

**2021-2022 Brown Center Coordinators for Faculty Advising
Summary Report**
Danielle Lindner (CAS), Monica Mendoza (SoBA), Daniil Zavlunov (SoM)
June 2022

Between September 1, 2021 and May 15, 2022, we served as the Brown Center Coordinators for Faculty Advising (CFAs). During our tenure as CFAs we reported directly to Provost Painter. Our work entailed close collaboration with Dr. Harry Price, Director of the Brown Center for Faculty Innovation and Excellence. This report summarizes our charge, details the principles that guided our work, outlines our priorities, reviews our accomplishments, and offers some recommendations and/or plans for future work.

CHARGE

Advancing the effectiveness of Academic Advising at Stetson is a priority that holds great opportunity for improving students' experiences and outcomes. As coordinators for Faculty Advising—each of us representing our respective College or School—we were tasked with collaborating with academic leaders and other constituencies at Stetson to cultivate an environment in which new faculty academic advising thrives and student success is recognized as a hallmark of academic distinction and learning effectiveness. Our specific charge was to:

- Co-develop and co-lead the Stetson's Academic Advising Council,
- Ensure the Academic Advising Council provides comprehensive advising across a student's tenure at Stetson,
- Develop, manage and direct an effective academic advising program within our respective College/School,
- Provide oversight of assessment of advising, and
- Enhance the roles of advisory committees, such as Pre-Health Advising and Pre-Law Advising.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

As we embarked on this work, we agreed upon several guiding principles.

- 1) Stetson already has a strong culture of faculty advising—advising is one of our institutional distinctions; this, however, should not preclude us from continuing to improve the overall quality of advising experience for our students, by strengthening what we already do well, identifying existing challenges or areas in which we might be lacking, and then developing solutions. This principle aligns closely with Stetson's current strategic plan;¹
- 2) Our work would build on and branch out from the work done by our peers at Stetson in the area of advising over the past decade;
- 3) We would use evidence-based approach, grounded in equity and inclusion;
- 4) We would adhere to best current practices and national standards in advising as articulated by NACADA;²
- 5) As Coordinators of Faculty Advising, we represent our fellow faculty and work to improve their experience as advisors (be that by ensuring equitable advising loads, offering professional

¹ See <https://www.stetson.edu/other/strategic-planning/media/Roll%20Ahead%20Graphic%208-2019.pdf>

² "NACADA is an association of professional [college] advisors, counselors, faculty, administrators, and students working to enhance the educational development of students." (<https://nacada.ksu.edu/About-Us.aspx>)

- development opportunities to new advisors, making available to all up-to-date resources on advising, etc.), because we believe that that experience translates into advising effectiveness, which benefits Stetson's students;
- 6) Simultaneously, as co-developers and, then, co-leaders of the Academic Advising Council (AAC) we are responsible to our students, who are in need of a coherent and comprehensive advising experience—experience that includes not only effective faculty advising, but also interaction with and reliance on resources provided by numerous University offices;
 - 7) Any policy proposal that originates with us would go through formal University channels (Academic Affairs Committee, Senate, UCCAP, faculty, Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs, etc.) for review and implementation, following the established protocols.

PRIORITIES

Following our initial meetings in September and October of 2021 and thorough review of Stetson's internal reports on advising from the last decade,³ we established a list of priorities for our work.

For students:

1. Learn more about student perceptions of our current advising model
 - Request and review advising data (NSSE advising item, etc.) from various University offices
 - Develop and administer survey regarding student perceptions of and satisfaction with advising
2. Meet with academic leaders to learn more about their views of our advising model's successes and limitations as it relates to student experience
3. Help students prepare more effectively for advising
 - Are the advising labs effective? Are there other things we can do to better socialize students to our advising model—to empower students in advising area? Should the academic advising website be revamped? Etc.

