



Academic Advising in the College of Professional Studies: Practices and Perceptions

Dr. Steven C. Hackett

Anna Thaler Petersen

Patrick Panelli

College of Professional Studies
Humboldt State University
March 5, 2013

We wish to express our gratitude to the faculty and staff advisors who were interviewed for this report. Thanks as well to John Lee, Emiliano Ayala, and Christopher Aberson for comments on an earlier draft, and to Institutional Research and Planning staff for assistance with data.

Introduction

In 2010 the CSU launched its Graduation Initiative, the purpose of which is to raise the freshman six-year graduation rate by eight percentage points by 2015, and to cut in half the existing gap in degree attainment by CSU's under-represented minority (URM) students (California State University, 2010). This is a moral imperative to better serve our students, and also a mechanism to get the greatest value from limited state support. Efficient progression minimizes student enrollment in unnecessary courses, properly sequences courses in a student's graduation plan, and limits the potential for students having to take extra semesters to complete their baccalaureate requirements. Effective academic advising supports student success and efficient progression towards degree, and fostering effective advising is one way to help achieve the Graduation Initiative.

The system of performance evaluation for faculty is heavily weighted towards classroom teaching effectiveness, scholarship, and service, and academic advising plays only a marginal role.¹ These modest incentives for effective advising can be contrasted with the imperative from the CSU Graduation Initiative for improving retention and success for all of our students. In order to identify aspects of academic advising at HSU that can be improved we first need to identify current academic advising practices and then compare them to "best practices" identified in the scholarly advising literature. While RTP-based incentives for effective advising may be modest, most faculty are strongly committed to their students' success. Consequently it is also important to determine from the faculty themselves what HSU can do to better support academic advising.

This study utilizes key-informant interview methods to solicit information from academic advisors in the College of Professional Studies. A key goal of this study is to document baseline advising methods and characterize the range of different approaches to academic advising employed by advisors in academic units across the college.

The report begins with a brief review and summary of the scholarly literature on effective academic advising. We then describe our research methods, followed by summary and analysis of our interview results.

Advising Best Practices: A Summary of the Scholarly Literature

Purpose of Academic Advising

O'Banion (1972) argues that the purpose of academic advising is "to help the student choose a program of study which will serve him in the development of his total potential" (O'Banion, 1972, p. 10). Effective academic advisors (whether staff or faculty) have the characteristics of being knowledgeable, fostering and nurturing, and approachable (Harrison, 2009). Within the educational purpose of higher learning, advising is generally intended to assist with students' progress toward earning their degree. Ideas about how that is best

¹ Despite its importance in student progression and success, academic advising plays a relatively minor role in terms of how faculty are evaluated for retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP). While teaching effectiveness is central to RTP, it is largely defined in terms of course-based instruction. Academic advising is only briefly referenced in Appendix J of the Faculty Handbook (Humboldt State University, 2012a) in a subdivision of teaching effectiveness addressing constructive and professional relationships with students ("...it is expected that faculty demonstrate sound academic advising, effective counseling of students on course-related matters, the ability to work with a diverse student population, and availability of the faculty member on a regular basis to assist the academic needs of students..").

accomplished vary to some degree in the scholarly literature, depending on the characteristics of certain student populations and the sector of university life in which advising is housed (Crookston, 1972; Habley, 2000; Harding, 2008; Nutt, 2003; O'Banion, 1972). Retention of students is also a key objective of academic advising in some institutions (Harrison, 2009). The influence of advising on student retention will be examined further in a later section.

History of Academic Advising

Academic advising has been a part of university life since the first universities were established in the United States (Habley, 2000). Although originally performed only by faculty, advising responsibilities have been expanded to other university staff, leading to some scholarly reexamination of its role and function (Habley, 2000). In the 1970s, scholars began focusing on advising as considering the development of the whole student, rather than simply course selection and scheduling (Crookston, 1972; O'Banion, 1972).

Increasing diversity in the population of college-goers over the course of the last century has necessitated an examination of best practices in advising students from varied racial, cultural, socioeconomic, and other backgrounds (Harding, 2008). Research in recent years has focused on advising strategies that are effective in enhancing these at-risk students' potential for success (Harding, 2008). These strategies are laid out in a later section of this report.

Academic Advising Practices

National surveys of campus practices of academic advising have been conducted nationally since the 1970s (Habley, 2000). These surveys have focused on the following core topics: coordination, training, policy, evaluation, recognition, and reward (Habley, 2000). The features of campus advising practices at US public four-year universities are summarized in table 1.

