	OE RESOURCE REQUEST APPLICATION
Operational Excellence	

University of California, Berkeley

I. SPONSORSHIP

A. Initiative

Initiative	Student Services		
Initiative Manager	Anne De Luca		
Phone	642-2261	E-Mail	OEStudentServices@berkeley.edu

B. Sponsorship

Sponsor Name	Vice Provost Cathy Koshland		
Sponsor Signature		Date	
Sponsor Name			
Sponsor Signature		Date	
OE Program Office Signature		Date	

C. Give the title of the resource

Creation of an Advising Council

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT/CASE FOR CHANGE

A. Identify and describe what needs the proposed solution is seeking to address.

At UC Berkeley, there is no unified vision or standards of practice for academic and co-curricular advising, and many advising supervisors are not familiar with professional literature or the training necessary to build and maintain a highly effective advising program and practice. We have a plethora of policies and resources to assist students with meeting their academic and personal development goals and needs. Navigating this labyrinth can be daunting. Advisers, both curricular and co-curricular, translate policy and help connect the dots that lead to degree completion.

While we have many outstanding individual professionals and programs, our current system, in which each college, academic department and co-curricular program is expected to develop its own policies and processes is problematic for several reasons:

- On many occasions, students must see multiple advisers to receive the information they require, and at times, receive contradictory guidance or misinformation due to a lack of advising standards or a structure for efficiently communicating and training advisors on best practices or emerging student development theories. Other times, they may never receive crucial information because they are unaware of whom to consult, or key information is missing from the source they commonly access. This results in student frustration and mistrust of UCB systems and departments.

- Staff members across many departments spend a great deal of time creating and maintaining duplicate or very similar processes and systems, usually without knowledge of each other's systems. This is a poor use of time, which may result in missing or delayed service for students and colleagues. It also is a missed opportunity for assessing ongoing efficiencies and savings.

- There is limited or non-existent formal coordination and collaboration among units that should be interdependent from a student outcome perspective. When such dependencies are identified, they often remain unchanged and unresolved due to interdepartmental conflicts based on philosophy, standards and reporting lines. This results in students having a less than seamless educational experience at UCB.

- There is no institutional level assessment of programs, service and knowledge, and therefore no way to identify institutional efficiencies or gaps in services.

This lack of communication and shared philosophy, inconsistent training and standards, along with the inability to assess how well we manage curricular and co-curricular advising has created a campus where students either ignore or avoid essential professional advising or seek only the department professionals they deem to be the "good" staff versus staff they feel don't have their best interest at heart. We hypothesize that this may have resulted in depressed alumni giving, particularly compared to other schools of our caliber.

B. Describe the solution that is being proposed to meet the identified need(s).

In order to address the complex nature of the particular advising problems above, we recommend:

(1) **The establishment of an Advising Council --** a single governing body working to achieve advising excellence through assessment, knowledge sharing, training, and talent development. The Council will manage and develop the shared policies, procedures and practices across curricular and co-curricular departments.

2. Advising Administrator (1.0 FTE Temporary 5 years) – Creation of a temporary position to oversee the formation and implementation of standards, training and assessment. The incumbent will report to Vice Provost Cathy Koshland and will be charged with guiding the Advising Council through its formative years. The goal is to develop a Council that is ultimately self-sustaining through a volunteer committee, with a rotating chair. The incumbent will guide the Council until that point.

This critical position is necessary because the formation of the Council, the implementation of the standards, and the training protocols on all new technology tools for advisors require the full time focus of a professional. We considered building an Advising Council without recommending the Advising Administrator position, using only the volunteer efforts of managers and administrators who served on the committee, but agreed that we needed a dedicated high-level staff member with the authority and responsibility to ensure that the work get done. The task of this paradigm shift is also too formidable and important for a group of over-extended managers to complete part-time. It requires the full time attention of a champion.

(3) **A shared campus-level integrated technological system** that will render tools to allow advisers to better share information across departments and provide better tools for students to track degree progress and institutional resources online. This solution is documented in another Resource Request Application (Technology and Tools to Support Excellence in Advising -Creation of an Advising Tool Kit), but mentioned here because authority for use for these systems will be governed by the Advisory Council recommended in this application.

ADVISING COUNCIL STRUCTURE
- A Advising Administrator (a newly created position) with the authority and responsibility to manage the work of the Council and ensure that the work move forward.
- The Council members must have authority and control resources, e.g. Program Directors, Head Advisors within Colleges, or must be new professionals with their fingers on the pulse of professional literature and best practices. The Council will be a balance between grassroots and top down.
- The Council must have executive sponsors, who set benchmarks and deliverables. These executive sponsors should be Harry LeGrande, Cathy Koshland, Gibor Basri and Andrew Szeri.

ADVISING COUNCIL VISION
- To work with the campus leaders and directors to create a shared vision for advising on campus.
- To coordinate and help to develop the training for new and continuing advisors on campus.
- To develop effective campus-wide assessment tools for individual advisors and programs and to ensure that regular assessment takes place, is evaluated, and recommendations are developed in response.

ADVISING COUNCIL OUTCOMES
We recommend the Council work in collaboration with staff of the Center for Organizational & Workforce Effectiveness (COrWE), Graduate Division, the Office of Planning & Analysis (OP&A) and Human Resources (HR)
- to form a comprehensive means of on-boarding, mentoring and training of all campus curricular and co-curricular advisers, by complementing the already existing training on campus, as well as developing training for current and prospective advising staff on campus.
- to develop campus-wide individual standards and assessment of performance for curricular and co-curricular advisors. ,
- to develop program/department standards and assessment of those programs.
This can be achieved through more comprehensive training and a moderate increase in the FTE of COrWE and OP&A which will collaborate with members of the Advising Council to better meet the needs of advising professionals here at Cal.

With these improvements, advisors within departments will have a common knowledge of and understanding of the basic level of service that is expected to be delivered to students.

C. Describe the alternate approaches you evaluated in the process of developing this proposal and why those alternatives were not selected.