For faculty:

4. Learn more about and begin to address workload concerns
 - Request data from Institutional Research: average advising loads by faculty member over the last ten years, number of TT and NTT faculty doing advising, etc.
 - What other strategies and models might we consider to help us address workload issues related to advising?
5. Meet with academic leaders to learn more about their views of our advising model's successes and limitations as it relates to the faculty
6. Determine how advising might be evaluated in the context of the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), Merit, and Tenure and Promotion

³ Stetson University's Task Force on Advising: "Academic Advising At Stetson Report" (2011); Stetson University Comprehensive Advising Plan Proposal (Zonovia Proctor, Diane Everett, and Stacy Collins, August 2017); Expectations for Faculty Advisors document (CUAAD, September 2017); Faculty Advising Focus Group (February 2018) notes; Faculty Advising Survey (Spring 2019); 2019-2020 Academic Advising Task Force (co-chaired by Neal Mero and Harry Price); "Proposal for Faculty Advisor Training and Professional Development" (June 2020), Prepared by Diane Everett, 2019-20 Provost Faculty Fellow for Academic Advising, and Stacy Collins, Director of Academic Success; "A Collaborative Faculty Advising Model" (August 2021), prepared by Harry Price.

- Is advising teaching, service, or something else? What percentage of the overall workload is allocated to advising? etc.
 - Create “evaluation of advising” document, which would propose metrics/evaluative rubrics—to be reviewed by appropriate University bodies (Academic Affairs Committee, Senate, UCCAP)
7. Develop standard process for recordkeeping for advising
 8. Determine who should carry out advising activities
 - Should some faculty advise, but not others? How might this be determined?
 - Should some faculty be allowed to opt out of advising?
 - Is there a role for professional advisors at Stetson? What are peer and aspirational institutions currently doing in this area?
 9. Develop comprehensive resources and training for new faculty advisors
 - Develop a more effective way to familiarize new advisors with the curricular and policy information they need to know for advising
 - Develop advising manual
 - Create new advising development opportunities
 - Systematize practices

Although these priorities formed the backdrop for the work that we would go on to do, from the start, it was made clear to us that of all the elements of our charge and priorities, the co-developing of the **Academic Advising Council (AAC)** should be our top agenda item during this academic year.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS and REFLECTIONS

Academic Advising Council

Work toward the creation of the AAC

As CFAAs and Advising Fellows of the Brown Center we have been given the charge by the Provost to develop and steer a University-wide Academic Advising Council. The primary role of the Academic Advising Council would be to advance the effectiveness of academic advising at Stetson and to improve the overall student advising experience. The AAC would provide leadership and guidance in all matters related to advising. This initiative grew out from more than a decade of research done by several faculty-led university committees. A theme that runs through this research is a need to establish a collaborative advising model in which the faculty take the lead, but which also includes all key stakeholders across the University who contribute to effective advising.

Starting in October 2021, we began to define the structure (membership) and mission (vision and responsibilities) of a new AAC. As our starting guide, we used “A Collaborative Faculty Advising Model” (August 2021) document, prepared by Harry Price, and based on the work of the previous internal task forces (see note 3) and similar advising models at other institutions. The document imagined/envisioned an AAC for Stetson. The principles guiding the proposed model’s design were:

- Change is constant: organizational structure is a living one and needs to evolve
- Recognize that the student body is changing (diverse socio-economic backgrounds, life experiences, lifestyles, cultures, etc.) and that advising must effectively respond to the changes
- Focus on faculty leadership development in advising

- Collaboration fosters innovation
- Deepen partnership among academic leaders from Academic Affairs and Academic Success
- Capitalize on existing strengths/assets

We subjected the model proposed (not shown in the current report) to thorough review and modification. Our research and conversations centered on the structure and mission of the Council. In addition to examining afresh all of Stetson’s internal reports on advising, in developing the structure and the mission/vision statement for Stetson’s AAC, we consulted about a dozen other schools’ advising councils and their missions.⁴ Examination of these documents revealed a remarkable overlap in visions for the councils and especially mission formulations, and that is because they all rely on NACADA, which sets “industry standards” in advising and which we had consulted aplenty as well.⁵ We have also relied on The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), and its standards and guidelines for Academic Advising Programs.⁶ In the process of this work, we generated two documents. The first was the AAC Mission/Vision statement (see Appendix A). The document is no testament to originality; rather, in deriving it, we aimed to capture the most common trends and best practices in the missions that we reviewed, selecting and adapting those applicable to Stetson. The work on the document that would cogently and tersely lay out the basic elements of the mission and vision for the Council continued until February 2022. We view the document that was created as a living one, permitting further revision as needed.

