

Minutes

University Undergraduate Advising Council

1303 Shelby Center

April 29, 2015 (10:30 – 11:30 am)

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

1. **Welcome and Introductions:** The meeting was called to order by Steve Duke. It was addressed that the majority of this meeting would comprise of Electronic Notes and the Continuous Improvement items.
2. **Minutes:** The minutes from our March 18th meeting were reviewed and approved.
3. **Old Business**

Electronic notes – development of guidelines/policies (Adams/Flynn/Bernard/Demyan)

Nancy—has received comments from committee members and made suggested changes

Judy—How will we manage email notes and retain those records when an employee leaves? Guidelines only recommend to note date, time, and substance of email.

Christian—depends on the note-taking system exactly how this is done.

Nancy—Will change to say that notes related to *substantive* emails should include summary of the email and/or quotes from the email (can even be a pasted-in email)

Steve—IT may be able to retrieve emails from former employees, but certainly easier to have the notes

Judy—helpful to advisors to have details and not have to search those emails with IT

DECISION: add to specifications for email records.

Steve—Who will “own” this document?

Nancy—it should probably stay with Judy Sanders as a piece of the advising manual

Judy—could be linked to from advising manual site

DECISION: Judy will be point of contact for this document, though Kathryn Flynn notes that Academic Affairs may have a different suggestion

Steve—should we add a note about timeline for keeping records?

Kathryn—federal policy is 5 years from enrollment, Legal needs to review this document

Steve—should have wording like “retention of academic advising notes follow guidelines for all student records” with a link to the official site with this guideline (i.e., don’t actually specify the time in the document in case this changes).

Judy—should we specify mechanism to destroy documents after this time?

Steve—no, don’t need to state procedure, beyond scope of this document

Discussion of where to put this statement—decided on first page below privacy.

Charles—guidelines set minimum, university can set maximum and guidelines to destroy

DECISION: Add reference to guidelines for retention of records. After Academic Affairs reviews (likely at May meeting with the whole subcommittee attending), Legal should review, then it will go to Judy for dissemination to advisors in formal presentations.

Motion to approve this document, unanimous approval by attendees

Spring Advising Survey (Sanders)

Judy—Survey was sent along with 3 reminders, asked Associate Deans to send supporting emails, and left survey open for nearly a month. In total, had 2,020 responses (about 400 less than last year). The timing with the registration tickets and Spring Break made this survey difficult for getting responses. Judy is working on a report, will send a draft to Kathryn possibly by next week, will get a report to UUAC for review by May or June.

Mike—what were the dates of the survey reminders and close?

Judy—sent out surveys in staggered timeline—JR/SRs got them as soon as their tickets closed and FR/SO got first invite around time of first reminder for JR/SRs—everyone had at least 4 days before spring break to respond. Additional reminders sent out after SB, left survey open for an extra week or two. There was a spike in responses last week (which she attributes to reminder emails from Associate Deans, which seem to be effective).

Continuous Improvement Ideas

Improving Training and Transfer Students

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 these two improvement areas. Committee split into two groups. Steve expects groups to meet once before the next UUAC meeting. Process is to *define* the problem before brainstorming specific issues and then solutions that can be pursued. By next meeting, subgroups will have defined the problems, brainstormed solutions. At next UUAC meeting, we will form plans of action and appoint task forces to address.

Rest of meeting was dedicated to subgroups. Members are asked to schedule a meeting soon and send Steve a 3-sentence statement of the problem.

4. **New Business:** None
5. **Meeting adjourned at 11:35 am.**