# EXCELLENCE IN ACADEMIC ADVISING IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE 2022-2024 CHARTER AND CHARGE

## AUTHORITY

The UVU Excellence in Academic Advising Implementation Committee (EAAIC) is an action group formed at the request of the Associate Provost – Student Success in close collaboration with the Associate Vice President – Enrollment Management. The Associate Provost – Student Success delegates management responsibility for the committee to the Senior Director – Academic Advising. EAAIC does not have governance authority within the meaning of UVU Policy 102.

## RESPONSIBILITIES

EAAIC has the ongoing responsibility of addressing the recommendations derived during the EAA Phase I process and outlined in the EAA Comprehensive Report.

### Ongoing

- Assess the feasibility of recommendations in the Phase I Comprehensive Report and determine priorities for action.

- Recommend the composition of subcommittees.

- Monitor the work of subcommittees.

- Maintain awareness of UVU's strategic and operating environment.

- Review major university plans to understand the advising community's role in achieving stated goals.

- Communicate findings to university leadership and the wider university community through their organizational communication channels.

## MEMBERSHIP

### Executive Sponsor

The executive sponsor of EAAIC is David Connelly, Associate Provost – Student Success.

### Chairs and Vice-Chairs

EAAIC is chaired by the Senior Director – Academic Advising with Katherine Brickey and Rachel Terry, Program Managers – Advisement Training/Assessment, serving as Vice-Chairs.

# Organizational Appointees

Organizational appointees hold membership by delegation or are appointed by offices with central roles in student advising/counseling and are, consistent with Robert's Rules of Order, full voting members of EAAIC. Organizational appointees serve on an ongoing basis so long as they hold the designated position. These appointees include the following positions:

| Position | Member |
| --- | --- |
| Senior Director – University Advising | Vincent Dreyer |
| Program Manager – Advisement Training/Assessment | Katherine Brickey |
| Program Manager – Advisement Training/Assessment | Rachel Terry |
| Director – College of Engineering & Technology Advising | Julie Harps |
| Director – College of Health and Public Service Advising | Shalece Nuttall |
| Director – College of Humanities and Social Sciences Advising | Natalie Shelley |
| Director – College of Science Advising | Monica Ferreyra |
| Director – First-Year Advising Center | Elaine Lewis |
| Director – Pre-Professional Advising Center | Adam Black |
| Director – School of the Arts | Andrea Calaway |
| Director – School of Education | Shaunna Requilman |

| | |
|---|---|
| Director – Woodbury School of Business | Polly Clauson |
| Associate Registrar | Kyle Hicken |
| Associate Dean - College of Humanities & Social Sciences | Deborah Marrott |
| Faculty Senate Representative | Dustin Shipp |
| UVU Student Association Representative | Tiana Vakaafi Wynn |
| Director – Adult Student Support Initiatives | Wade Oliver |
| Assistant Director, Multicultural Student Services | Kumen Louis |
| Director, Concurrent Enrollment Advising | Peni Mounga |
| Program Director – Enrollment Management | Derek Kent |
| Program Manager – Online Programs | Martha Wilson |

## Support Staff

EAAIC is supported by the administrative assistant for the Office of University Advising, who is entitled to participate substantively in the meetings on the same basis as other members but does not hold voting rights.

## Member Expectations

EAAIC members are selected so that the committee can draw on a range of viewpoints from across the university. Members are not, however, specifically representing their organizations. EAAIC members should approach their work from a "whole university" perspective rather than the interests of their organizations or positions.

- Attend and participate in all meetings or find a substitute if unable to attend
- Review all materials for committee projects and give input as requested
- Lead or monitor the work of assigned subcommittees
- Facilitate two-way communication between EAAIC and the broader campus community particularly your own organizations
- Maintain awareness of broader UVU and higher education issues in general
- Model the positivity and enthusiasm that differentiates UVU's staff and faculty as Wolverines

# ORGANIZATION

## Meetings

EAAIC will typically meet every 2-3 weeks on a schedule coordinated by the committee leadership and support staff.

## Chair Responsibilities

The Chair and Vice-Chairs will develop the annual agenda and agendas for each meeting and may add items to the agenda, at the request of the members, where the items are appropriate to the committee's responsibilities. They will introduce agenda items during the meeting and may determine the structure of discussion. The chair will preside over discussion.

## Deliberative Procedures

Under most circumstances, EAAIC will operate informally and strive toward consensus using the EAAIC Deliberative Procedures. These procedures should be used flexibly to promote collegial deliberations. Procedures for formal sessions, when necessary, are included in the attached EAAIC Deliberative Procedures document.

# EAAIC DELIBERATIVE PROCEDURES

August 30, 2022

# BACKGROUND

The EAAIC Rules of Procedure are an implementation of Martha's Rules of Order. This process was created by a housing cooperative in Madison, Wisconsin, with the intent of facilitating efficient, consensus-based decision-making. It recognizes that linear models of procedure such as Robert's Rules of Order are excessively majoritarian. In an organization that seeks to work toward consensus through negotiation, cooperation, and compromise, complex procedures often silence or discourage minority views, especially when there are significant differences among members' competence with formal procedure. Martha's Rules also recognize that fully informal discussion, however, may have the same effect, privileging those more comfortable with public speaking or who tend to contribute more forcefully in discussions. These procedures provide a structure for informal discussion that supports genuine consensus building.

The principles of Martha's Rules are consistent with the longstanding culture of EAAIC. This specific implementation of Martha's Rules is adapted from the American Association of Philosophy Teachers Rules of Order, February 8, 2013, in order to promote more effective discussion within committee meetings.

