

Wednesday, April 28, 2021
Zoom Meeting
3:00 – 4:00 PM

Present: Debra Jackson, Marta Ruiz (Admin Support), Anna Jacobsen, Alicia Rodriguez, BreAnna Evans Santiago, Charles Lam, Joel Haney, Karlo Lopez, Kris Grappendorf, Mary Slaughter, Melissa Danforth, Pratigya Sigdya, Zackary Zenko

Absent: Anne Duran, Jeremy Woods, Patrick O'Neill, Tzu Fen Chang,

The meeting began at 3:00 PM

D. Jackson welcomes and thanks everyone attending.

Delineation of faculty vs. staff advisor roles –

D. Jackson asked C. Lam to give his input on where he saw the division between faculty and staff advisors' responsibilities.

C. Lam stated that after the AS&SS committee took on the issue, he found that everyone has their own opinion on where that division is. He also stated that it all comes down to who students want to see and that it sometimes depends on their grade level and sometimes it does not.

K. Grappendorf stated that it would be hard to have one common plan for staff and faculty advisors, since there is a variability in terms on what the expectations and responsibilities are on faculty and staff advisors in different programs and schools.

A. Jacobsen mentioned that one of the biggest issues in this delineation of faculty and staff advisor roles has to do with communication. There is also the issue on where staff advisors are making decisions regarding sending students to specific GE courses and electives. She also mentioned that there is a workload issue since there are those units that staff advisors are actively recommending in comparison to other units. She suggested taking these issues to the Faculty Affairs committee.

Z. Zenko stated that the number of advisees assigned to a faculty member should correspond to a course releases and time.

M. Slaughter suggested that there needs to be a way to track course releases and time.

M. Danforth stated that what she tells her students is that the difference between faculty advisors and staff advisors is that faculty advisors deal more with major courses and career goals. While staff advisors deal more with helping students fill petitions, GE courses, and campus level issues.

J. Haney stated that staff advisors are channeling to specific classes without knowing the damage they are causing, the other courses, that they are not suggesting students to take.

C. Lam agreed with the committees' comments that communication between faculty and staff advisors is not there. He also mentioned that different preferences for advising between programs and schools will

Wednesday, April 28, 2021
Zoom Meeting
3:00 – 4:00 PM

always end in a disagreement regarding how advising should be handled. He asked the committee where they believed this bias from staff advisors comes from for certain courses.

The committee mentioned that it has to do with the schedule of courses and that some faculty are unfavored/favored by staff advisors. Additionally, some staff advisors share their opinions on some faculty with students leading them to not wish to take the course or courses with certain faculty.

Faculty representation on Advising Leadership Team -

K. Lopez stated that if they continue with their plan with selecting one faculty representative for each school that would result in ALT becoming bigger than it already is. Therefore, they were considering only having one faculty representative and ovs an alr1fessiono stus.3 (s)1. Advr20.5o-6v-5(o)-6o-9n)2.2 (t)- (s)-1.3 (at)-3 (-