1. Over the years two reports have addressed the need for an Advising Infrastructure. While we drew heavily upon both, we are not recommending either in its entirety
   a. In September, 2009, the Advising Task Force, which had been convened by Christina Maslach in 2008, recommended a tri-level governance structure for advising on campus. We determined that the structure was too bureaucratic and that the roles of the three levels were not clearly thought out.
   b. In 2004, a proposal was developed by a group AdvisorNet to create a centralized governing body. Elements of this proposal were adopted by the Advising Task Force.
   Neither report addresses fully the interconnectedness of curricular advising and co-curricular advising particularly given the suite of resources available on campus
2. We considered expanding the role of the current Advising Network Council (ANC). While the ANC is a wonderful informal guild the volunteer members lack authority. It relies on the donation of FTE from departments above and beyond the job description of the coordinating members. It therefore, cannot be the primary body for developing the needed infrastructure.
3. We considered building an Advising Council without recommending the Advising Administrator position, using only the volunteer efforts of managers and administrators who served on the committee, but agreed that we needed a dedicated high-level staff member with the authority and responsibility to ensure that the work get done. The task of this paradigm shift is also too formidable and important for a group of over-extended managers to complete part-time. It requires the full time attention of a champion.
4. Creation of a campus-wide academic advising center. Through numerous meetings with students, staff, faculty and deans, we determined there is current value in retaining advising within the departments. We believe that once an effective assessment program in place, we can effectively determine the value of our college advising offices in the future.
5. Maintain the status quo - We have no mechanism to assess our advising programs on campus and therefore no manner in which we can determine efficiencies and provide better support to students. Maintaining the status quo does not move in the direction of Operational Excellence. We lose the opportunity to grow our alumni donor base.

III. IMPACT AND STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

A. Describe how the proposed solution aligns with the OE goals:
- Reduce administrative costs and enable the campus to direct more resources to teaching and research
- Advance an effective and efficient operating environment
- Instill a culture of continuous improvement that leads to high quality performance and outcomes

Instill a culture of continuous improvement that leads to high quality performance and outcomes:
- There will be greater coordination of advising efforts through a shared philosophy for advising, advising standards, and centralized advising tools (as recommended by OE Resource Request "Technology and Tools to Support Excellence in Advising -- Creation of an Advising Tool Kit"). This will result in a consistent advising experience for students regardless of the department from which they are receiving the advising. There will be a decrease in the number of errors and less

miscommunication with students. Advisors will not be duplicating the work of others. The cumulative result will be increased staff time with students, increasing the quality of the advising. Students will spend less time managing avoidable advising errors and thus will spend more time on the curricular and co-curricular activities, thus enhancing their Berkeley experience.

- Creating campus-wide metrics for assessment of individuals and programs allows us to continually make small, affordable adjustments to our practices as we keep pace with the future (Win the Future with Assessment) The new alignment will help the university achieve its WASC* accreditation goals

  WASC has created The Educational Effectiveness Framework and institutions are now rated for accreditation on metrics such as assessment and standards as they relate to student learning in curricular and co-curricular activities. We must create a mechanism for assessing our effectiveness in these areas and be prepared to answer the questions in these areas during WASC campus visits.

Effective and efficient operating environment
- There will be cost savings in a number of areas, e.g. $940K/annually for policy development, currently done in individual departments, advising students who are simply confused because they do not have access to information about their finances $1,100K/annually, or their degree status $37K/annually.
- Increased use of efficient technology tools will decrease paperwork, and increase productivity, record keeping and student case management.
- If we develop common technological platforms across campus departments, we can develop a single set of training modules for each. All advisors will be able to be trained using the same materials, and the knowledge will transfer across departments when advisors move, allowing for a faster start up in a new position.
- Supervisors of advising staff will decrease time it takes to manage performance, orient and train new staff and take corrective action. This will free up time for them to advise as well as engage in managerial activities such as budget management and fundraising

B. Identify any other anticipated benefits in implementing the proposed solution.

1. Creation of an Advising Council will create a clear channel for vetting advising issues and disseminating information on new policy and professional development. The result will be more accurate and consistent advising across the institution.
2. Our campus will be connected to a larger advising community within higher education, ensuring that we can institute the latest theories, best practices, and technologies.
3. Greater collaboration across departments will lead to greater creativity, making UCB a model for our peer institutions.
4. Create equity among the colleges in terms of access to tools and essential information on policy changes.

5. The student experience will be enhanced. Consistent and uniform advising creates a level playing field for all students regarding access to information.
6. Staff will spend more time on satisfying work, which will increase morale, productivity and creativity.
7. We anticipate a reduction in training time as advisers change jobs on the campus.

C. Identify the risks of not implementing the solution.

1. The University will not benefit from the savings in staff time that will result from the implementation of an Advising Council.
2. We risk creating a work environment that does not attract or retain top professionals, particularly new professionals from the top higher education administration graduate programs. We lose the ability to continually improve as a result of the fresh ideas new staff bring from other institutions--particularly ideas vetted through research in the field of education.
3. Lack of cohesion and integration of curricular and co-curricular units leads to an incoherent and fragmented learning experience for students.
4. We will need the Advising Council in place in order to be positioned to best adopt the new tools that are being created. There must be a centralized, organized effort to train staff on newly adopted technological enhancements.

D. Describe the constituency that is intended to benefit from the proposed solution (e.g. students, faculty, staff, 1-many units)

1. All Students
2. All Faculty
3. All Advising Staff

E. Describe the extent to which this proposed solution is a collaborative effort either within campus or with external partners.

This is a highly collaborative effort, directly involving staff from academic, administrative, student affairs and wellness units under the administrations of the Vice Provost for Teaching Learning, Academic Planning & Facilities, the Graduate Division, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Vice Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion, as well as collaboration with units under Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance (Tang, ASUC), and Vice Chancellor for Research (BIO).

F. If applicable, describe how the proposed solution may enable additional projects to be considered.

1. High Performance Culture Initiative- E-Performance
2. Technology and Tools to Support Excellence in Advising (Creation of an Advising Tool Kit)
3. Student portal & student systems
4. This body would be essential to implement the 5 RRAs for the Student Services Initiative Technological tools.

G. What is the impact of the proposed solution on the existing systems and processes? Does it eliminate the need for existing systems and processes?

1. There are a number of departmentally based systems in place to support student advising. With a common infrastructure, we will be better positioned to leverage those systems/databases across the campus and eliminate systems that are redundant, dated and inefficient.
2. If we move to an online system for what is now a paper process, and integrate different systems, we will be able to streamline a number of processes.
3. This solution will result in a change in the process of hiring and performance management, i.e. holding advisors to the same standards across campus and implementing an individual assessment process. This will ensure viable succession planning as well as alignment with the higher education job market in general.
4. Shared assessment tools and protocol will eliminate individually developed department surveys and reduce any staff time currently devoted to this enterprise.