The other document was the structure of the AAC, on which we worked between October 2021 and late February 2022. Even as we were monitoring what other institutions were doing in terms of their AAC memberships, we wanted our AAC structure to reflect Stetson’s advising “landscape” and student needs. The membership of the AAC fluctuated significantly in the early iterations of the document as we were debating the role of each member on the Council. We believed the AAC—a recommending body on all matters advising—should be made up of those who will be most effective at successfully advancing the betterment of academic advising at Stetson and improving the overall student advising experience. Each member of the AAC would represent a particular branch of Stetson’s advising and, as such, would hold critical knowledge of that specific area. We also wanted to ensure that the AAC include significant faculty representation. As we worked on the document, we sought input into the structure of the Council from the Provost, Associate Provost for Faculty Development, Director of the Brown Center, Deans and Associate Deans, Faculty Senate, and Academic Success leaders. Each consultation left a significant imprint on the final make-up of the AAC, which is truly a collaborative body, integrating all divisions responsible for advising at Stetson (see Appendix B).

The final drafts of both documents were submitted to the Provost in late February 2022. The Provost reviewed and accepted our documents, establishing the AAC and initiating the process of populating it in March of 2022. By mid-April, all but one member accepted the invitation to serve on the Council. Currently, all members of the AAC serve *ex officio*.

⁴ These included: University of North Carolina Wilmington’s Academic Advising Council (<https://uncw.edu/aac/>); UC Berkeley’s Advising Council, especially (https://advisingmatters.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/general/web_advisingcouncil_0.pdf); Florida International University’s Council for Undergraduate Academic Advising (<https://cuua.fiu.edu>); University of South Florida’s Council on Academic Advising (<https://www.usf.edu/undergrad/caa/index.aspx>); Central Washington University (<https://www.cwu.edu/academic-advising/>)

⁵ <https://nacada.ksu.edu/>

⁶ <http://standards.cas.edu/getpdf.cfm?PDF=E864D2C4-D655-8F74-2E647CDECD29B7D0>

First AAC Meeting

The Academic Advising Council met for the first time on May 3, 2022 from 9:30 to 11 am. Our main goals for the meeting were to review the structure and mission/vision of the AAC, discuss the Council's prehistory, review what works well in the areas of advising represented by each member and reflect on the challenges that remain and need to be addressed, and, most importantly, to begin to set priorities and goals for the AAC for next year. (Meeting minutes are posted to the AAC Teams page.) There was a general agreement that the AAC structure and mission/vision are good. Among the needs identified were: second wave of summer advising for new enrolling students that would take into account the transfer of IB, AP, and other credits; better support for graduate students by way of resource page that would address financial aid questions, housing options, etc.; advising map for all undergraduates, which would allow students to understand the entire advising process at a glance; consistency of information concerning advising (common understanding of what advising is); resources for faculty advisors; new faculty advisor training; and inequities in advising loads.

Student Survey regarding their advising experience

To begin to ensure that Academic Advising Council would provide comprehensive advising across a student's tenure at Stetson, we need more data on students' overall experience with advising. We began by contacting Colin MacFarlane, Executive Director of Institutional Research and Effectiveness. He provided information about the available data regarding student perceptions of advising. Several instruments administered to various student constituencies ask students to complete a few items regarding their advising experience (i.e., the National Survey of Student Engagement, the Student Satisfaction Inventory, the Your First College Year and College Senior Survey from HERI-CIRP, and the Stetson Student Survey), but more comprehensive data were not available. Over the course of the months of October and November 2021, we developed a brief survey to gain a basic understanding of the students' perception of and satisfaction with their advising experience. The survey was based largely on existing instruments available through NACADA, though we modified these to best correspond to the unique features of Stetson's advising practices. The survey draft was refined on several occasions in the process of review and discussion with Academic Success staff. The anonymous online survey was distributed to students via e-mails from Academic Success after the Fall 2021 advising and registration period.

