Advisory Council for Academic Planning and Advising/ACAPA
September 14, 2012
10:00-12:00 p.m.
Brault Board Room

Minutes


Members not Present: Charlotte Calobrisi, Alison Thimblin.

Chair Dr. Leidig called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and welcomed committee members.

The State of the QEP: Dr. Keri Bowman, Director of Academic Planning and Advising, attended all the Phase 2 campus’ CITF meetings, which provided an understanding of the overall needs for implementation on the campuses. Campus faculty presence on these committees will help reinforce the hand-off process and the transition between student services and faculty advising.

Faculty Training Proposal: Dr. Bowman distributed the faculty training proposal for discussion. The proposal explains the timeline and faculty and advising specialist responsibilities. All training in this proposal would be coordinated through the Office of Academic Planning and Advising to promote college-wide consistency.

Committee discussion revolved around the need for good faculty training in order to explain the program; identifying faculty at each campus to help train other faculty, and possibly producing a faculty training video. As the training begins in January, a suggestion was made to offer a training reviews closer to the timeframe for advising, which begins the following October. Additional subjects raised included the question of how to advise students preparing to transfer, and creating an informational video, updated annually, to answer transfer issues and health career questions. Easily accessible general information for both faculty and students was also considered important. Dr. Bowman is working on a faculty GPS website and asked committee members for pertinent information. Dr. Leidig recommended that students addressing transfer issues should be referred to the adviser who specializes in this area.

The matter of incentives for faculty members who volunteer to train other faculty was raised, and while this will be looked into by Dr. Gabriel, a committee member brought up the importance of “framing” the program as a good opportunity to become an effective faculty advisor. Dr. Leidig reinforced the idea of getting the word out about training directly from the faculty to the faculty, but also giving thought along the way to the faculty member limit on advising. Dr. Gabriel asked that a discussion take place soon at ADMN Council.

Dr. Gabriel, Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment, explained the advising specialist hiring process and the timeline that begins the first week of October, with all positions filled by late March or April. The campus breakdown is: Alexandria - five, Annandale - seven, and Manassas – four. Newcomers will need to become familiar with the campuses.
These are faculty status positions but do not require a Master’s degree, which will enable campuses to use those who are already in advising positions, but are without the Master’s degree. Campuses should work closely with HR on the required credentials.

Phase II campuses: Faculty Advising Managers (from Woodbridge and Loudoun) were asked to talk about faculty advising manager recruiting, criteria and strategies. At the Loudoun campus, Dr. Leidig felt the key was to find experienced faculty who were well-respected and have good relationships with other faculty. Committee members agreed that faculty members have to have a love of advising, are respected by their colleagues, and are good communicators. A communication is sent out by the Academic Deans asking if anyone would be interested – followed by a selection process.

Also at the Loudoun campus, Dr. James Edwards, the QEP Campus Task Force Chair, stated the names of the students would be released on Monday, October 1 and faculty advisors were notified. They are working on balancing the load for each faculty member and doing a weekly check as well as looking at a balance between the disciplines to provide equity among the faculty. Advising specialists will meet with the students, and are communicating with them via e-mail. SDV instructors are visiting classes and introducing the process to all new students.

At the Woodbridge campus, Ms. Tanya Ingram, the QEP Campus Task Force Chair, indicated that three of the divisions were provided the faculty advising list and the load is around 12-15 per faculty member, with the expectation that it will grow. Faculty members are asked to see their advising specialist if issues arise over financial aid and class schedules. Students received two e-mails stressing the importance of advising. Students were assigned their advising specialists at their SOAR sessions and the importance of seeing them emphasized. Woodbridge is working with SDV instructors to add this piece to the class curriculum.

At the Woodbridge campus, the Provost asked the Faculty Advising Manager to lead the process. Dr. Leidig suggested that the character of each campus might influence the process on each campus.

Dr. Gabriel went over the data from of the last two weeks and indicated that the list had been purged in Blackboard. Faculty assigned were 950 at both campuses.

Dr. Leidig noted that two different processes were being followed by the pilot campuses. At Woodbridge, students were being assigned to a faculty advisor through the SOAR sessions, but at Loudoun they were receiving their assignments later in the semester, on October 1. She posed the question: Where do we need to be the same and where do we need to be different?

Committee members felt students needed to know who their advisors were. Students at Woodbridge left SOAR knowing who their advisors were, but at Loudoun they will know later. There was some discussion of whether it matters. Dr. Gabriel mentioned that a critical piece to keep in mind when data collection occurs is that we don’t need to worry much about different processes unless they lead to different outcomes.

If students are doing better at one campus, this would be a “red flag” to look at possible changes at the other campus. Speaking from the student perspective, committee members felt it was important to know that there would be similarity among campuses. Committee members agreed that it would be useful to look at data from the two pilot campuses to see if significant
differences are observed. While faculty members are reaching out by e-mail, committee members suggested a need to look at other methods of preferred student communication, such as texting, etc.

**Process for Capturing those who are Missed:** A recommendation was made to give the student letters to faculty members who could hand them directly to the students. Information should also be given to the academic division administrative assistants and to Student Services. Loudoun has a routing list for each service. Dr. Gabriel stated that they are currently working on the final process to pull the lists of all new students and should have them in the near future. It was stressed again by committee members about the importance of creating broad campus awareness on the need for all new students to see their advising specialists.

**CRM Needs:** Dr. Gabriel distributed a handout describing the CRM and the timelines. Vendors will be considered starting the end of September and forwarded to Purchasing by mid-January. A vendor will be selected no later than April in order that year end funds may be used. ELI and Pathway need to be included as the process moves forward.

Dr. Bowman asked about the most immediate issues and responses included being able to track student movements, the ability to make notes to help the next adviser, a student communication flow system, good tracking mechanisms, and good training instruments for faculty.

**Tasks/Assignments/Reports:** Dr. Bowman handed out a list of tasks and asked that they be reported back by October 10. In addition, committee members were asked to respond by e-mail with at least 3 suggested FAQs for the faculty website (questions that faculty would ask), and at least 3 FAQs for the student GPS website (questions that students would ask). Recurring status reports will be requested at future meetings.

Dr. Gabriel will look into release time and e-mail will be sent to the Committee. The posting of the advising positions will take place in October with hiring in January or February. He asked that Provosts be kept in the loop on the hiring process.

**Final Thoughts or Questions:** Faculty training was raised and committee members felt a need to “flesh out” the training specifics. Dr. Leidig recommended that faculty advisors be appointed as early as possible. Mr. Khaseem Davis, QEP Manassas Campus Task Force Chair, distributed a handout on the process at Manassas - hiring updates and faculty and staff concerns. Learning and Technology Resources staff offered to assist both faculty and students. As NOVA is an open institution with on-going admissions, there is a greater need for an overall system to look at advising loads.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon by the Chair.

Norie Flowers, College Recorder