H. What is the impact on the proposed solution on the workload?
See details of efficiencies within the attached budget

IV. WORK PLAN AND PROPOSED SOLUTION DESIGN

A. Provide a statement of:
● Deliverables — results the solution must deliver to achieve the stated objectives.
● Constraints — factors that may limit the options for providing the solution (*e.g., an inflexible deadline*).

Deliverables

CREATE AN ADVISING COUNCIL, THE WORK OF WHICH WILL BE TO ACHIEVE ADVISING EXCELLENCE THROUGH ASSESSMENT, KNOWLEDGE/TRAINING, AND TALENT DEVELOPMENT;: Resulting in an advising program that provides a robust academic and co-curricular experience for every student. (see Appendix A)

" A decentralized culture like Berkeley's requires a nimble central administration, one that not only negotiates key initiatives and creates resources for furthering them, but also with the authority to fix problems and see that commitments are followed through. The more the "Berkeley Way" is followed the more centralized the support services need to be. This is especially true for data gathering functions, where "one stop shopping" for accurate information will benefit faculty and staff alike. "
(p 12, WASC Visiting Team, 2004)

● Identify Advising Council members and draft charter
● Identify council staffing FTE, draft duties and agree on reporting line
● Recruit and select a Managing Administrator.
● Define campus advising philosophy and vision for delivery of service to students
● Formulate the campus-wide metrics to use for the assessment of effectiveness and efficiencies gained

through implementation of advisor performance standards
- Draft plan for development, implementation and assessment of department/program standards
- Using data from assessment of program/department standards, make common-good recommendations to campus administrators
- Using data from assessment of program/department standards, assist department directors/deans in improvement of services

CREATE SHARED STUDENT SERVICE DELIVERY STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT: All student service programs and departments that conduct curricular and co-curricular advising are mindful of the vision for achieving excellence. Excellence may be achieved through the implementation of shared standards for all programs and departments as well as the creation of standards unique to each program/department. This will set the foundation to better articulate and assess outcomes. (See Appendix C)

Universities are often guided in determining their student learning outcomes as a function of the accreditation process. UC Berkeley's accrediting body, Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), explicitly evaluates Educational Effectiveness (EE) in the review process. In the last WASC review the following was stated

"The team believes that "articulating and embracing a shared vision" of student learning outcomes is critical to enhancing the quality of student learning at Berkeley." (WASC, 2004) In the the last year WASC has evolved the review process to include a more explicit rubric "The Educational Effectiveness Framework"

The Educational Effectiveness Framework along with other national organization standards such as Council on the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) & National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), can serve as a canon from which to articulate program/department standards of which student learning outcomes will be among the measures.

- Advising Council drafts plan for development, implementation and assessment of department/program standards
- Incremental development and implementation through strong collaborations with programs/departments
- Scheduled periodic assessment of each UCB student service, followed by data analysis, recommendations and implementation (Partner with Office of Planning and Analysis)

CREATE A PROGRAM FOR TRAINING AND ON-BOARDING OF CURRICULAR AND CO-CURRICULAR ADVISING STAFF, SUPERVISORS AND MANAGERS: Create an orientation process whereby regardless of the department, all UC Berkeley newly hired curricular and co-curricular advisers receive a consistent and universal on-boarding experience that is unique and separate from all other University Orientation processes. Additionally, assess current workshops and online learning tools that directly address skill and knowledge development needed for success of curricular and co-curricular advisers at UC Berkeley, and supplement those, or supplant those with workshops and learning tools to create a robust training program for current and prospective advisors. These programs will need to be tailored to the subcultures that require different kinds of training, e.g. undergraduate

advising, graduate advising, co-curricular advising, etc. (See Appendix B)

- Advising Council commissions an ad-hoc committee and monitors design of project. (Partner with COrWE, Graduate Division and Human Resources)
- Advising Council and Management of COrWE, Graduate Division and HR determine how current training and trainers will be adapted to implement new advisor training modules and orientation program.
- Scheduled periodic assessment of training and orientation programs followed by data analysis, recommendations and implementation (Partner with Office of Planning and Analysis)
- Explore the creation of an academic program for training future higher education professionals. Such a program will allow graduate students to hold entry level paraprofessional positions within UCB curricular and co-curricular advising departments, which will lighten the workload of full time professionals and allow for some expansion of services at low cost. (e.g of programs at UCLA, USC, U. Penn, U. Maryland College Park and Michigan)

CREATE INDIVIDUAL PROFESSIONAL ADVISING STANDARDS: Job expectations and performance appraisals (E-performance) are aligned with shared and articulated campus and individual standards for advising. (See Appendix C)

- Advising Council drafts plan for development, implementation and assessment of shared individual standards as an addition to current HR performance management tools
- Incremental development and implementation through strong collaborations with programs/departments
- Coordination with Human Resources to include the new standards in job families, job standards and within performance management (E-performance)
- Coordination with COrWE, Graduate Divisions, etc. to align standards with training and e-learning
- Implement into adviser performance management (annual appraisal, skill development, and career development), supervisors and managers make recommendations for training and advancement as appropriate. (Partner with Human Resources)

Constraints
1. Time and availability of potential council members.
2. Bureaucracy required to adjust adviser job descriptions to include standards of practice.
3. Lack of resources for involvement in professional organizations.
4. Resistance to assessment due to time, staffing, fear of loss of autonomy, and/or fear of change in culture

B. Provide a work plan for the proposed solution with high-level steps to complete the solution, including timeline. (Try to limit your plan to no more than seven steps.)

