AAC Meeting Minutes: November 18, 2022

In Attendance: Clint Smith, Brittney Vietti, Jill Thomas, Sarah Roth, Priyanka Aich, Katie Matheny, Amy Hurd, Crystal Nourie, Stacy Ramsey, Janet Tulley, Corey Burgess, Soemer Simmons, Wendi Whitman

I.   Approval of minutes from November 4th
     a.   Approved by Jill, seconded by Brittney.


II.  Chair's Remarks


III. Secretary/Treasurer Report


IV.  Old Business
     a.   Advising Success Network Updates – Amy
          i.   Date set to bring everyone together (December 2).
     b.   AAC Charge Review – Clint
          i.   We are adding Pre-Health advising to the Special Populations group.
          ii.  Continued group review of the charge and council members' comments on the document.
               1.   Discussion of how to address any attendance issues.
               2.   Section 5 is where we would bring in the student representatives' ability to vote.  We will vote on this when we have quorum.
               3.   We can change the definition of quorum so instead of being a specific number, it can be a percentage of seated members (potentially 50% + 1).
               4.   Conversation about adding wording regarding the advising award selection committee under Section 2 or 3 depending on if it's a standing committee or not.
               5.   Clint is going to clean up the document and send it out as an email attachment and post it in Teams.  Please review the updated charge and we can vote on it at the next meeting or make any additional changes that are needed.
     c.   AAC Elections – Clint
          i.   Thank you to Soemer and Tracy in Tech for getting this up and running.  Nominations are open until Nov 22.
          ii.  The election will happen Nov 30-Dec 2.  It's in MyISU right now.
               1.   Do we want to put this behind Central Login on the AAC site instead?  It could make it more accessible so no one is unintentionally left out.  We would send a direct link and

afterwards, verify who voted and make sure they're an advisor. That may be easier than trying to track down ulids ahead of time for everyone in an advising role. We don't want to miss people in My who do want to vote.

iii. Determining percentages and specific definitions of advisement (and whether that's direct meeting with students as compared to advising responsibilities) can be very hard to monitor and then create and maintain a comprehensive, consistent, fair list of advisors.

iv. Can we send out a direct link to the ballot through the ADV listserv and Wiki? Voters could list their department/affiliation. Voting would no longer be anonymous, but it's not currently anonymous- anytime we sign into My, our name/ulid is attached behind-the-scenes to our vote.

v. The next step is that we need to look at the current list. The previous AAC president, Jazmyn, compiled a list of advisors that is on the AAC Teams channel. Need to compare that to the advisor listserv (159 subscribers, currently).

vi. Discussion about who should be eligible to vote in elections. Should anyone who works with advisors be able to vote for advising representation? Or should it only be advisors? We believe it would require a vote and be a change to the charge to open voting to non-advisors.

vii. How would we define eligibility? Would it be those in an advising role or a role that "intersects with advising" or is "affiliated with the advising community?"

viii. The decision was made that the upcoming election is coming up too quickly to make large scale changes to who should be included in the voting process or where/how people vote. This should be part of the overall review of the AAC charge.

ix. Clint is going to work with Jazmyn on how she created the most recent list of advisors who should be able to vote in the AAC election within My.

V. New Business
   a. Transfer Registration & Orientation Day Feedback & Future – Corey Burgess
      i. Student evaluation data from first 2 in person TRODs- the goal was to ask pointed questions to find out if this is working, but we acknowledge that students don't have a prior frame of reference. 75% of students surveyed preferred the virtual advising appointment format. Show rate for appointments is in line with previous years.
      ii. From Orientation Services' perspective, students were not getting confused about the two parts. They were able to figure it out and do what

needed to be done.  Advisors sending specific, targeted messages really helps with this too.

    iii. Transfer Guides were able to help with specific questions about classes, locations, etc. Students were able to ask more informed questions.

    iv. Scheduling is a better, more efficient process now with more options for students.

    v. Attendance at the transfer social is also much better now.  There is a stronger emphasis on community rather than a "solo" day.

    vi. Corey has not heard direct feedback from advisors. They have talked to students, parents, and Admissions staff and haven't heard criticisms to this point.

    vii. Students who have been readmitted and don't need to come to campus automatically get messages to come for part 2.  If they don't need that additional step, advisors or students can email Transfer Orientation to have them taken off the list so they don't get that messaging.

    viii. Ideally, students have met with their advisor and have their class schedule before they come to campus for the in-person portion.  They really want to get their ID card when they're here in person.  If advisors have appointments post December 2, the last Transfer Day, they can still come to the in-person portion and then come back and get their ID a different time.

    ix. The Housing block continues to cause complicated situations and problems that require students to take additional steps that are confusing and unclear to them.  Housing is at the information fair in the morning at TROD to answer lingering questions, but the block causes an issue for the advisement portion beforehand.

    x. Appointments are scheduled based on earned and in progress hours.  We don't want to bounce students around unnecessarily.  Slate calculates hours differently than CS and includes in progress hours.

    xi. Department/school advisors present said the process went very smoothly for them and they liked the change and thought it was beneficial for students.  They found the flexibility helpful in their schedules as well.

    xii. If advisors have any specific concerns or questions abut how this format works in their individual areas, they should reach out to Corey.


VI. Campus Solutions/Registration
    a. Registration went from a 4-step to a 2-step process so saving students a few steps. The videos have been updated to reflect this process.

b. As discussed at the last AAC meeting, Gina Turton will send a message to the advisor listerv about adjusting the registration time frame for the spring, so watch for that.

VII. Committee Updates
   a. Assessment
      i. Has not met.  Asking for specific information about students' major and time they were requesting overrides.  Their next meeting is in mid-December.
   b. Technology
      i. No update.  Next meeting is in December.
   c. Teacher Education
      i. Has not met.
   d. PDT
      i. Subgroup working on Spring Advisor Day.
   e. Mentoring & Connections
      i. Communication went out to advisor mentors & mentees. Message went out to the advisor listserv asking for updates to major/dept/unit pages. Sarah Roth is stepping off the committee at the end of the fall semester so a new chair will be in place beginning in January.
   f. Advising Awards Committee
      i. Julie Navickas, Cristen Monson, Anjie Almeda, Lana Cunningham, Gina Turton, and Christie Martin have all accepted.  Katie Matheny is the student rep.  Have not heard back from COE and Brian Aitken has declined.

VIII. Student Representative Reports
   a. No report this week.

IX. Other Business?

X. Next meeting:  10:00 AM, December 2$^{nd}$

Submitted by:
Sarah Roth
11-22-2022