+

ORGANIZATION CONDITION COMMITTEE REPORT
Date: 20 May 2022

Section 1: Executive Summary

Evidence collected by the committee shows that the organization of advising throughout the university is inconsistent. To address the level to which our organizational structure supports academic advising, most of the evidence gathered was qualitative data. This reflects the variety of advising structures and applications that are in use. Changes made since 2016 have helped to create a more centralized advising community, but there is still work to be done to make it equitable for advisors and students.

Section 2: Condition Committee Membership

Name	Title	Committee Role
Julie Harps	Director - CET	Chair Weekly update emails; Budget email
Kristen Nuesmeyer	Director-Academic Standards	Co-chair Position descriptions
Adam Black	Director - UCAC	Member
Cindy Braithwaite	Academic Advisor II - WSB	Member
Cole Bertelsen	Counselor - First-Year Center	Org Chart contributor
Deanna Pitts	Academic Advisor I - SOA	Member
John Macfarlane	Academic Advisor II - CHSS	Integration data contributor
Kalili Havea	Counselor - First Year Center	Peer advisor contributor
Kameron Barkle	Academic Advisor I - CET	Resource email contributor
Kris Farnsworth	Assistant Director - FAC	Adv Center Hours contributor
Kristie Dockstader	Academic Advisor II - CHPS	Curriculum process contributor
Mandy Halloran	Academic Advisor I - COS	College Coordination contributor
Travis Reynolds	Counselor - CDC	Member

Section 3:   Narrative on General Situation and Findings

The structure of academic advising at UVU has gone through significant changes in the last seven years. These changes created advising teams for each college, a pre-professional advisement center, a first-year advisement center, and brought the reporting line for almost all advisors under a senior director. These changes have set a foundation for advising collaboration and communication. All colleges now have representation in advising leadership that discuss and decide advising policies and practices to support student success. However, there are no areas to find any written, consistent policies are practices. Most advisors do not know that we have an institution wide mission and vision for advising. Some colleges have written their own.

The advising directors meet regularly with the Sr Director, the Associate Provost for Student Success and Retention, and the Associate VP for Enrollment Management. The latter two communicate advising information to and from the president's cabinet. There is an established Advising Leadership Council where directors meet with other members of the campus community such as: the Registrar, Student Retention, Financial aid, Academic Standards, Concurrent Enrollment, and Admissions to collaborate and address processes and issues related to advising. Additional coordination meetings are not consistent across divisions but do happen (see evidence document 3). Some information is only currently being shared with the first-year center director, who has been sharing it with the other directors. This information is shared in a weekly update email the First-Year director sends to other academic advising directors which highlights important items that may not be shared with their areas directly. (Evidence 13) Academic Forum e-mails and meetings help to disseminate information to all advisors and to conduct training so that students will have a seamless transition from one college to another.

Advisor training is conducted year-round, and the advisor certification process helps to integrate colleges and schools. Foundations of Inclusion and Advisor training offer training and encouragement to support diverse perspectives. In addition to these trainings, UVU shows support for students by requiring advising for all new students, and through the creation of the First-Year Advising Center. One challenge is the differences in hours of operation, remote work, and student ratios across campus (see evidence document 2). While streamlining some of the student experience with advising would be helpful with consistent hours and availability, there needs to be flexibility due to the different needs of students and staff. What some centers can do is not feasible with a smaller team, ratios, or no administrative help. If extended hours are going to be expected there will need to be additional positions or funding for some of the smaller advising areas on campus.

There are inconsistencies and discrepancies among advising positions and descriptions across the advising community (see evidence folder document 9). There are 7 colleges with Advisor I and Advisor II positions. Responsibilities of the Advisor II vary from college to college. There are some core similarities for these positions but do have some differences. For example, WSB Advisor II position has 15% of Key Roles and Responsibilities allotted to "Other Duties as

Assigned" while the CHPS Advisor II position has an even 25% split among Key Roles and Responsibilities with no allotment for "Other Duties as assigned".

There are two centers who use the term counseling instead of advising and have a master's degree qualification. However, Advisor II positions and FAC Counselor positions are graded the same despite having different degree qualifications (evidence folder 9) The primary difference seems to be the counselor positions list: "Knowledge of psychosocial interviewing and counseling techniques including the administration and interpretation of relevant tests." (See FAC Counselor Position Description in Evidence folder 9). We call all of it Academic Advising as an umbrella term, while using Counselor and Advisor somewhat interchangeably and may need to be addressed (see evidence document 11 which only uses the term Academic Advising and evidence document 12 which shows comparison of UVU advising structure to other Utah schools). Position titles and responsibilities are things that can be addressed by the Advising Selection and Development Condition Committee, and we support their recommendations.

There are also many support offices across campus that have titles of advisor or counselor. They are also referred to as specialty or support advisors. There are two coordinator positions have advising as part of their duties (Global Aviation and Integrated Studies). The Global Aviation Coordinator supervises a call center employing an advisor generalist and student employees that advise students in their program. However, these coordinator positions with significant advising responsibilities fall outside of the newly centralized advising structure. (evidence document 1) Peer advisors were broadly used this last year. Their work varied, depending on the needs of the college so it would be beneficial to provide some consistency in expectations for peer positions as well (see evidence document 4).

