

Year-End Report

1. **Council:** Advisement and Registration
2. **Academic Year:** 2015-2016
3. **Council Members:** Valeriya Avdeev, Tom Fallace, Eileen Gardner, Danielle Liautaud, Linda Refsland, Elizabeth Stroppel, Barbara Suess, Victoria Wagner
4. **Council Charges and Summary of Council Activities** (please list the council's charges - both standing charges and charges for that particular academic year - and describe any significant discussion/progress related to each charge):

The Council met with Magaldi in October to revise our charges, specifically moving this charge to FY17:

- a. Review assessment reports of the new advisement model prepared by the Academic Development Unit.

The Council adopted the following new charges for the year (2015-2016):

- a. Survey faculty about the impact of the new advisement model. Our survey was distributed to advisors in January 2016 and the summary report was presented to the Senate at the April 26th meeting.
- b. Examine and evaluate the level of effectiveness of Degree Works. Our survey results gathered some feedback about Degree Works.

5. **Recommended Charges for The Next Academic Year:**

Follow up on list of recommendations based on the results of the A & R Committee Survey of Faculty Advisors:

1. To address concerns about inconsistent training and limited opportunities for development, we recommend a consistent ongoing training module that is universal for all advisors. Colleges and departments may customize this module with needs specific to their area, for example certification, procedures, etc. This module should outline the role and expectations for advisement as well as provide training for necessary skills, tools, resources, etc. Additionally training should cover topics such as prioritizing caseload, outreach, UCC information, and provide regular updates and training opportunities.
2. To address concerns that there has been limited participation in training opportunities, colleges should mandate initial and ongoing training for their advisors. Our survey responses confirm that training and advisor feedback is most effective at the department level.

3. Our survey responses echoed the Blue Ribbon Task Force recommendation of “a comprehensive and ongoing program of professional development for all advisors and orientation and training for students.” Based on survey responses, we recommend improving communication about the expectations and definitions of the roles of advisor and advisee.
4. We recommend that departments use advisement expectations as a guide for advisor feedback each semester. This begins to address the Blue Ribbon recommendation for the “development and implementation of assessment system,” which was also mentioned in responses from both the 2011 and 2016 surveys.
5. As was identified in the 2011 survey and by the Blue Ribbon Task Force, 2016 survey respondents repeatedly mentioned that the single advisor model for double majors is not working. We recommend that double majors, specifically Education majors, should have two advisors.
6. Based on the finding that 21% of advisors do not maintain notes or records of their advising sessions and more than half do not use Banner or Degree Works notes, we recommend that all notes are recorded and in a system accessible to others, i.e., Advisement Notes and/or Degree Works. All advisors should receive training in these systems to facilitate effective record keeping.
7. Based on survey respondents’ desire for more current information, such as program changes, we recommend additional timely updating and promotion of the existing advisement resources, such as the Advisement webpage and Registrar announcements.