Table 1: Academic Advising Practices at Public Four-Year Universities in the United States

| Practices | % of campuses |
|--|----------------------|
| Have published statement on advising | 69% |
| Employ director/coordinator of advising | 86% |
| Split advising responsibilities between specialized advising staff and faculty | 63% |
| Mandate or offer advisor training | 90% |
| Evaluate advisor effectiveness regularly | 27% |
| Offer recognition/rewards to quality advisors | 50% |
| Require faculty to advise | 84% |

Source: 2011 Survey Data (National Academic Advising Association, 2011).

Different types of institutions utilize a variety of different models for academic advising (Reinarz, 2000). University faculty are solely responsible for advising in 15% of four-year public universities (Harrison, 2009). The split model, in which advising responsibilities are divided between faculty and specialized advising staff are used in 63% of public four-year universities in the United States (National Academic Advising Association, 2011). The use of a centralized advising center can allow for greater time to be spent with students, and allow for more exploration of life and vocational goals (O'Banion, 1972). Peer advising may also be used to assist with specific course choice, depending on the availability of instructional personnel (O'Banion, 1972).

A supplementary model, in which an advising center provides assistance, but all students are assigned to a faculty member, is used mostly in private colleges (Harrison, 2009). The total-intake model involves staff advising all students for a period of time before transferring them to department faculty (Harrison, 2009). The last commonly used model is the satellite model, in which each academic unit is responsible for its own advising (Harrison, 2009). In some situations, a student may begin their college career exploring their academic strengths and career goals with specialized advising staff, and, once a program of study is chosen, may then work directly with department faculty (O'Banion, 1972).

Ultimately the decision of who in an institution should carry out academic advising depends on available resources and the philosophy of the administrators there (O'Banion, 1972).

Table 2: Academic Advising at Public Four-year Universities in the United States

| Summary Values | Mean |
|---|-------------|
| Number of contacts between faculty advisor and advisee during academic term | 2.1* |
| Number of advisees assigned to each faculty advisor | 25** |
| Number of contacts between full-time advisor and advisee during academic term | 2.4* |
| Number of advisees assigned to each full-time advisor | 284.9* |

* = From 2003 Survey Data. ** = From 2011 Survey Data

Source: 2003 Survey Data (Habley, 2004) and 2011 Survey Data (National Academic Advising Association, 2011).

Assessment of Academic Advising

It is important to evaluate the effectiveness of academic advising programs in order to determine the impact of advising on student learning and success, either in terms of process or outcomes (Cuseo, 2012; Lynch, 2000; Robbins & Zarges, 2011). There are four levels of assessment that are often used: assessment of individual advisors, the advising program as a whole, the advising unit (an academic department or center), and the institution as a whole (Lynch, 2000). Advisors themselves may evaluate the program as a whole, themselves, or their peers (Cuseo, 2012). An advising program director or the students being advised may also be consulted (Cuseo, 2012; Robbins & Zarges, 2011).

The evaluation of advisor effectiveness is tied to other issues within academic advising programs' structure, including clarifying the meaning and purpose of advising, advisor selection and recruitment, orientation and training, and recognition and reward of advisors (Cuseo, 2012). The use of assessment results in improving or changing an advising program is also important to consider (Robbins & Zarges, 2011).

The Connection between Academic Advising and Student Retention

Many scholars have sought to establish a direct, empirically-based connection between high quality academic advising and student retention (Crockett, 1978; Cuseo, 2003; Metzner, 1989). While a connection of such a nature has not yet been shown, several studies have shown a positive association between the two (Crockett, 1978; Cuseo, 2003; Metzner, 1989; Nutt, 2003).

...[H]igh quality advising can help students clarify their educational goals and relate these goals to the curriculum and to future careers; encourage academic success by assisting students with a selection of course work that is compatible with their interests, abilities, outside commitments, and career

aspirations; facilitate referral to other services and programs at the institution; and establish a personal bond between a student and personnel of the college (p. 423, Metzner, 1989).

As noted earlier, advisors who are knowledgeable, nurturing, and approachable can influence students' college experiences in powerful and positive ways (Crockett, 1978; Cuseo, 2003; Harrison, 2009; Metzner, 1989; Nutt, 2003).

