



**Task Force on Undergraduate Retention and Graduation:
Meeting Documentation
March 31, 2011**

Part 1. Attendance

Committee Numbers:	Lisa Axe, John Bechtold, John Cays, Barry Cohen, Ian Gatley, Jack Gentul, Sharon Morgan, Theodore Johnson, Judith Redling, Cheickna Sylla
Meeting Aim:	“It is the purpose of the Task Force on Undergraduate Retention and Graduation to complete an analysis of undergraduate retention and graduation and to recommend tactics for implementation that will yield improvements on both areas.” President Altenkirch Charge to the Committee, February 3, 2011
Meeting Date:	March 31, 2011
Meeting Time:	3:00 pm
Meeting Location:	398 Fenster Hall
Chair:	Ian Gatley
Vice Chair:	Jack Gentul
Meeting Purpose:	To review the ViSTA model for the task force; to focus on systems of advisement at NJIT

Part 2: Agenda

Agenda Items	
1	Approval of minutes from March 24
2	Review of ViSTA model report for end of March, 2011
3	Discussion of models for advisement and best practices in CoAD, NCE, CSLA, CCS, EOP, and ADHC.

Part 3: Discussion of Agenda

Discussion on Agenda Items	
1	The current system largely assumes that advising by faculty in a principal field of study is best. The charge of the committee today is to critically evaluate this assumption, reviewing current advisement models in each college.
2	(referring to handout of CoAD advising model). In CoAD, there is a bifurcation of roles. A professional advisor has had contact with students throughout UG career, while studio faculty (professionals engaged in the field) also participate in advising. Students have a variety of questions – both types of advisors can fully address. However, current advising does not address advising on major changes. CoAD advocates a confederacy of advisors (1 Design, 1 UG architecture, 1 Grad) that are available on a daily basis and can participate in early warning intervention. Faculty advisement should focus on professional development.
3	Advising should not be done in a vacuum. There has been good collaboration between CoAD and my office, for example. We will mediate when a change of major is advised.
4	Availability of advisors is critical. The depth of advising (prescriptive, developmental, intrusive) requires the time of a professional advisor. Consistent exposure of students to advisement is also important.
5	The CCS model is congruent to the CoAD model. A set of professional advisors works chronologically with students through UG career. There is little transfer out of college, but movement within college. These professional advisors manage these movements. Advisement is structured around a three-credit sequence of seminars; professional advisors lead, and bring in alumni from industry for career advisement. The professional advisors also manage co-ops and internships. Faculty mentoring comes into play with the professional societies.
6	In NCE, there is a full-time advisor in ECE only, much like the CCS model. There is faculty mentoring in the professional societies. Availability and preparation of faculty for other than professional development advising (i.e. prescriptive, developmental and intrusive) is a challenge.
7	Jessica Binns advises all undergraduates; faculty are involved in IAC and other clubs. There are lots of problems with students that need to be addressed.
8	Math advisors are all faculty members. There are 6-8 advisors based on student interests. They are available during posted office hours. Students need faculty input when signing up for a double major. This system works well for the Math dept.
9	There is a professional advisor in Biology (Karen Roach); Roumiana Petrova

	(University Lecturer) advises students in Chemistry. Chuck Brooks advises UND CSLA students. There also is a pre-law and pre-med advisor in CSLA.
10	In ADHC, a professional advisor, Dawn Klimovich, advises students through years 1-3. Atam advises year 4+.
12	Please review Student Senate document on expectations of advisors. There are a lot of “action” words. Accessibility is critical.
13	There are a total of 600+ students in EOP. There is a separate professional advisor for every cohort (Freshman through Senior). Each advisor has approx 150 students.
14	We need to take into consideration HS behaviors. A professional advisor is more accessible and less intimidating.
15	Faculty involvement must be an essential component of any advising system.
15	There are clearly different flavors of advising. A central network where advisors can meet and share information and ideas is essential. I’d like to call a motion for this committee to recommend a professional model of advisement with involvement of faculty in professional development.
16	The motion has a second.
17	All vote. Vote in favor is unanimous.

Part 4: Action Items from Agenda

Action on Agenda	
1	Analysis of best practices in advising models at benchmark institutions.
2	Define common goals of professional advisement and faculty involvement.
3	Analyze plan to incorporate professional advising model of student advisement into learning communities
4	Discuss advising of undecided students and managing changes of major.

Part 5: Remaining Questions for Resolution at Next Meeting

Questions	Individual
-----------	------------

to be Answered		Best Able to Provide Answers
1	What sections of the ViSTA model are at the three levels of evaluation?	IG, JG, JR
2	What work remains before the committee before the final report is due to the president on May 15, 2011?	IG, JG, JR
3	How may we increase our web presence for the task force, its processes, and its findings for all shareholders, including MSCHE?	JR, NE