A total of 295 students completed the survey. Most respondents came from the College of Arts and Sciences (70.8%, $n = 209$), followed by the School of Business Administration (23.1%, $n = 68$) and the School of Music (5.8%; $n = 17$). There were 71 first-year students (24.1%), 61 sophomores (20.7%), 67 juniors (22.7%), 71 seniors (24.1%), and 25 graduate students (8.5%) in the sample. We also asked students whether they were members of groups that may have unique advising needs. The sample included 31 transfer students (11.2%), 16 international students (5.4%), 22 student athletes (7.5%), 33 honors students (11.2%), and 31 double majors (10.5%). The most common methods of interaction with one's faculty advisor were face-to-face meetings, virtual meetings, and e-mail, all endorsed by over half of respondents. Students also expressed preferences for these methods of interacting over phone calls and text messages.

We assessed student satisfaction with advising using 17 items rated on a four-point scale where 1 = Disagree, 2 = Somewhat Disagree, 3 = Somewhat Agree, and 4 = Agree. Mean advising satisfaction Scores for the entire sample ranged from 1.24 to 4.00 ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .62$), though it is important to

interpret this mean score with caution given that the measure was not necessarily developed with the intention of calculating a total score. Rather, it is informative to look at individual items, including means, standard deviations, and the number of students who rate each item “Somewhat Agree” or “Agree”, indicating satisfaction with that aspect of the advising experience. Means, standard deviations, and ranges for each advising satisfaction item appear below for the entire sample, along with the number of students rating each item a “Somewhat Agree” or “Agree”.

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min.	Max.	Percentage of Students who Express Satisfaction*
1. My faculty advisor is prepared for my advising appointments.	3.73	0.65	1	4	93.6% (<i>n</i> = 276)
2. My faculty advisor provides accurate assistance in selecting appropriate courses.	3.63	0.74	1	4	80.3% (<i>n</i> = 237)
3. My faculty advisor is knowledgeable about academic policies (e.g., course exclusion, pass/fail, transfer credits, etc.)	3.74	0.67	1	4	80.7% (<i>n</i> = 238)
4. My faculty advisor is able to help me with forms to complete registration-related tasks (e.g., change of major, add/drop, transfer of credits, credit overload, etc.)	3.63	0.75	1	4	74.9% (<i>n</i> = 221)
5. My faculty advisor is knowledgeable about graduation requirements.	3.81	0.54	1	4	83.4% (<i>n</i> = 246)
6. If my faculty advisor does not know the answer to one of my questions, they make the effort to connect me to someone who does.	3.73	0.64	1	4	76.6% (<i>n</i> = 226)
7. My faculty advisor’s availability is currently meeting my needs.	3.67	.079	1	4	79.3% (<i>n</i> = 234)
8. My faculty advisor listens and respects me as an individual.	3.79	0.63	1	4	82.7% (<i>n</i> = 244)
9. I am given the time I need during my academic advising appointments and do not feel rushed.	3.76	0.63	1	4	81.4% (<i>n</i> = 240)
10. My faculty advisor offers helpful suggestions when I have scheduling issues/problems.	3.67	0.76	1	4	73.9% (<i>n</i> = 218)
11. I would feel comfortable talking with my faculty advisor about personal issues/concerns that may or may not pertain to academics.	3.22	1.09	1	4	64.4% (<i>n</i> = 190)
12. My faculty advisor helps connect me to campus resources designed to support my success when needed (e.g., Academic Success, Accessibility Services, Student Counseling Services, Tutoring/SPI, etc.)	3.54	0.87	1	4	67.8% (<i>n</i> = 200)
13. My faculty advisor has provided appropriate referrals for exploring alternative majors and/or minors.	3.52	0.88	1	4	60.7% (<i>n</i> = 179)