The seven college advisement teams are led by directors and collaborate with departments and colleges. The center that advises for pre-professional students also report to a director. All eight of these directors report through the Sr Director of Academic Advising, who should be the main contact for the advising community. There is a ninth center that advises first-year students for all of campus. The counselors in this center report to one of three assistant directors. The assistant directors report to a director who reports directly to the Associate Provost of Student Success. There are two academic programs whose "advisors" do not report through a director: Integrated Studies and Global Aviation. Graduate advising is handled differently in each college. Some have separate graduate advisors (that do not report through advising), faculty advisors, and others are absorbed by the team. Reporting lines are not easily available to students. The FAC website has the director listed, but others do not.

At an institutional level, advisors are part of the curriculum process. The Curriculum office has included advisors in the curriculum approval process by sending notification of changes and giving the opportunity to comment on curriculum across campus. At the department level, many advisors are not invited to be part of the development of new or revised programs or courses. It is up to the departments to invite advisors to be part of these discussions.

The current budget allocated by UVU is $1,000 per Advisor. According to emails from Advising Directors, this amount is insufficient to cover professional development, technology, and other resources that each are necessary for day-to-day functions. Common annual expenses for Advisors include professional memberships, conferences, employee appreciation, operating expenses, and technology. For example, travel to out-of-state conferences can cost $2,000-$3,000 per person. Every three years the university asks that we replace computers for each employee, which can cost around $2,500 each. These, along with all the other operating costs far exceed $1,000 per Advisor per year.

A resource that is not consistent across advisement centers is having the support of an Administrative Assistant. Three out of nine advisement centers at UVU do not have an Administrative Assistant. This takes valuable time from other positions and makes it hard to manage students. Administrative support could help with budget, purchasing, website maintenance, and office management, as well as managing drop-ins and scheduling without having to take away time advisors could be taking appointments. If advisors are in appointments, there is no one there to greet the students who are dropping in.

Some colleges have centers where all advisors are centrally located, and some do not. In some cases, it is necessary to be split due to program location (Aviation, Culinary Arts, Emergency Services, etc). Multiple colleges/departments have moved advisors or advising centers to give the offices to faculty. In one case, the director was told they needed to find new offices and move out. In another case the advisors were given a new space that is less accessible for students. They will need signage to find the advisors, must walk through a work room, and will have little seating for students while waiting. In a third instance, the center was split when some advisors were moved to a different location to give faculty the nicer offices.

Section 4: Recommendations for Action

1. Define a formal and accessible institution mission statement for advising and re-review organization structure to make sure it is reflective. This recommendation may be connected to the recommendations and work of the Commitment Condition Committee.
   High Priority.

2. To ensure that Advisors have adequate, up-to-date technology (computers), other programmatic resources, and sufficient training, we recommend the annual budget be set to an amount that will cover all needs of each center. Evidence 6
   High Priority

3. Provide administrative support for advising areas who do not have an administrative assistant. Administrative support could help with budget, purchasing, website maintenance, and office management, as well as managing drop-ins and scheduling without having to take away time advisors could be taking appointments. Evidence 6, 7 **High Priority**

4. To ensure that students have convenient and consistent access to their Advisors where they can discuss things confidentially, we recommend each advisement center be provided with a dedicated space that is owned by advising and assess the need to be centrally located as desired.
High Priority Evidence 7

5. Create a clear structure with consistent job descriptions and expectations for Sr Director, Director, Assistant Director, and levels of advising (i.e. Senior advisor, Advisor I, Advisor II, etc) with consistent compensation for job duties and qualifications. Address structure of peer advising and advising that exists outside of current structure (FAC, PP, Global Aviation, Honors, graduate, etc). Evidence 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12
High Priority

6. Ensure that departments are appropriately including advisors in curricula discussions.
High Priority Evidence 10

7. Define services, processes, policies, and procedures for all units and have a formal source location for reference. As we transition to a more centralized structure and work to provide consistency in services, processes, policies, and procedures, it is important to maintain the flexibility for directors for delivery of services based on student needs, department needs, and staffing. This will honor the variability of number of staff and funding available to different units.
Medium priority Evidence 1, 2, 10

Section 5: Sources of Evidence

Doc #	Title	URL
1	Academic Advising Organizational Flow Chart	https://lucid.app/lucidchart/8909a32f-5699-41af-accf-bb2350cd07b4/view?invitationId=inv_06ede400-5271-420a-87b6-0b8bb8730996&page=0_0#
2	EAA_Advising Center Hrs_ Remote	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/959524178375
3	EAA College coordination results	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/958913055957
4	Department Peer Advisor	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/959525502122
5	Integration data	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/959532283884
6	Budget email	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/959520867354
7	Resource emails	https://uvu.app.box.com/folder/163274118066
8	Survey results	https://uvu.app.box.com/folder/163274873532
9	Position descriptions	https://uvu.app.box.com/folder/163443353612
10	Curriculum process	https://uvu.app.box.com/file/960024670368
11	Educomp	https://uvu.app.box.com/s/fqltbyl42m83mv6hct6gz1kq95veytls/file/961888575656
12	Utah Advising Structures	https://uvu.app.box.com/s/fqltbyl42m83mv6hct6gz1kq95veytls/file/961894925062
13	Weekly update emails	https://uvu.app.box.com/folder/164474410977