



Memorandum

D R A F T

To: Susan E. Mitchell
Associate Vice President of Student Academic Support Services

From: Jackie Trischman
Chair, Academic Senate 04/05

Date: April 13, 2005

Subject: Faculty Advising Role Advisory Committee DRAFT Recommendations
Feedback

The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (EC) has reviewed the draft recommendations of the Faculty Advising Role Advisory Committee (FARAC). The EC thanks FARAC for seeking broad input in developing these recommendations. We hope you will find the following reactions, questions and suggestions useful in the further development of your recommendations.

There are several points that were echoed by members of the EC, including that the University should minimize the number of staff advisors students need to see as much as possible, that the implementation of a degree audit system should be a high priority, and that the CoBA model is working well. In other areas, there were suggestions of important considerations that may have been missed or that we would wish to emphasize as being of particular importance. These are bulleted below:

- Evaluation, processing and posting of student transcripts needs to be done in a timely manner for any advising structure to work. This needs to be addressed and subsequently assessed on a short timeline.
- Measures comparable to those suggested for faculty in section 3. a., 3. b., 3. c. and 3. d. need to be in place for the undergraduate advising staff as well, and these needs to be as visible as any such assessment of faculty advising practices.
- Academic advisors are not the only advisors with whom career counselors need to establish a link. The academic advisor may not be the best resource for a particular specialty and it would be a disservice to students to formalize a relationship between a point person for a department and career services at the exclusion of fostering other relationships within departments.

- The staff advisor to department/major/option ratio is as critical as the overall student to staff ratio.
- Strategies to require students to see advisors are needed. Suggestions have included:
 - University wide requirements that students declare majors at an earlier stage, such as by the end of the 2nd year or immediately upon transferring.
 - Advisor signature requirement for all Fall registrations.
 - Fostering student:advisor meetings has significant structural hurdles within the University, including the need for a campus event coordinator, parking issues and risk management roadblocks.
- If a mistake is made in advising on the part of faculty or staff, there needs to be a mechanism for that student to resolve the issue in a timely manner. The current passback of students and waiting periods for appointments is not acceptable.
- Rather than designate money to solve problems resulting from exceptionally high faculty workloads, as seen by the high current SFR, money should be invested in decreasing the SFR so faculty have time to do what is recommended.

We hope these comments prove helpful in your deliberations. Thanks to you and the committee for your efforts, and for offering the EC the opportunity to provide feedback.