14. My faculty advisor is knowledgeable about careers that apply to my major.	3.77	0.56	1	4	81.7% (n = 241)
15. I have made progress toward clarifying or confirming a major and career path through meeting with my faculty advisor.	3.62	0.81	1	4	73.2% (n = 216)
16. I would recommend my faculty advisor to other students.	3.53	0.96	1	4	76.3% (n = 225)
17. Overall, I am satisfied with my advising experience at Stetson.	3.57	0.88	1	4	76.3% (n = 225)

As highlighted above, many of our students express satisfaction with their advising experience. On 11 of the 17 survey items, greater than 75% of students in our sample were satisfied. We also examined the data for potential differences between groups in our population, and differences were minimal, particularly when correcting for the effects of running multiple statistical comparisons. Some of the group sizes were also very small; as outlined below, more regular assessment of the advising program may help us to boost sample sizes and allow for more robust analyses.

In addition to the quantitative data obtained above, we asked students two open-ended questions: 1) What has been most beneficial about your advising experience at Stetson; and 2) What are your suggestions to improve academic advising at Stetson? We do not present full qualitative results here for the sake of brevity, though we are happy to discuss qualitative data with anyone interested. The qualitative data highlight the importance of both the transactional (i.e., what classes to take and when, how to register for classes, etc.) and relational (i.e., developing a caring, collaborative working relationship) aspects of advising for student satisfaction. While many students offered positive comments, some also pointed to difficult experiences (e.g., switching advisors several times until finding a good match; some problems identified were unique to specific student groups). Other students also offered comments about improving resources or other aspects of the advising process (e.g., better explanations of degree requirements, more information about experiential learning, more frequent meetings). Although the number of students expressing dissatisfaction with advising was small, their specific concerns suggest areas within advising in which the University could do better.

Overall, the results of this initial comprehensive survey of advising are positive. However, the data we obtained come from a relatively small set of our student population who responded voluntarily to an e-mail invitation to participate. It will be important to implement regular assessment of University-wide advising program so we can gather additional data and explore the connection between academic advising and important student outcomes like retention, persistence, and time to degree completion. Moving forward, it is also important for us to use the data we gathered from students in conjunction with other information (e.g., results of faculty surveys, our meetings with the Deans and Associate Deans described below, and best practices in advising) to continue to work toward a more unified advising experience for all students.

Meetings with Deans and Associate Deans

With the view to the CFA charge—namely that, in the contexts of the AAC, we ensure a comprehensive advising across a student's tenure at Stetson and, in the context of our own work as CFAs, develop, manage and direct an effective academic advising program in our respective College/Schools and provide oversight of assessment of advising—in January 2022 we held a series of meetings with all Deans and most Associate Deans. Our intent was to discuss with them their visions and priorities in

advising and for our roles as CFAs, gain their perspective on students' advising experience, consider with them the workload issues surrounding advising, discuss summer advising, etc. To ensure consistency for the purposes of comparison, we drafted a list of questions to guide our meetings:

1. What is your hope for the Coordinator of Faculty Advising role and the Academic Advising Council? How do you envision CFAs and the AAC supporting faculty advising?
2. What do you think are the top three concerns/problems that need to be addressed related to advising in the College/School?
3. In some of the data we have (e.g., faculty survey about advising), faculty raise workload concerns about advising. What are your thoughts about advising and workload?
 - What other strategies and models might we consider to help us address workload issues related to advising?
 - Establish a maximum advising requirement/default load?
 - Additional compensation possibility?
 - Possible course release for those with heavy advising loads?
4. What are your thoughts about how advising should be evaluated/assessed in the context of the Faculty Annual Report (FAR), Merit, and T&P?
5. At some institutions, some faculty advise and others do not. What are your thoughts about that model?
 - Should some faculty advise, but not others? How will this be determined? Should some faculty be allowed to opt out of advising?
6. Do you see a role for professional advisors at Stetson?
7. What kinds of resources and training do you think would be ideal for developing new advisors in the College/School?

