

Proposal for Policy Change to UWEC Advising Requirement Prior to Registration

An email requesting feedback from department chairs and program directors regarding the policy proposal was sent out on March 12th, 2019 by the University Senate Academic Policy Chair upon the request of the APC committee. Deadline for feedback was April 12th, 2019. Feedback was received from seventeen departments/programs (15 departments/2 programs) and one dean. Six departments/programs supported the proposal and eleven departments/programs were opposed to the proposal. The table (on page 2) truncates the feedback that was provided over the 1-month open period. The statements within the table that are *italicized* and in **bold** print are statements that were shared among multiple departments/programs. Also, included below are comments/suggestions made by the departments/programs regarding the role of Advising, Retention, and Career Center (ARCC) on campus.

Additional Comments/Suggestions

1. ARCC does a good job of seeing students through their core LE requirements.
2. ARCC should be directed to find ways to encourage majors to engage with their departments and programs.
3. Desire for ARCC to continue to marshal its resources towards the first- and second-year students to aid retention rates.
4. The ARCC advisors in the first two years should be helping students read their degree audits. This will allow them to discern their requirements (and getting students to triple check that they are registered correctly for their degree requirements).
5. Any amendments to the proposal should be minimum in scope, such as requiring ARCC pre-registration advising for all freshmen, sophomore, and junior undergraduates.
6. Why aren't ARCC advisors requiring the use of 4-yr planners to address what seems to be the problem? Why aren't student peer advisors being used to address the workload of ARCC advisors (at the very least, the student peer advisors could help underclassmen load their 4-yr planners)
7. Departments/Programs request the flexibility to work collaboratively with ARCC advisors on an individual department level to create the most efficient advising process possible.

In Support of Proposal	In Opposition of Proposal
<i>For majors with higher advising load, the change is welcomed</i>	<i>Policy change results in new hires for ARCC and less resources to hire IAS/Tenure-Track faculty</i>
Student resolution supported policy change if faculty advisors are intentionally involved in the process	<i>For majors with lower advising load, the change is unwelcomed because current policy has already resulted in diminished student/faculty advisor contact</i>
Increases accountability efforts on behalf of ARCC and Enrollment Management	Diminished student/faculty advisor contact will increase the misinformation and “misadvising” from ARCC advisors
	<i>ARCC advisors are not well versed to provide career and graduate/professional school information to upper classmen. Faculty advisors are more suited for this endeavor</i>
	Potential to weaken student’s relationship with their respective departments, some departments rely on fostering these relationships to recruit and retain students
	No compelling data has been provided to support requiring PAC codes for upper division students would increase 4-year graduations rates
	<i>Does not believe that ARCC has the staff to handle the work load without drastically reducing time spent on advising visits</i>
	Despite the good intentions within the student resolution, proposal may have negative impact on “Discovery” majors
	Department chairs are better suited to initiate and file substitutions
	ARCC advisors already have too much on their plate and this has negatively impacted some experiences for students. These experiences must be straightened out by faculty advisors leading to frustration with the current model
	<i>Limited or no data has been presented to suggest how effective this new model has been at other institutions</i>
	Proposal change may impact student’s ability to register for courses in a timely fashion
	Proposal change undermines student responsibility and independence, especially for students in their third and fourth years
	Unnecessary hurdle for students who are excelling and/or doing well matriculating through their respective majors
	Unclear of what issues the proposal is attempting to resolve and/or benefits from proposed change