Ad Hoc Committee  
On  
College of Education Advising Center  
September 18, 2003

ATTENDING: Lee Kem, Marty Jacobs, Alesa Walker, Janice Hooks

This committee met to address the COE Advising Center – it has outgrown its current resources.

Dr. Watkins presented his perceptions related to the center:

1. Concerns – Blocking, Advising and staffing of advising center.
2. Blocking
   a. Information – Teacher Education Admission Criteria
   b. Language – “Must be admitted to Teacher Education to enroll in the following courses.” rather than “blocked.”
3. Possible solution:
   a. All freshman prospective candidates for admission to Teacher Education be classified as…
      • Unconditional [ACT score of 21 or above]
      • Conditional [ACT score o 19 or 20]
      • At Risk [ACT score of 18 or less]
   b. Required Action…
      • Unconditional
         o None
      • Conditional
         o Independent Study [Approved Professional Development Plan ~ PDP]
      • At Risk*
         o Course 099 [XXX Preparation Program] ?
         o Required Preparation Sessions

*Individualized Preparation Program

c. Exit Strategies…
   • Conditional Status
      o ACT score of 21 or higher
      o GPA  2.45 or higher
   • At-Risk Status
      o ACT score of 21 or higher
      o GPA  2.45 or higher

4. Staffing…
   • Faculty
   • Staff
   • Graduate Assistants
   • Tutors
   • Volunteer Retired Teachers
   • Etc
5. Advising
   With the exception of probationary and at-risk students, after the first year
students will be assigned to designated faculty members for academic
advising.

6. Staffing of Advising Center

This material was discussed by the committee.

1. The concept of Unconditional, Conditional and At-Risk students was accepted as
a classification system for mentoring.

   Dr. Kem noted that she does not receive ACT scores until
mid-semester which would preclude classification until that time.

   There is a move to have a second semester of EDU 099 (FYE) for all freshmen.
   Dr. Kem felt that there could be groups within the large groups focused on needs
outlined by the classification system during this semester.

2. The group agreed that unconditional and conditional students could be assigned to
a designated faculty member in the middle of the third semester. Dr. Kem noted
that all freshmen have holds which must be removed by their adviser –this system
will follow them to the sophomore year. Faculty within programs will need to
develop plans to mentor the conditional students to meet admission criteria. At-
risk students will remain as Dr. Kem’s advisees with intense mentoring (Myers-
Briggs, referral to Cindy Clemson, etc).

3. It was recognized that faculty must buy into this process. They must be given
sessions with respect to undergraduate advising programs and mentoring students
in ways to meet the admission criteria.

4. **Note –additional thoughts from Lee,**
   “another level to think about as we revise the scope of the A/C:
   There will be a major increase in work load for Brenda Owens as all these files are
transferred to her. These will need to be reassigned and then filed. Where will they be
filed? Who will maintain the files? Who will do all the filing each semester of info/MAP
reports/grades/etc? This involves many hours each semester in this office.
I like the idea of keeping students until the beginning of the sophomore year if students
are unconditional. If students are on conditional or at risk status, then I could work with
them in an EDU099 type course to upgrade skills, etc.
I do want all the incoming transfer students for at least the first semester. There is so
much info to know (that I already know) about transfer courses, etc., that this would be
adding an unnecessary layer for other faculty. With the Transfer O each fall semester,
this would be a logical progression.
Thanks for working with me for my sake, but also for the students. The students must be
the priority!