ADVISING LEADERSHIP TEAM MEETING NOTES
Monday, March 22, 2021
Zoom Meeting 2:00 pm - 3:30 pm


Absent: Ilaria Pesco

Action Items:
- L. Vega will consult with Debra Jackson about releasing the report from the Chancellor’s Office to the Student Success Network.
- L. Vega will bring up to Debra Jackson to consider adding a school-based advisor to the GI 2025 Committee.

Meeting began at 2:02 p.m.

Updates
- Issues of academic disqualification, delayed-registration and -graduation have increased with students who take courses through CSU Fully Online. If a student term withdraws from the matriculated campus but fails to withdraw from the CSU Fully Online course, which requires a separate process, problems ensued if their GPA falls below requirements. Academic advisors are asked to be watchful of these cases.
- There was a discussion about the budget in the statewide meeting. The budget has an addendum, also known as a budget trailer (AB-928), that will force some changes on advising. It is going through revisions and they do not have complete details. A singular lower division general education pathway might become a requirement of all students, impacting advising in the CSU.
- There is a partnership of San Francisco State University with the entertainment industry in Los Angeles. [https://www2.calstate.edu/CSUEA/Pages/default.aspx]. Dr. Dina Ibrahim with SFSU is creating entry level careers for apprenticeships in the entertainment industry for CSU Students. To get these internships, students typically pay around $1,500, but Dr. Ibrahim has negotiated so that students can pay around $300. L. Vega will share this information with the Center for Career Education and Community Engagement (CECE) department.
- The NACADA meeting had a presentation about how to provide more opportunities during advising and how we can reinvent or restructure advising to better assist students. L. Vega’s notes will be shared with the academic ALT.

CSU Graduation Initiative Report
L. Vega shared a report from the Chancellor’s Office with the group that summarizes the state of advising in the CSU system. The group shared their feedback about the report.

- A comment was made about how the report mentions adopting case management strategies and having a case manager for every student, but when a school grows bigger it does not address how we will have a case manager for each student.
- It was mentioned that the report states vague terms, for example “enhancing advising and intrusive advising,” and asking advisors to do more with the same number of resources. There does not seem to have a lot of direction and clarity in the report.
- How do you decide which students get help? At CSUB, most students are first generation college students, persons of color, single parent, and if we focus on one group of students then the others suffer.
- The Chancellor has focused on the equity gaps, so there will be more of a push on advising.
- Advisors are waiting for the advising proposal that is based on the InsideTrack report. That proposal may have a connection with this report and the expectations of everyone.
- It would be helpful to see a trajectory of a plan with realistic expectations of short-term and long-term goals.
- When we get reports from outside places without interpretive framework or messaging from our upper administration it leaves us “spinning.”
Referral #28 from an Academic Senate subcommittee was shared, and it had various questions around advising. In order to answer some of these questions, it was suggested that we need to do the leg work, do more research, review data, get IRPA involved, and compare what our campus is doing to other campuses.

There are concerns about not having shared governance and no strategic plan around advising. Whose role is it to develop a plan and implement it?

There was a suggestion to do the work amongst this group, and break into groups to be able to answer some questions from Referral #28, then create a plan and propose it. All the stakeholders may need to be a part of that conversation. The council for faculty advising meets separate from this group and they will have a new set of goals and ideas coming from there.

The message that seems to be coming across is that the administrators, or people in higher positions, are not happy with the work advisors do, but advisors are sometimes putting in 12 hours of work a day. Academic advisors cannot avoid a sense of helplessness when their passion for helping students is not acknowledged, or when new mandates increase workload, making them feel demoralized and susceptible to burnout.

ALT re-affirms the value of consultation with advisors when structural change is under consideration.

**Instruction Modalities Fall 2021 Update**

Administrative Support Coordinators (ASC’s) are entering the class notes in Peoplesoft and they will start showing up for everyone as the ASC’s continue to build the classes. L. Zuzarte is working with ITS to add an *Instruction Mode Legend* in the class search results in Peoplesoft, which will explain the different class modalities. Each class has a *Class Note* and an *Instruction Mode* which will be color coordinated. We are hoping this is ready when registration begins.

**Advising Representative for GI 2025 Committee**

K. Ziegler Lopez requested that when L. Vega speaks with Debra Jackson, that they consider adding a school-based advisor to the GI 2025 committee. Jaime Paschal was the school based advising representative of the GI 2025 committee. When she entered her new role in Enrollment Management during Summer 2020, she resigned from the committee and her vacancy has not been filled.

**Freshmen Housing Requirement for Fall 2021**

Ben Perlado sent an email out to the Student Success Network (SSN) on March 5th, regarding the First Time Freshmen housing requirement, and they identified admitted students to receive the service indicator. There was no communication that this was actually going to happen for Fall 2021, especially since we are still in a pandemic. The email stated that if anyone had questions, they should contact the housing department, and there will be many questions, considering there has not been further communication. There was a question about whether or not students currently living in the dorms, were going to be allowed to interact with each other, as many were feeling isolated. Advisors requested more information and guidelines around this matter.

**Academic Calendar Two Week Delay Start Dates**

The calendar was delayed 2 weeks for registration for continuing students. There were no changes to the dates for incoming freshmen and transfer students.

**Disqualified Students admitted after last day to add [Appeal of disqualification]/ Petition for re-admission**

L. Vega will note in his office to not allow students to be term activated for the upcoming term, if they do not submit Appeals at least 1 week before classes begin. If the appeal is approved, it will be for the following term. When advisors submit their approval for an appeal or petition, they can make their recommendation in an email to delay the approval for the following term.

**Mental Health Training Collaborative**

M. Medina Cruz has followed up with *Kern Behavioral Health and Recovery Services* and is waiting to hear back regarding the training in July. She will forward any responses to the ALT.

**Meeting ended at 3:15 p.m.**