	MILESTONE	TIMELINE
1.	Determine council membership, draft charter for council,	3 months

	and identify support staff	
2	Determine goals, objectives, and work plan and communicate plan to campus	2 months
3.	Create & roll out individual advising standards and assessment	6 months
4.	Create & roll out program standards and assessment	18 months
5.	Create & roll out training modules	8-12 months
6.	Create & roll out on-boarding and mentoring program	2 months
7.	Roll out plan for recognizing outstanding programs and individual contributors	2 months
8.	Oversight of the design and assessment Advising Tech Tools	ongoing

C. What are the data requirements for the proposed solution?

- Information on other campus advising councils for best practices and bench marking
- Profile of Berkeley students (UCUES, Student Data Warehouse)
- Information on current systems/practices and need of each curricular and co-curricular advising units
- Alumni giving and other development data

D. What are the technical requirements for the proposed solution?

- e-Performance
- Expertise in retrieving data
- Expertise in business analysis
- Expertise in higher education assessment
- Expertise in training managers and supervisors in strategic planning
- Expertise in training curricular and co-curricular student affairs professionals

E. What are the greatest risks for the proposed solution and the plan to reduce or eliminate the risks.

	RISK	MITIGATION PLAN
1.	Resistance to assessment	• Involve cross-section of population in the assessment design
2.	Resistance to adopt new systems	• Demonstrate benefit • Use leadership spine - communication from someone trusted • Beta groups - early adopters
3.	Workload concerns	• Explain impact • Demonstrate results particularly highlighting those that are immediate • Set up on-line shared website for solutions/discussions • Honesty about amount of work
4.	Resistance to "cultural change" (i.e. recognizing advising as core to mission, adopting professional acumen/standards)	• Active benchmarking with other universities to educate campus on benefits of incorporating professional standards to all constituencies
5.	Resistance to "yet another	• Distinguish the council as a source of governance (versus a

committee." We already have so many advising-related committees which include advising leaders. Why another one?	community of practice) and collaboration that articulates and maintains the standards necessary to ensure the quality of a core service (along the lines of teaching and research). • Benchmark the development of our council with other campuses who have achieved success in effective advising programs and systems.

F. How does the proposed work plan allow for evaluation and course correction to ensure the outcomes meet the campus needs?

The Council will be charged with developing a mission/vision and strategic plan and setting up the expectation that individual advisers and programs will connect their work to the overall plan by developing outcomes and assessment tools. All involved will conduct regular evaluation to determine if outcomes are realized, and devise plans for addressing shortcomings.

VI. CHANGE MANAGEMENT

A. What is the change management plan to successfully implement the outcomes of the proposed solution?

I. Who will be impacted by the proposed change?
A. 36,000 Students: 25,000 Undergraduate, 11,000 Graduate and Professional School Students
B. 720 Advisors: curricular (academic), co-curricular, personal counseling (Tang), and all Faculty involved in advising/mentoring grads & undergrads
C. All curricular and co-curricular advisers, supervisors and managers. As well as staff involved in the following activities:
   1. Building technical tools.
   2. Managing transactional services essential to tracking student petitions and progress.
   3. Mining and analyzing student data.
   4. Developing assessment plans.
   5. Training and consulting on professional practices and business processes.

II. How will they be impacted?
  A. Students:
   1. Seamless service; less confusion in navigating the various services on campus.
   2. Education and guidance in developing a full curricular (major, preparation for graduate school) and co-curricular (service experience, civic engagement, skill building, personal growth, social adjustment, career planning) experience.
  B: Staff and Faculty:
   1. New and honed professional vision and skills.

2. Accountability for adhering to policy and practices as decreed by Advising Council.

3. Competency in employing best practices for completing administrative tasks at Berkeley in an effective and efficient manner.

4. Technical tools that aid in tracking student progress more comprehensively and expediently.

5. Understanding of the role they play in the larger effort of student progress and achievement

6. Support of an infrastructure that acknowledges dependencies and inspires collaboration.

C. Administration:

1. Acknowledgement of advising as core to the education, research and public service mission of Berkeley.

2. Accountability for creating an infrastructure for training and oversight of an advising program.

3. An influential body (i.e. Advising Council) that can offer systemic solutions, maintain high standards of practice befitting a campus like Berkeley, and ensure adherence to policy.

III. What new competencies will be required to successfully deliver the desired changes?

A. Technical & Managerial: Any new skills necessary to use Advising Tools; Business Process Analysis; Facilitation Skills.

B. Professional: As outlined by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) and professional organizations such as NACADA (National Academic Advising Association), NASPA (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators), ACPA (American College Personnel Association), NCORE (National Conference on Race & Ethnicity in Higher Education), NODA (National Orientation Directors Association), etc.

C. Strategic Planning: Developing mission/vision, articulating outcomes, creating assessment tools.

IV. How will these new competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) be acquired? Will they be developed in-house or hired in? If developed in-house, what learning strategies will be used (training, education, coaching, etc.)?

A. On boarding & continued training sponsored by the Advising Council and utilizing materials offered by CAS and professional organizations along with staff from COrWE, the Graduate Division and HR via orientation, workshops, campus conference.

B. Participation in communities of practice BPAWG, CAN, Webinars, etc.

C. Participation in conferences Webinars and "Stay Day" on campus, and professional conferences.

D. Screencasts/"how to videos" for technical tools.

V. What is the communication plan for keeping stakeholders informed?

The Advising Council would be charged with devising a communication plan that would create vehicles for **soliciting** input from all constituencies (students, staff, faculty, administration), **disseminating** information and mandates to supervisors of advisers, and **providing counsel** to sponsors and administrators.

VI. How will you measure success?

● As indicating by surveys such as UCUES and assessment tools, evidence of students' high regard for advising programs and services.

- Feedback from new advisers acknowledging effective, comprehensive, and engaging on-boarding/training programs.
- Student outcomes as articulated by the Council, programs, departments have been realized.
- Retention of highly skilled advising professionals.
- Adherence to campus policies.
- Business processes that run smoothly with as few steps as possible.
- Advising programs and individuals that are recognized as exemplary in performance review and by professional organizations and other campuses.

B. What incentives and/or disincentives are proposed to influence behavioral changes necessary for the successful outcome of the proposed solution?

Incentives
- Value from recognition that the work of advising is core to the success of the institution.
- Acknowledgement that the institutional vision for excellence in teaching and research applies to staff efforts in advising as well.
- Persuasive and informed visionary leadership that inspires hard work and dedication.
- Clarity of job expectations that match the student affairs marketplace across higher education.
- Positive performance feedback.
- Training and tools that help in being more informed and effective.
- Opportunities to enhance professional skills and career development.
- Students' high regard for services, as reflected through ongoing assessment.
- Student success in realizing all that Berkeley has to offer.
- Promotion and awards.

Disincentives
- Poor performance appraisals
- Continued short comings in assessment data can lead to decrease department/program fund
- Reputation of the campus as substandard for the advancement of professional skills.
- Status quo in maintaining practices and systems that are not sustainable.
- Continued inequity of training and resources across campus.

C. Who has been identified as the change leaders and implementers to carry out the changes necessary for the successful outcome of the proposed solution?