The meetings proved informative in that they furnished us with a great variety of positions on advising. They also revealed many common concerns over advising and similar views on the role for CFAs and the AAC, but also exposed significant, philosophical disagreements and left some questions unanswered.

Concerns with Advising, shared by all Academic Leaders

- Faculty have inconsistent view of what advising is or should be
- Insufficient training for new faculty and/or motivation for all faculty advisors
- Students have very different advising experiences across schools and units and even within units
- Stetson lacks of common narrative on advising
- Helping students with course selection (transactional—as opposed to relational—aspect of advising) may not be the best use of faculty time
- Extreme inequities in advising loads exist and must be addressed
- Challenges with some advisors (advisors who are inaccessible to their advisees, etc.)
- Lack of consistent documentation by advisors on advising
- Assessment/evaluation of advising (both evaluation of faculty advisor performance and assessment of student learning/development) is lacking

Common themes on the role for CFAs and the AAC

- CFAs and AAC become the body that communicates with faculty and students about advising
- To create a common narrative on advising
- To develop a clear definition for the role of the faculty advisor
- CFAs should act as moderators on what advising looks like or what it should be

- Facilitate routine training of faculty advisors and communication with faculty advisors about advising matters; further systematize training and communication (CUAD currently handles some of this – possibility of shifting to AAC)
- Create a more vibrant set of faculty advisor development opportunities
- Address workload inequities
- Develop procedures for assessment of advising (e.g., student assessment, self-assessment, model competence, peer assessment, etc.)
 - Codify what advisors should be doing by way of rubrics and metrics
 - Articulate a set of standards and expectations that are both qualifiable and quantifiable
 - If we have a faculty advising model, it needs to be ingrained more clearly into who we are in HR, T&P, workload, FAR, etc.
- Strengthen relationships between faculty advising, pre-professional advising, and Career and Professional Development
- Review content of Advising Labs

Disagreements over Advising and Unanswered Questions

Several topics raised by our questions produced no consensus among the three deans and their associates. Comparing responses from the three schools, particularly contentious questions proved to be 1) whether advising constitutes teaching, service, or something separate; 2) whether all faculty should advise 3) whether there is a role for professional advisors within Stetson’s system. The question of workload inequities produced no immediately actionable proposals.

LOOKING AHEAD

Our work during AY2021-22 laid the groundwork for much activity next year. The Academic Advising Council is now established and running (with some staff members taking on projects to be done over the summer months—see below). We have done significant work—by way of student survey, discussions with the Academic Leaders and Academic Success toward ensuring that the Academic Advising Council is able to provide comprehensive advising across a student’s tenure at Stetson—this will be the AAC priority next year. As CFAs, we have made some progress toward developing, managing and directing an effective academic advising program within our respective College/School; however, this work must also embrace the challenge of first addressing some of the structural problems discussed earlier—these problems (particularly that of workload inequity) are hard to surmount without initiating at least some systemic changes. The same holds true for assessment of advising. To be sure, we have done research into this topic (as a result of which we decided that we will be using the term “assessment of advising” to refer to holistic analysis of students’ entire advising experience at Stetson and “evaluation of advising” to refer to analysis of advisor effectiveness; the former is within the purview of the AAC, while the latter, of the CFAs), but much more work remains. One area, which we have not tackled at all this year—in part because of personnel fluidity—is Pre-Health Advising and Pre-Law Advising. We plan to pursue this more actively next year.

Below are some concrete plans for AY2022-23:

CFAs

Summer 2022: two CFAs attend the NACADA Summer Institute

August 2022: CFAs meet with Student Success to review/assess summer advising, transfer of credits, discuss Advising Labs 201 and 202, etc.

