



11/09/2021

Dear Faculty Senate Executive Committee,

Described below is a proposal for your consideration from the Professional Faculty Ad Hoc Review Committee 2.0 (PFAHRC2.0). We have outlined the proposal, background information, rationale for the proposal, and guiding procedural steps. The proposal, by design, is a high-level conceptualization with the expectation that details will be addressed in subsequent stages if there is support for the proposal to move forward.

Proposal. The PFAHRC2.0 recommends the creation of a three-tiered system of progression, within the position profile, for academic advisors/counselors currently employed at Oregon State University. Individual academic advisors/counselors would submit materials for evaluation demonstrating how they have met the eligibility standards that accompany the enhanced position opportunities from Academic Advisor/Counselor to Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor I and Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor II. Movement along this tiered system of progression acknowledges increased contributions through a title change, pay increase, and heightened responsibilities. In turn, academic advisors/counselors within these elevated tiers provide an enhanced impact on both their units and their students by covering additional work responsibilities, operating with more autonomy/higher levels of decision-making authority, and better serving the complex needs of OSU's student populations. In keeping with the existing practices related to promotional increases, the PFAHRC2.0 recommends that salary increases of 10% accompany shifts to Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor I and Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor II. Academic advisors/counselors new to Oregon State University would be hired at the level commensurate with their experience and skill set.

Background. In 2020, the Professional Faculty Ad Hoc Review Committee 1.0 successfully advocated for continuous employment status for Professional Faculty positions. In 2021, the PFAHRC2.0 was charged to consider enhanced position opportunities for Professional Faculty. The wide range of positions held by Professional Faculty at Oregon State University makes it nearly impossible to create a one size fits all model. Previous efforts toward an advising career ladder existed, so the PFAHRC2.0 directed its initial efforts there, with the thought that any adopted framework might serve as a springboard for other Professional Faculty position types. An initial meeting convened in May 2021 with time spent reviewing documentation that had been gathered in previous efforts. During our deliberations, we recognized that academic counselors are also aligned within the same Human Resources Position Profile (PR4 Consultant Academic Advisor/Counselor), so we adjusted our considerations to be inclusive of those positions as well.

Rationale. Academic advisors and academic counselors occupy important roles in support of the transitions, experience, and success of our students. They are expected to have wide-ranging expertise (institutional, curricular, relational) and work diligently to honor Oregon State University's [Advising Vision, Mission, Goals, and Commitments](#) and, yet, enhanced position opportunities (within position) do not clearly exist for these employees. This can lead to employee transitions, either within or beyond OSU, and result in a loss of expertise, continuity, time, and resources (specifically the posting, hiring, and training cycle). Oregon State University is not alone in this lack, nor is this a new problem. In September 2008, Iten and Mathey¹ wrote:

Does your institution have a mechanism to reward advisors for their breadth and depth of knowledge and their adeptness in assisting students through complicated academic situations? Or, in order to advance, are advisors forced to take their talents to administrative posts? If your institution falls into the second category, then you are in the majority.

Even when frontline advisors do not shift to administrative posts within academic advising or academic counseling, a route itself with limited options, they often shift to different units or colleges in search of professional growth and improved compensation. Iten and Mathey (2008) suggest the development of "career ladders" to encourage advisors' expertise, to reward deserving advisors, and avoid having advisors shift to administrative positions simply to move up. The authors point to longstanding practices at the University of Minnesota, nascent efforts (at the time of publication) within the University of California-Riverside, and pending (at time of publication) efforts at the University of Louisville. The University of Tennessee, Knoxville² employs a three-tiered model, but each of their levels require a master's degree, which is distinct from the PFAHRC2.0 proposal.

To counter this reality and allow interested academic advisor/counselors to remain and grow within position at Oregon State, the PFAHRC2.0 recommends that the Faculty Senate, Faculty Affairs, and University Human Resources develop a three-tiered system of progression within position profile, each accompanied by a level of compensation increase. We have provided some initial thoughts toward qualifications by level - affiliated with the elements of the position profile, [OSU's Advising Vision, Mission, Goals, and Commitments](#), and, ideally, their corresponding position descriptions (Appendix 1). We also provide an initial list by level of relevant items or activities to potentially include as an employee, or consider as a supervisor (Appendix 2). Just within the PR4 Consultant Academic Advisor/Counselor Professional Faculty position profile, a great deal of variability exists. To that end, we recommend the implementation of a submission process that allows for unique situational and

¹ Iten, C., & Matheny, A. (2008, September). Promoting academic advisors: Using a career ladder to foster professional development at your institution. *Academic Advising Today*, 31(3). Retrieved from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/Promoting-Academic-Advisors-Using-a-Career-Ladder-to-Foster-Professional-Development-at-Your-Institution.aspx>

²University of Tennessee, Knoxville. (2017). Academic advisor career path. Retrieved from the NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web Site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Portals/0/Resources/Clearinghouse/Documents/AcadAdvCareerPathUT2017.pdf>

contextual inputs (advisor vs counselor; centralized unit vs decentralized unit) within a consistent format (Appendix 3).

