive and require a separate admissions process.
- Representatives from various programs were asked to identify when students are informed of the criteria for admissions and how we are communicating the competitiveness.
- Honors College students are told that the Honors College cannot accept every student during the recruitment process. For these students, the rejection has more to do with not thinking it's possible for them to be rejected.
- The School of Nursing sends a letter from the Dean prior to students submitting their deposit that indicates the admissions process is a two-step process. These letters are not being sent immediately following the acceptance letters from Admissions.
 - Many of these students end up as "Plan B" students, in that they transfer to COSAM to major in Health Services Administration.

- COSAM picks up many of the Nursing, Education, and Engineering students that aren't accepted into the programs.
- In Engineering, the criteria for acceptance (GPA and test scores) are communicated during CWE, with required advising and early intervention.

4. Other

- Krysta Diehl raised an issue with transfer students who don't come to SOS, yet have PINS and register without being advised. Some of these students are registering well in advance of SOS, then not attending. It was suggested that a PIN be set for these students at the same time a time ticket is set.
- A similar issue was raised with regard to students registering before their time ticket during CWE. Specifically, students have learned that they can register with a smartphone, so either parents or siblings are registering for them. It's essential that the Office of First Year Programs and the colleges develop a way for registration to be fair and equitable for all students.

Adjourned 11:10.