Change Leaders
1. Sponsors of student services initiative: Cathy Koshland & Harry LeGrande
2. Assistant Vice Provost Cynthia Schrager
3. Liz Elliott, Director, COrWE
4. Advising Directors, Supervisors, Analysts: Anne Aaboe, Mary Howell, Rebecca Miller, Katie Dustin, Dale Masterson, Susan Hagstrom, Kimberly Johnson, Billy Curtis, Steve Sutton, Anne De Luca, Sharon Joyce, Jonathan Poullard, Troy Gilbert, Cara Stanley, Derek van Rheenan, Eva Rivas, Ivor Emmanuel, Carla Trujillo, Moira Perez, Claudia Covello

Implementation Team Member Recommendations:
1. Existing groups:, The Advising Network Council, L & S Departmental Advisory Group, SAO Supervisors Group
2. Additional curricular & Co-curricular advisors: Alexis Bucknam, Susan Cass, Derek van Rheenan, Eva Rivas, Kim Guilfoyle, Lynn Huntsinger, Mary Howell, Megan Voorhees, Marcia Gee Riley, Claudia Covello, Fabrizo Mejia.
3. Staff from the Office of Planning & Analysis/SRC

VII. FUNDING MODEL AND BUDGET

A. Could the proposed solution move forward with partial funding? If yes, describe the revised scope, including the associated savings impact.

No, it cannot. We need to centralize the organization of this effort and cannot rely upon already over-burdened manager, advisors and supervisors to care out extra time to create standards, metrics for assessment, etc. Partial funding would only decrease our current service delivery.

B. What is the plan for sustainable funding to support ongoing operations of the proposed solution?

Considering options within the EVCP portfolio to support the small amount of ongoing costs relative to the savings which can be identified through better advising.

C. Please download and fill out the OE Resource Request Budget Template located and follow the instructions on the first worksheet in the workbook to complete the budget and line descriptions. Include both completed sheets with the Resource Request.

VIII. ASSESSMENT PLAN

Please use the table below to detail your metrics.

METRIC CATEGORY	SPECIFIC MEASURE	MEASURE BASIS	DATA COLLECTION METHOD	DATA COLLECTION FREQUENCY	FUNCTIONAL OWNER OF DATA COLLECTION	LARGER GOAL TO WHICH METRIC RELATES
EXAMPLES:						
FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE						
1 Reduction in average price of office supplies	*Avg price*	*Per item*	*Look at vendor catalogs*	*Quarterly, first day of each quarter*	*Procurement Director*	*Overall reduction of 15% in average price of office supplies*
OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE						

1 Reduction in average processing time per transaction	*Avg person-hours required*	*Per transaction*	*Survey of transaction processors*	*Semi-annually*	*Director of Billing*	*Reduction of 20% in average transaction processing time*
FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE						
1. Reduction of FTE in efforts that are duplicated and/or could be centralized	Avg person hours required	Per transaction	Business process analysis on relevant process	Annually	Unit head	As defined by Advising Council initiative
2						
OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE						
1. Effectiveness Advising council/infrastructure for maintaining advising standards	Effectiveness rating of initiative and/or policy	Per specific initiative and/or policy	Outcome assessment	Annually	Chair of Council or Sponsors	Achieve high level of effectiveness
2. Effectiveness of Individual Advisor	Performance rating	Per job expectations guided by CAS Standards	Performance appraisel	Annually	Supervisor	Achieve high level of effectiveness
3.						
PRODUCT / SERVICE QUALITY						
1. Effectiveness Advising Program	Effectiveness rating of program	Per goals of program guided by CAS Standards	Outcome assessment	Annually	Program lead	Achieve high level of effectiveness
2.						
EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION						
1. High satisfaction with job and program standards	Satisfaction score	Per individual	Survey of advising staff	Annually	Advising Council or Supervisors	High levels of job satisfaction, success in retaining employees, success with career

						advancement
2						
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION						
1. High satisfaction from students	Satisfaction Score	Per individual	Survey of students	Annually	Program leads	High level of satisfaction with advising services, programs
2. High satisfaction from Sponsors	Satisfaction Score	Per individual	Survey of Sponsors	Annually	Advising Council	High level of satisfaction with work of council
PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY						
1						
2						
SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE						
1						
2						

Appendix A - Advising Council

"....advising is one of the very few institutional functions that connect all students to the institution...Within this context, students can find meaning in their lives, make significant decisions about the future, be supported to achieve to their maximum potential, and access all that higher education has to offer" (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education Administration, August 2009).

Through lack of vision and infrastructure, this campus has fallen short of excellence in developing a cohesive advising program that strives for efficacy, consistency, and efficiency. A fully realized advising program needs a mission/vision and governance in order to provide a robust academic and co-curricular experience for every student.

Institutions of higher education across the country recognize advising as a skilled pursuit supported by a body of professional literature, educational training, and oversight. Some examples of councils from other institutions include:

http://www.provost.wisc.edu/caa/
http://dus.psu.edu/uac/
http://www.advising.calpoly.edu/council/index.htm
http://www.fctl.ucf.edu/FacultySuccess/Advisors/council.php

We propose that a similar body exist on the Berkeley campus.

Description
- A single, standing body that oversees the mission, standards, communication, training, and tools for curricular and co-curricular advising.

Authority
6. Create and maintain the mission/vision for advising at Berkeley
7. Develop and execute a strategic plan for continued improvement and alignment of advising services
8. Develop recommendations of policies to sponsors
9. Partner with units such as COrWE, Graduate Division & HR to promote professional training
10. Create framework for guiding the assessment of institution-wide, program-level and individual advising goals.
11. Facilitate communication among all advising units
12. Identify ongoing issues across student experience
13. Identify dependencies and points of collaboration

Membership
C. 9-11 campus leaders who manage significant resources/personnel who are directly involved in curricular and co-curricular advising departments and programs such as:

- Orientation/On-boarding (CalSO, BIO, Welcome Week)
- Academic Planning (breadth, major, enrichment)
- Research (URAP, Qualifying Exam, Dissertation)

Appendix A: Advising Council, March 2011
Student Services Initiative - Advising Workgroup

- Degree Progress/Graduation
- Financial Concerns
- Leadership and Public Service
- Residential Living Office of Student Development
- Educational Equity (ASC, DSP, GenEq) & Multi-cultural Development
- CPS, Social Services