Guiding Steps. The PFAHRC2.0 has worked collaboratively with the Office of Faculty Affairs and University Human Resources via the ex-officio membership of Heather Horn. The following proposed steps have guided our discussions to date:

1. PFAHRC2.0 submits a recommendation of the high-level concept to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. After review and recommended edits, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee will send support of the recommendation to the Provost.
2. The Provost discusses and reviews the recommendation with the President. The Provost will respond to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with a determination and/or questions.
3. If a determination is made to move forward with the proposal, then the Provost will instruct Faculty Affairs and University Human Resources to determine the specific processes on how to implement the initiative. A process outline, details around remaining decision-points, etc., will be generated by Faculty Affairs and University Human Resources and shared with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the PFAHRC2.0. Faculty Affairs and University Human Resources shall provide regular updates to the PFAHRC2.0 as that group works on Steps 4 and 5.
4. PFAHRC2.0 works with the Faculty Senate Promotion & Tenure Committee on a recommended set of guidelines for review and movement into enhanced position opportunities. These guidelines are reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
5. PFAHRC2.0 provides the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with a final report on their work by the end of calendar year 2021. Criteria toward enhanced position opportunities presented for approval by the Faculty Senate before the end of AY2022.

We appreciate your consideration of this proposal and welcome your questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Malone, Chair, Cross Campus Strategic Initiatives

Membership:

Vicki Ebbeck, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Liaison
Erin Heim, College of Public Health & Human Sciences
Selina Heppell, Faculty Senate President
Heather Horn, ex-officio, Faculty Affairs and University Human Resources
Brett Jeter, College of Engineering
Rebekah Lancelin, Honors College
Michelle McAllaster, College of Agricultural Sciences
Dianna McGinnis, OSU-Cascades Advising
Janet Nishihara, Educational Opportunities Program
Vickie Nunnemaker, Faculty Senate Office
Kyle Ross, College of Business
Tristen Shay, College of Liberal Arts
Lizet Stone, Professional Faculty Leadership Association
Carlea White, Ecampus
Jordon Zardinejad, OSU-Cascades Academic Affairs

Appendix 1: Suggested Qualifications

Academic Advisor/Counselor: Qualifications

- Possess BA/BS degree
- Provide accurate educational information
- Effectively use Student Information Systems
- Articulate the meaning for the elements of the curriculum
- Assist students in reflection of educational, career, and life plans
- Monitor student academic progress
- Interpret and explain OSU and college academic policies, procedures, and requirements
- Refer students to appropriate academic and personal resources
- Articulate a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusivity
- Engage in personal assessment and self-development

Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor I: Qualifications

- All from initial level
- Role-related progressive experience for a period of at least three years
- Demonstrate commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusivity through participatory action
- Demonstrate continued success in advising/student services roles
- Continue professional/personal development
- Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of campus and community resources that support student success
- Navigate and use appropriate information technology and make data-driven decisions applicable to advising

Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor II: Qualifications

- All from initial level and level 1
- Role-related progressive experience for a period of at least three years since achieving Advisor 1
- Demonstrate leadership (i.e., Programmatic, Curricular, Institutional, or Professional Service)
- Demonstrate ability to develop, facilitate, and/or modify academic advising practices within a specific unit or in service to a subset(s) of students
- Demonstrate a level of independent decision-making beyond what is present/common at Advisor or Advisor 1 levels
- Facilitate individual or systemic change in support of diversity, equity, and inclusivity

Appendix 2: Suggested Measurables for Promotion Evaluation

Academic Advisor/Counselor: Measurables

- Record of degree(s)
- Participation in New Advisor Retreat/Quarterly Advising Town Halls/Advisor Coffee Talk forums
- Regular and routine use of the Office of the Registrar's Digest
- Academic Standing Committee, Academic Requirements Committee, Academic Advising Council, or other Faculty Senate process/involvement
- Department/college/OSU trainings or meetings
- Campus forums
- OSU Training Days
- IAR learning sessions
- Written statement on individual practice
- Professional development plan
- Personal philosophy of academic advising
- College-specific Advising Framework adherence
- MyDegrees meeting notes
- College progress/graduation checks/audits
- Students Taking Academic Responsibility (STAR) meeting materials
- Major intake/exit materials
- S/U/W contacts-drop in
- Proactive campaign evidence

Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor I: Measurables

- Minimum of 3 years in progressive experience
- History of minimum performance ratings of meeting expectations
- Social Justice Education Initiative/Search Advocate trainings
- Winter term advising learning community
- Conferences (i.e., NACADA, NCORE)
- Related webinars
- Group readings
- Self-designed reading curriculum
- Articulate needs of emerging student populations
- Connect academically at-risk students with appropriate resources
- Collect and distribute student needs and performance data
- Professional association participation
- Service component to university or unit
- Use of OSU dashboards and/or data reports
- Proposed changes to advising processes

Senior Academic Advisor/Counselor II: Measurables

- Minimum of 3 years in progressive experience (since achieving Advisor 1)
- History of minimum performance ratings of meeting expectations
- Continued demonstration of pursuit of level 1 indicators
- Possible instances of increased independence and decision making: New Student Orientation; OSU ADMS activities; student appts; Student seminars-workshops; student ambassador events-lead role; faculty/student connections; career events; departmental advising assessment
- Demonstrated leadership of inclusion and equity efforts within the unit and/or the larger advising community

Appendix 3: Submission Mechanism

- Establish a submission mechanism (perhaps via Qualtrics) that could be initiated either by employee or supervisor that seeks to capture the unique situational and contextual inputs within a consistent format. This mechanism could contain questions toward:
 - Demonstrating qualifications (to be completed by employee, peer, supervisor)
 - Goals met (to be completed by employee and supervisor)
 - Areas of strength (to be completed by employee, peers, supervisor)
 - Areas of growth (to be completed by employee, supervisor, peer)
 - Student voice around advisee experience (to be completed by students)