Fall 2022: develop a proposal for addressing workload inequities (in AY2021-22 we gathered a great deal of internal data on this issue; in AY2022-23 we hope to examine how our peer and aspirational institutions handle this problem, before we begin to develop the proposal)

Fall 2022 and Spring 2023: CFAs conduct a refresher advising session (one in September; one in February) for all faculty in their College/School

- Required for new faculty advisors; optional for the rest

Spring 2023: Create “evaluation of advising” document draft, which would propose metrics/evaluative rubrics. The draft would be subjected to all normal University vetting processes (see above, Guiding Principles, no. 7).

AAC

Fall 2022: begin to update/modify Stetson’s Advising webpage—student-centered redesign (visually attractive, user-friendly)

- Add AAC page
- Create “Advising Glossary”/Resources page
- Create separate page for graduate advising

Early Fall 2022: Reach out to faculty advisors and ask about the summer advising (e.g., “How do you feel about summer advising?,” “How do you view the relationship between your advising work and summer advising?” etc.)

Fall 2022: Design and administer (November 2022) advising survey to faculty, asking about experience with advising during the latest advising period, seeking to gauge what resources faculty members need, etc.

Fall 2022: Administer advising survey to all students following the advising period. We will add specific questions for first-year students about aspects of the advising experience that are unique to them (e.g., summer advising, Advising Lab 101/102, etc.).

Fall 2022 & Spring 2023: Build a comprehensive database of advising resources for faculty.

Fall 2022 & Spring 2023: Review the current process for recordkeeping for advising (i.e., SSC/Degree Audit); offer recommendations for streamlining recordkeeping if needed, with the goal of making records more useful for faculty, students, and staff.

APPENDIX A
STETSON UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC ADVISING COUNCIL MISSION STATEMENT

PROVIDE COORDINATED LEADERSHIP, GUIDANCE, AND REPRESENTATION FOR THE ACADEMIC ADVISING COMMUNITY

FOR STUDENTS:

- Create a successful advising experience for each student's unique academic journey
- Promote student satisfaction, persistence, retention, and success by enhancing the academic advising experiences
- Monitor the student experience of advising by way of regular surveys of that experience

FOR FACULTY & STAFF:

- Facilitate discussion, deliberation, and communication for academic advisors across the University
- Encourage collaboration among those responsible for advising at Stetson
- Develop and establish a framework for assessing advising effectiveness
- Incentivize, recognize, and reward advising excellence and engagement
- Create, provide, and promote faculty development opportunities to enhance advising effectiveness with the goal of meeting or surpassing Stetson's Expectations for Advising and the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education's Advising Standards
- Provide networking and training opportunities for those involved in academic advising

FOR THE INSTITUTION:

- Provide a unified vision for issues related to academic advising
- Serve as a hub for all matters related to academic advising
- Capitalize on existing advising strengths while also supporting a culture of continuous improvement in advising
- Serve as the collective voice for advising community to provide perspective, counsel, and feedback on advising to key University administrative offices
- Highlight the contributions of academic advising to the mission and goals of the University's Strategic Plan
- Keep abreast of best practices in academic advising

- Review and/or propose policies and procedures related to academic advising
- Support advising assessment and program level effectiveness
- Share best practices and strategies in the field of advising across the advising community

APPENDIX B
Structure of the Academic Advising Council

- 3 Coordinators for Faculty Advising (CAS, SoBA, SoM), serving as chairs of the AAC
- Academic Success
 - Advising
 - Career & Professional Development
- Academic Success – Athletics
- International Students
- Transfers
- Pre-Professional
- Graduate Advising Reps
- Senate Rep – Chair of Academic Affairs Committee (or chair's designee)
- Student Rep – SGA from Academic Affairs Committee
- Registrar's Office

Consultative:

- Brown Center Director
- Academic Success Director
- Dean of Student's office
- Honors
- FSEM
- Admissions FTIC
- Divisional Reps – Social Sciences, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Education
- CUAAD
- ROTC
- Bonner