Advising Task Force

Report to Faculty Senate

Dr. Gary A. Gabriele
Vice Provost and Dean of UG Education

Charge

To develop a series of recommendations for the President and the Provost that will improve Advising and Mentoring.

Issues to address:

• What problems or shortcomings do the students see in the current system?
• What issues in the Advising process pose problems for Faculty?
• What Services or Resources are currently available to students and Faculty?
• Provide Recommendations for how advising can be improved.
ADVISING TASK FORCE SCHEDULE

OCT. 8
Organizational meeting

OCT. 8 – 22
Subcommittees meet and develop assessments.

OCT. 22
Subcommittee updates.

OCT 22 – NOV 12
Subcommittees collect data

NOV 12
Review of subcommittee work

NOV. 19
Begin to formulate recommendations

DEC. 3
Complete recommendations and begin writing report.

DEC. 10
Review of Final Report, make any final recommendations.

Jan 21
Final report and recommendations finalized by Task Force

Process

• Three subcommittees formed
  – Student Expectations
  – Faculty Issues
  – Current Advising Processes and Programs

• Visit by consultant 10/17-18.
Findings

• Current advising processes decentralized
  – Each school/department sets up an advising process that best suits the number of students and advisors available.

• Architecture, Science, and Engineering, divide the number of incoming students among the available faculty advisors assigned to that class.

• Management, and in some disciplines of H&SS (EMAC, Arts, and STS), professional staff exists with a primary responsibility for advising students.

Student Satisfaction

we formed a meaningful and useful relationship with at least one faculty member
My advisor showed concern for my personal growth and development
My advisor was available when I needed him/her
My advisor was knowledgeable of academic policies/procedures and campus resources
My advisor was helpful in assisting me with course selection
My advisor is easy to talk with
I feel comfortable contacting my advisor
Intacted my advisor when I had questions about my academics
I use the CAPP report for Academic Planning
I understand the requirements needed to graduate (e.g., major, minor, general education program)

Figure 1 Student survey results on general advising
Student Satisfaction

Student Expectations

- Curriculum
  - Students would like their advisor to be knowledgeable about their particular curriculum, to be able to answer questions that are related to their degree requirements, and to provide them with information on the best courses to take.
  - Students would like their advisors to be more available.
Student Expectations

• Mentoring
  – Students would like their advisors to develop an understanding of them as individuals to be able to provide them with information and advice that is best suited for them.
  – Students would like to get career advice from their advisor, and to explain the relevance of their curriculum and courses to their career goals.

Results of Faculty Survey

• One of the biggest concerns faculty have is giving out incorrect information to an advisee.
  – Complexity and constant changes in curricula makes it difficult to be up to date.
  – Impact of wrong information can be severe
• There is currently very little acknowledgement during the yearly review process for good or poor advising.
  – Advising is considered part of service to the university rather than as part of teaching.
Results of Faculty Survey

- In some departments, the large number of advisees per advisor (>40) makes it difficult to develop any kind of relationship with advisees.

- Current advising processes do not require the student to meet with their advisor; hence unless a student has a question, they have very little incentive to see their advisor.

Recommendations

- Ensure that the yearly faculty evaluation process properly acknowledges advising; move advising to be part of teaching evaluation.

- Add full-time advising staff to assist faculty and students in schools/departments with high numbers of students.

- Expand resources to assist advisors.
  - Improve training and make it mandatory
  - Electronic catalog
  - Improve CAPP
  - Develop UG Plan of Study
Recommendations

• Strengthen early warning systems for all levels.
  – Require interim assessment of all students to be reported to a central database
  – Strengthen processes and communication between UG Education and Student Life
• Require all students to meet with their advisor at least once an academic year.
• Expand the reward and recognition for advising.
  – More department/school awards
  – Honor roll for good advising
  – Reinstate faculty-student lunches
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