Sponsors
1. Primarily VPTLAPF & VCSA, (working closely with CUD, VCEI, VCAF(CPS, Health Promotion, Social Services), VCR (BIO))

Staff
1. Managing Administrator to shepherd the process into standard operating procedures for all curricular and co-curricular departments
2. Administrative support from existing position in VPTLAPF
3. Contributions from consultants, trainers, and analysts from the membership units as well as:
   a. COrWE
   b. Office of Planning & Analysis
   c. Graduate Division
   d. IS&T
   e. Human Resources

Meeting cycle
   a. 2-3 times per semester

Points of Collaboration
1. Academic Senate
2. Council of Undergraduate Deans
3. Graduate Division
4. Schools and Colleges
5. Communities of practice (BPAWG, CAN)

Appendix B: Training/On-boarding of Advising Staff

Solution:
The university must implement systems to ensure adequate on-boarding, orientation and training of advisers. We must ensure consistent delivery of advising across departments and units to secure a high performance culture. To this end, a common theoretical and professional foundation for advising work must be established at Cal. The identification of campus-wide goals, principles, core values, philosophies, ethics/responsibilities, and objectives for advising needs to be identified and clearly articulated across the university; the university needs to define what advising means at Cal and then disseminate this information across campus. Using the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) guidelines, the association suggests "Academic Advising is based in the teaching and learning mission of higher education, is a series of intentional interactions with a curriculum, a pedagogy, and a set of student learning outcomes. Academic advising synthesizes and contextualizes students' educational experiences within the frameworks of their aspirations, abilities and lives to extend learning beyond campus boundaries and time-frames." Furthermore, as an institution we should also follow NACADA's recommendation of establishing specific student learning outcomes and methods to assess them for each primary area of advising on campus (e.g. academic, student affairs). These learning outcomes for academic advising might include such items as students being able to:
- Craft a coherent educational plan based on assessment of abilities, aspirations, interests, and values,
- Use complex information from various sources to set goals, reach decisions, and achieve those goals,
- Assume responsibility for meeting academic program requirements,
- Articulate the meaning of higher education and the intent of the institution's curriculum,
- Cultivate the intellectual habits that lead to a lifetime of learning, and
- Behave as citizens who engage in the wider world around them.

Once an advising philosophy, principles, etc. have been established for the university, comprehensive on-boarding, orientation and training should be implemented that is grounded in these items. NACADA's Core Values of Academic Advising and the CAS standards for Professional Practice in Higher Education should be used to inform this work. The university should also identify specific practices and policies that need to be changed or instituted in order to meet the articulated goals, principles, and/or objectives for advising. Currently the training of advisers isn't consistent from department to department. For instance, many advisers are only trained in the specific day-to-day procedures associated with advising their students (i.e. program or degree requirements, how to use DB2 to place holds, etc), but they're not provided training regarding the profession of advising, professional advising standards, etc. In addition, in some academic units the advisers are supervised by an MSO who may or may not understand the advising profession and may not be able to effectively train and mentor an adviser. This inconsistency in on-boarding, orientation and training from department to department and the lack of most advisers' understanding the "big picture of advising," has created a system in which students are dissatisfied with the quality and the consistency of advising at Cal.

Following the successes seen at UCSD and UCR, with their certificate programs in academic advising and student development theory for advisers, we should draw on the talents of professional trainers to accomplish the necessary training needs of new (and even experienced) advisers campus-wide. We recommend that the Center for Organization and Workforce Effectiveness (CorWE) be charged with developing a comprehensive adviser training program that provides the theoretical and practical

application of advising knowledge and skills essential for successful performance as advisers. The adviser on-boarding, orientation and training program should be a structured curriculum including a variety of delivery methods appealing to adult learners such as

1. open-enrollment workshops,
2. webinars,
3. informational panels and interactive forums,
4. online learning modules and books/articles for self-study,
5. cohort-based classes,
6. creating networking opportunities for advisers across campus, and
7. professional and career development activities.

These programs should address competencies related to advising such as learning and advising theory; higher education/dynamics of a campus environment; student development theory; understanding the role of the adviser; trends and issues facing diverse students; teaching, counseling & helping skills for advisers; communication strategies for student advisers; advising diverse student populations; working with students in difficulty or distress; and case studies in working with specific student issues.

In addition to the CorWE comprehensive on-boarding, orientation and training program, the university should also invest in resources for continued learning and professional development of advisers. Professional networking opportunities as well as those for the sharing of information/best practices so that advisers have the opportunity to learn from one another, increased opportunities for general discussion, professional dialogue, and community-building among advisers are all important.

- We recommend that a campus website and/or clearinghouse for professional development resources, advising services, best practices, etc. be established.
- We recommend that holding a campus-wide biannual Advising/Counseling/Mentoring conference for continued training and learning could be implemented as well as participation in the annual UC system Advising Conference if it resumes in the future (last held in 2009 due to budget constraints).
- Curricular and Co-Curricular advisers should also be encouraged to participate in activities to further their learning as well as professional networking opportunities and sharing of information/best practices.
- It is also imperative that advisers understand the specific learning goals associated with their positions, the learning outcomes for their department, and the areas in which their work with students will be assessed.

An important complement to the structured on-boarding, orientation and training program by CorWE and the ongoing professional development opportunities is mentoring. It is well established that adult learners learn best by doing, so a coaching/mentoring experience will help to reinforce important competencies while providing first-hand learning with immediate feedback. It is especially important for new advisers to have on the job training with seasoned advisers. One easy way in which an effective mentoring program could be implemented is through the Berkeley Staff Association. Since the BSA already has an existing mentorship program, working with the association to develop a mentoring component specifically for advisers is a logical approach. Departments and units should also establish in-house training programs where a new adviser would be paired with a seasoned adviser whom he/she could learn from through active observation. Once the new adviser had gained confidence in him/herself in his/her new role, the seasoned adviser would then observe the new adviser and provide coaching and reinforcement.

A byproduct of the creation of a consistent on-boarding, orientation and training program for advisers will also be enhanced accountability and tracking of an adviser's progress through various training modules and experiences. Tied to Career Compass, professional development and career advancement will become more attainable and transparent.

Alternatives considered:
Rather than making use of CorWE to develop a comprehensive training program for the university, a consultant with a background in professional training could be hired to design and implement this program. For instance, a professional with NACADA or CAS who is an expert in the training of curricular and co-curricular advisers could be brought in to assess our training needs and to design a program tailored to our needs and challenges. Since it would be more cost effective to use CorWE, due to their familiarity with the university and their ability to coordinate on-going training, this would be a more cost effective approach.

