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 **Advising Working Group Presentation to HSU Department Chairs – 3/13/14**

 Members: Ken Ayoob, Sheila Alicea, Grace Cardenas-Leal, Dana Deason, Tyler Evans, Micaela Gunther, Jacque Honda, Margaret Kelso, Vikash Lakhani, Tracy Smith, Kathy Thornhill

The Advising Working Group originally generated eight areas of study based upon source materials from the Educational Advisory Board. We further reduced the original eight points and conflated and rearranged them into three larger areas. These were divided into work group responsibilities for three smaller groups led by Vikash, Jacque and Ken as listed below. The groups worked independently until February 28th at which time the full working group met to share our findings. In the meantime, Jacque, Vikash and Ken met to coordinate and monitor progress. All recommendations for policy and action are made with the Guiding Principles in our charge in mind. All groups considered technology, milestones and professional development/training as part of their deliberations.

1. **Coordination**. Dividing responsibilities, such as mentoring versus course selection, and identifying who should be responsible for appropriate delivery—whether professional advisors, faculty advisors, or technological tools. This would require a coordination of information and definition of roles, as well as appropriate training and professional development. Who is doing advising and how do we define the roles and functions of advising? How do we train advisors to best accomplish goals of advising? What tools do we currently have and how/by whom, should they be used.
	1. **Accountability.** Who is responsible for what, both in our work, and later in the implementation process?
	2. **Technology**. Many processes can be addressed with technology. These include, but are not limited to, information for advisors and students, identifying a student’s course needs, scheduling and registering for appropriate courses, identifying student skills and interests, and flagging inappropriate courses.
	3. **Training/Professional Development.** Once responsibilities are identified and assigned, what kinds of training should be developed? What should the overall approach to “advising culture” be?
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1. **Advising Structure/Culture**. Defining the role of advising and how it should impact student success. Identify types of advising and mentoring, codifying responsibility between faculty, professional advisors and mentors, balancing prescriptive with developmental types of intervention, minimizing overlap in services and interventions. How are we to integrate advising into efforts to close the achievement gap?
	1. **Accountability.** Who is responsible for what, both in our work, and later in the implementation process?
	2. **Technology**. Many processes can be addressed with technology. These include, but are not limited to, information for advisors and students, identifying a student’s course needs, scheduling and registering for appropriate courses, identifying student skills and interests, and flagging inappropriate courses.
	3. **Training/Professional Development.** Once responsibilities are identified and assigned, what kinds of training should be developed? What should the overall approach to “advising culture” be?
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1. **Hierarchy of student advising needs**. At different points of a student’s career, the needs are different. During the pre-freshman period, most issues are course-related; during the freshman year, homesickness and roommate problems may occur; in the junior level, heavy mentoring and internship-seeking could become more prominent. How do we get students the information they need when they need it?
	1. **Freshman Advising.** Should we approach freshmen differently that other students, both before they arrive on campus through HOP and later in their crucial first two semesters?
	2. **Identifying Milestones** to aid with appropriate intervention. Outline what should be accomplished by what period in a student’s education to aid in identifying appropriate intervention.
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**As a reminder and for easy reference, here are the Guiding Principles from the Provost:**

**Guiding Principles for developing the proposal include the following:**

* Students develop a semester-by-semester program of study that takes them from entrance to the university through graduation.
* Students minimize the number of units that do not count toward graduation. The expectation is that freshmen will graduate in four years and transfer students will graduate in two years.
* Early detection and intrusive intervention for students who do not follow their program of study. If students need to change their program of study in order to be successful this happens early in their college experience and in a way that minimizes additional units above those required for graduation.
* Once a program of study is chosen students will have restricted choices in developing course schedules.
* Milestones and benchmarks will be developed for every program that correlate with success in that program. These milestones and benchmarks will be used to track satisfactory progress and guide intervention when necessary.
* Career advising will be integrated into each program of study.
* Appropriate roles for student, faculty and professional advisors will be identified and coordinated.
* Advising resources will be focused where they are most effective. Advising needs to be timely and targeted.