# PRINCIPLES

Effective, practical action is most likely to result from an evolutionary process of proposal, evaluation, and revision. Those opposed to a proposal often identify good reasons that it should not be adopted. But even with a good proposal, opposition can identify opportunities for clarity or improvement, enhance the entire group's understanding of the proposal and the larger issue it addresses, and build commitment among the members to implement it effectively.

EAAIC members should approach discussion as group deliberation rather than debate. They must be willing to listen carefully and consider what others are saying. Everyone must make a good faith effort to understand each other before criticizing ideas. They must also be trusting and brave enough to speak their minds. The expectation is that every effort will be made to be clear but that there is no requirement or expectation that participants will present well-formed arguments on the spot.

Consensus does not mean unanimous support. Consensus is reached on a proposal when most members find it acceptable. This may result in adopting ideas that some members find only minimally acceptable, and even that a few members may continue to oppose. Those in the majority should continue to aim for as broad a consensus as possible and should cooperate to address objections. Those with concerns should not use the goal of consensus as a means of obstructing action.

# PROCEDURES

## Proposals

A proposal is a recommendation that a specific action be taken, often that EAAIC express a specific conclusion in the reports that it produces. Once a proposal is made, it belongs to the group. As such the person who proposed it no longer "owns" the proposal and cannot withdraw it. There is no need to second a proposal.

The person making a proposal should be given reasonable time to explain it. It is helpful to provide time for questions to clarify the proposal before acting on it. A proposal that is adopted should be specific in wording and actions to follow from its adoption, but it is acceptable to offer a proposal conceptually and then allow specific wording and actions to take shape in deliberations.

It is natural, normal, and expected that there will be multiple proposals related to a specific topic to be on the table at any time in a discussion. Every effort should be made to ensure that all participants understand which proposal is being focused on at each point in the conversation. It is not practical to insist that discussion remain on one proposal prior to moving to another proposal on the same topic, especially when developing analytical conclusions or language. However, proposals on one topic should be settled before proposals on another topic are considered.

In discussing proposals, it is likely that they will be amended. The amendment will be adopted by a consensus model which mirrors that of adopting proposals more broadly. As the proposal belongs to the group, not the person who proposed it, there are no "friendly" amendments.

## Consensus Check

As decisions are made by consensus, the majority of all proposals will be unanimously approved. When consensus is not immediate, EAAIC should move toward consensus through an iterated process of consensus checks and discussion.

The consensus check aims to discover how the group feels about the proposal. The chair states the specific proposal being considered, and then takes count of the following:

1. Who substantially supports the proposal?

2. Who finds the proposal acceptable?

3. Who is uncomfortable with the proposal?

4. Who is uncertain about the proposal?

5. Of those with concerns, whose concerns are strong enough that they would object to adopting the proposal by majority rule?

This is repeated with all the proposals on the particular topic. The chair or support staff track the results of the consensus check.

Based on the results of the consensus check, four paths are recommended.

1. If all members support the proposal or find it acceptable, then the proposal is considered to have consensus and is adopted without a vote.

2. If most members are uncomfortable with the proposal, no further action should be taken on it.

3. If many members are uncertain about the proposal, it should be clarified or more information gathered prior to checking for consensus again.

4. If any members of the meeting are uncomfortable with the proposal or a small number of members are uncertain about it, then discussion should continue until consensus is reached.

5. If it is determined that consensus is not possible then a vote should occur.

## Discussion

Further deliberation following a consensus check is oriented toward building consensus. The discussion should focus on the concerns of those who are uncomfortable with the proposal or uncertain about it.

1. Those with concerns should first be invited to explain the concerns, seek additional information, and identify elements of the proposal that should be clarified.

2. The entire group is invited to offer explanations, thoughts, or information to help resolve the discomfort and uncertainty and move the group toward consensus.

3. As deliberations become more focused on specific issues, amendments to the proposal can be considered that would incorporate the concerns while maintaining what supporters find valuable in it.

Following discussion, the consensus check should be repeated to evaluate whether consensus has been reached. Moving to a consensus check should not occur until it is clear that all voices on a proposal have been heard.

## Voting

If it becomes clear that some members will not be able to be satisfied with the proposal, but it is still desired to have clarity on the issue rather than reconsidering it at a later time, then it should be put to a vote. Moving to a vote should not occur until it is clear that all voices on a proposal have been heard. The need to move to a vote is demonstrated if there appears to be a substantial majority in who at least find the proposal acceptable and either:

1. There is no movement toward consensus following a discussion post-consensus check, or

2. Any number of members who are uncomfortable or uncertain state that that they do not see themselves being moved to at least finding the proposal acceptable by further deliberation or amendment.

The question at hand for every vote is, "Should EAAIC adopt this proposal over the stated concerns of the minority, when a majority of the committee thinks that it is at least acceptable?" A majority of those present and voting is required to adopt a proposal. All voting members present may vote. A proposal that is defeated by vote should not be reconsidered without significant revision.

# FORMAL SESSION

Should formal procedure prove necessary, any member may request that the chair move the committee into formal session. The decision of the chair may be appealed to the committee. In the event that the decision is appealed, the committee shall enter formal session on the vote of a two-thirds majority of those present.

In formal session, the committee shall operate according to *Rosenberg's Rules of Order: Simple Parliamentary Procedures for the 21st Century* (Sacramento, California: League of California Cities, 2003). The committee will remain in formal session until the agenda item for which formal session was entered is completed and will then revert to informal session without further vote or action from the chair.