Impact
The implementation of a structured adviser on-boarding, orientation and training and mentor program will contribute to the OE goals. In addition to improving the satisfaction of students with their advising experience, the delivery of advising and information will be consistent across campus. This increased efficiency will contribute to established learning outcomes more readily being met. Individuals in advising positions will also have a stronger sense of how they contribute to the learning environment and to the success of their students due to the increased connection with advising as a profession. Just as student satisfaction will increase, the turnover of curricular and co-curricular advisers will decrease due to their increased satisfaction with their individual role due to on-boarding, orientation and training and the established support of an invested mentor. The need to invest resources in bringing in new hires and providing training for them will be decreased. The increased communication among advisers across campus will also result in increased congruency of policies and operating procedures.

Additional benefits
The comprehensive on-boarding, orientation and training, mentor program, and ongoing professional development will provide additional opportunities for advancement of staff advisers within other departments at the university. Our being able to invest in our advisers will assist us in retaining them rather than losing them to other organizations.

Risks of not implementing the solution
It makes financial sense for the University to invest in centralized advising. Each individual department is responsible for developing and providing their own training program when a new adviser is brought onboard. Training effectiveness varies from department to department.

The primary risk of not implementing a comprehensive campus-wide on-boarding, orientation and training and mentor program is the continued increase in the dissatisfaction of our students with advising. As student dissatisfaction continues to increase, we may see our retention rate of students being impacted.

Moreover, as tuition and fees are on the rise, there will be greater expectations by students (and parents) for services that are comparable to peer institutions. Relying on the name brand of "Berkeley" cannot make the institution complacent in what is becoming a buyer's market for higher education among demanding consumers.

Who will benefit:
STUDENTS: The primary constituency which will benefit the most from this solution is the students. It's clearly been established that Cal students are dissatisfied with the quality of and inconsistencies with advising across campus. This solution will ensure a consistent delivery of services while improving the overall quality of the advising experience for our students.

ADVISERS: A secondary but also important constituency, are the individuals providing advising, the advisers. Since a consistent and thoughtful on-boarding and training program will provide exceptionally trained individuals who thoroughly understand their role and who have a grounding in the professional field of advising, general job satisfaction of advisers will also increase.

FACULTY: A final benefit will be to the faculty, who will have a renewed faith in advisers who are appropriately guiding students to their classrooms and who will also be more useful resources for them.

Describe the extent to which this proposed solution is a collaborative effort either within campus or with external partners.
The Center for Organization and Workforce Effectiveness (COrWE), Graduate Division, the Advising Council, the Berkeley Staff Assembly, and senior advisers on campus, who will serve as mentors to newly hired advisers, will all play a very significant role in the proposed solution. CorWE will be charged with developing and implementing a comprehensive on-boarding, orientation and training program tailored to the needs of both curricular and co-curricular advisers across the university to ensure the consistent and effective delivery of services to our students. The Advising Council will set the vision for advising, key to determining what the foundation of the program will look like. They will also be ensuring that ongoing assessment of student needs is made and that the results inform changes to the training plan. The roles of the BSA and senior advisors has been discussed in the mentoring section.

If applicable, describe the proposed solution may enable additional projects to be considered.
As curricular and co-curricular advisers begin to identify themselves with the profession of advising and understand the benefits of on-boarding, orientation and training to them, they will more actively participate in and seek out opportunities for development. Advisers will also become more invested in the on-boarding, orientation and training of their peers. Programs beyond just mentoring will be able to become reality. For instance, it is foreseeable that advisers will take the initiative to implement projects and programs for one another such as quarterly professional development programs.

Deliverables & Constraints
The primary result the solution must deliverer is increased quality of advising which needs to translate to an increased student satisfaction with advising. A more consistent delivery of advising from department to department must also be realized.

Implementing a comprehensive on-boarding, orientation and training program from scratch will be challenging.
- One primary constraint is whether CorWE currently has the staffing and funding to development and implement the necessary on-boarding, orientation and training program required to achieve the needed improvements in advising.
- We will need to identify and leverage the current training programs that exist, such as that of the Graduate Division.
- Current advisers might be reluctant to acknowledge their competency gaps and will perhaps assume they don't need training if they have been providing advising for a period of time.

- Managers and supervisors may be hesitant to commit the staff time necessary for the advisers to benefit from on-boarding, orientation and training and professional development.
- Another constraint will be committing funds for ongoing professional development such as the participation by advisers in conferences.

Data requirements:
In order to design and implement a high quality comprehensive on-boarding, orientation and training program for   advisers, we must have assessed the status quo. We must be able to identify who our curricular and co-curricular advisers are on campus and assess where their current knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) lie now on the spectrum of KSAs needed to perform their jobs at a high level. Based upon the vision for advising that the Advising Council sets and the standards that are put in place, we will then be able to build an effective program.

We will also need to identify the job functions that are unique to individual units and those that overlap in order to build the most effective training program.

How does the proposed work plan allow for evaluation and course correction to ensure the outcomes meet the campus needs?
With the oversight of the Advising Council and the implementation of regular program and individual assessments, we will be able to identify what those outcomes are that the campus needs and make adjustments to the training plan.

Appendix C - Standards & Assessment

Problem
Advising is not recognized as a core function of the educational mission of the University.

Inconsistent professional practice - e.g. Students report different levels of service from different departments. There are university-wide standards for delivery of services to students and no means to assess efficacy of service delivery. We are greatly in need of stronger collaboration and alignment across curricular and co-curricular advising.

"Institutions like Berkeley have a special kind of duty to the larger academic community to serve as examples for others to emulate, and the University of California, Berkeley should take this responsibility seriously in the enhancement and promotion of good educational practice. " (WASC, 2004)

In the past 15 years there has been a significant push toward the "integrated use of all of higher education's resources in the education and preparation of the whole student" (Learning Reconsidered, 2002). Not the least of these resources is the professional staff who advise students in both their curricular and co-curricular pursuits while at Berkeley. If we are to rise to a standard of excellence we must create a set of standards that will facilitate our ability "to provide a practical liberal education that [will] prepare students for life, work, and civic participation in an increasingly complex world (Greater Expectations, 2002).

Universities are often guided in determining their student learning outcomes as a function of the accreditation process. Berkeley's accrediting body Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) explicitly evaluates Educational Effectiveness (EE)in the review process. In the last WASC review the following was stated "The team believes that "articulating and embracing a shared vision" of student learning outcomes is critical to enhancing the quality of student learning at Berkeley." (WASC, 2004) In the last year WASC has evolved the review process to include a more explicit rubric "The Educational Effectiveness Framework" (Appendix .1) that coupled with the Council on the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) can serve as a canon from which the newly formed Advising Council can extract institutional advising standards and assessment expectations.

It is imperative we design and implement new operations standards and assessment to improve our delivery over time. Investment in this practice will lead to a more nimble and creative operation that is better equipped for future budgetary crisis since we will be aware of our landscape and know immediately where we can adjust to meet the demands of the future.

<div align="center">

SOLUTIONS/DELIVERABLES

</div>

Appendix C: Standards & Assessment, March 2011
Student Services Initiative - Advising Workgroup

I.   **CREATE INDIVIDUAL PROFESSIONAL ADVISING STANDARDS:** Job expectations and performance appraisals (E-performance) are aligned with shared and articulated campus and individual standards for advising.

Developing individual standards for all staff engaged in the activity of advising students necessitates the consideration of competencies at three levels
- Core Advising Competencies - defined by the Advising Council to apply to all staff engaged in student support
- Job family specific competencies - defined by the Advising Council to speak directly to the functions of an adviser (this should not be limited to job families that are explicitly titled advisor)
- Customized program based competencies - defined by the managers and staff in a program

Core Advising Competencies
The advising core competencies should reflect the fundamental values of the University while also capturing the everyday realities of students.

In *Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs,* Pope, Reynold & Mueller (2004) identified seven core competency areas which have been slightly altered below to accommodate the specific UCB context:
1. Administration and self-management
2. Multicultural awareness, knowledge & skills
3. Advising
4. Assessment and research
5. Teaching and training
6. Ethics and professional standards
7. Translation and use of theory to guide practice

Although not an exhaustive list the following are illustrations of standards that correlate to core competencies and correspondent assessment techniques.

Core Competency: Advising
Standard: Ability to advise constituents on policies and procedures
Assessment tools: UCUES analysis

Core Competency: Teaching and training
Standard: Ability to coach students to set goals/plans and corresponding action steps
Assessment tools: time to degree, qualitative debrief of student events, Career Destinations Survey analysis

Core Competency: Multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills
Standard: Ability to recognize the interpersonal dynamics that may occur in a multicultural context
Assessment tools: UCUES, supervisor observation

Appendix C: Standards & Assessment, March 2011
Student Services Initiative - Advising Workgroup

Core Competency: Administration and self-mangement
Standard: Responds to all student e-mail correspondence within 72-hours
Assessment tools: e-mail archive review

Although a selected sample of assessment strategies are offered above it is worth noting that there is a great deal of existing campus data related to the student experience. In many cases localized assessments may be required, however a great deal can be learned from marshaling, analyzing, and comparing existing data.

Job Family Competencies
In addition to the CAS standards and associated Self-Assessment Guides for specialized programs nearly all sub-fields in student affairs have professional organizations that have developed their own set of standards, principles, or values that specifically speak to student learning outcomes and service delivery. These professional standards are developed through a collaborative and peer review process and thus should be considered in the course of defining job family based competencies. Because Career Compass was not based on standardized professional groupings within student affairs per se the Advising Council may find that existing CAS and other professional standards reflect competencies in both the job family and customized categories.

Customized Competencies
Each program will develop a small set of competencies based on the articulated mission and learning goals completed as part of the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative or similar student learning outcome effort. For example, it would be suitable to expect an undergraduate advisor for a major program to be able to articulate the departmentally defined student learning goals for said major. In the case of academic departments, it may be necessary to define and append learning goals related to the learning that takes place in advising to the existing learning goals

Impact and Alignment with OE Goals

A. Reduce administrative costs and enable the campus to direct more resources to teaching and research.
B. Advance an effective and efficient operating environment
C. Instill a culture of continuous improvement that leads to high quality performance and outcomes.

Risks of not implementing the solution
- Inconsistent levels of service to students
- Increased cost to the University in duplication of efforts (see budget: Efficiencies Earned in Policy Development and Interpretaion, savings of $920K/annually)

Constituency who will benefit

The primary constituency which will benefit the most from this solution are the students. It's clearly been established that Cal students are dissatisfied with the quality of and inconsistencies with advising across campus. This solution will ensure a consistent delivery of services while improving the overall quality of the advising experience for our students.

Collaborative effort
The Advising Council is predicated on collaboration and coordination between and amongst campus partners. Additionally it responds to needs identified in the most recent WASC accreditation review.

II.   CREATE SHARED STUDENT SERVICE DELIVERY STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT: All student service programs and departments that conduct curricular and co-curricular advising are mindful of the vision for achieving excellence. Excellence may be achieved through the implementation of shared standards for all programs and departments as well as the creation of standards unique to each program/department. This will set the foundation to better articulate and assess outcomes.

<u>Standards for whom</u>
All college and major academic advising (undergraduate professional, and graduate), Study Abroad, Fall Program for Freshman, Extension, Summer Bridge and Summer Sessions. Also, Athletic Study Center, Student Learning Center, Dean of Students Offices, Office of the Registrar, Residential Living, Orientation Programs, Academic Achievement Programs, Disabled Students Program, Gender Equity Resource Center, Multicultural & Cross Cultural Student Development, Student Life Advising Services/EOP, Transfer, Re-entry and Student Parent Center, Career Center, Incentive Awards Program, SAGE Scholars Program, Professional Development Program, International Students, Clinical Health and Wellness Education Programs, Associated Students, Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreational Sports Programs.

<u>Development</u>
All curricular and co-curricular advisers on the UC Berkeley campus belong to a nationally recognized profession of individuals. This higher education professionals support the academic mission of their institutions through the transference and translation of information directly to students which aid in student success and degree completion.

Standards should address service delivery within a department in areas such as communication, management of resources, student satisfaction, campus collaborations, facilities and equipment.

<u>Assessment</u>
Metrics and instruments should be developed by the council and departments to periodically measure department compliance and revise as needed.

Investment (staff time), Savings (Staff Time--overtime), Outcome (Efficiencies lead to Student Satisfaction and Alumni Giving)

Appendix C: Standards & Assessment, March 2011
Student Services Initiative - Advising Workgroup