There are several factors connected with student persistence that are influenced by advising practices, including student mentoring, student satisfaction with their college experience, academic and career planning and decision-making, effective use of student support services, and contact between students and faculty outside the classroom (Cuseo, 2003). A strong connection has been demonstrated between retention and the level of student satisfaction with a university (Cuseo, 2003; Metzner, 1989). Even poor quality advising has a positive effect on retention when compared with the effect of no advising (Metzner, 1989). Students' persistence is also connected to their commitment to educational and career goals (Cuseo, 2003). Academic advising can provide a constructive environment to discuss and work toward such ends (Cuseo, 2003).

In addition, students often benefit greatly from help with career-related decision-making that they can gain from working with their advisor, particularly those who start college with an undeclared major (Cuseo, 2003; Humboldt State University, 2012a). Providing referrals to support services for students also helps with retention, particularly with regard to at-risk students, and is an important function of advising (Cuseo, 2003; Humboldt State University, 2012a). The mentoring that goes along with such referrals, as well as with help with decision-making, can help students feel that they "matter" (Cuseo, 2003). For first-generation students, or those with other factors that may put their successful progression at-risk, that sense of mattering to the academic institution can contribute heavily to their decision to persist toward their degree (Cuseo, 2003).

Styles of Academic Advising

There are three main styles of advising that are described in the literature: prescriptive, developmental, and intrusive/proactive. We briefly summarize each of these styles below.

Prescriptive advising is intended to assist students in making most efficient use of time in progressing to degree (Crookston, 1972; Heisserer & Parette, 2002). It is characterized by a relationship in which the advisor makes a recommendation about the student's academic progress regarding course choice or progression to degree, and the student follows the advisor's recommendation (Crookston, 1972; Heisserer & Parette, 2002). Negative aspects of this style of advising include the lack of student involvement in decision-making, the lack of emphasis on relationship-building and mentoring, and the risk of absolute trust in the advisor's authority and knowledge (Crookston, 1972; Heisserer & Parette, 2002). Positive characteristics of this style are seen in its convenience to the advisor, and in the importance of guidance from advisors to students in discussing course selection, career options, and educational goals, and explaining graduation requirements and registration procedures (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). In addition, students typically perceive prescriptive advisors as competent, and minority students often show a preference for prescriptive styles of advising (Heisserer & Parette, 2002).

Developmental advising is a shared responsibility approach that involves both student and advisor in promoting initiative and growth in the student (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). The advisor directs students to proper resources, facilitating development of greater independence, decision-making, and problem-solving

(Heisserer & Parette, 2002). Positive aspects of this style of advising appear in the emphasis on growth in students, guiding them to be capable of increased self-direction, and focusing on their potential—in effect, using advising as another opportunity for teaching (Crookston, 1972). The weaknesses of this approach include a large demand on advisors’ time, which can make it very difficult in the case of large caseloads of advisees, the necessity of training, and the challenge in working with students who need a great deal of guidance and scaffolding as they develop (Heisserer & Parette, 2002).

Intrusive advising (also called proactive advising) involves the advisor in the affairs of students through deliberate intervention to enhance student motivation, using intensive advising designed to increase the probability of student success, working to educate students on all options, and approaching students before situations develop (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Varney, 2012). This style of advising has been studied as an intervention strategy with at-risk students, and shown to be effective as such (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). Knowing that an advisor will contact them makes advisees more likely to keep up with their work (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). The disadvantage of this style is the time demand that it puts on the advisor; it is only effectively implemented when advisors have the time and resources necessary to give a great deal of attention to each advisee (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Varney, 2012).

Table 2: Summary of Main Characteristics of the Three Styles of Advising

| Characteristic | Prescriptive | Developmental | Proactive/Intrusive |
|--|--|--|--|
| Purpose | Timely graduation | Development of student | Making progress toward graduation and overcoming obstacles |
| Advantages | Students rely on advisor’s knowledge for guidance in course selection, career options, educational goals, graduation requirements, and registration procedures, and convenient for advisor | Emphasis on student growth, increasing their self-direction, and focusing on their potential | Helps to teach college success skills, and follow-up contacts make them more likely to keep up with their work |
| Disadvantages | Lack of student independence, danger of dependence on advisor if advisor is not knowledgeable, lack of emphasis on relationship-building, and lack of mentoring | Large time commitment for advisor, and necessity of training for advisors | Large time commitment for advisor, and necessity of training for advisors |
| Responsibility | Advisor | Advisor & students | Advisor & students |
| Availability of options in course choice | Limited to advisor’s recommendation | Depends on students’ goals and discussion with advisor | Open to discussion with advisor |
| Sources of information about course choice | Advisor | Advisor & students | Advisor, students’ instructors, other service providers for students, and students |
| Independence of student in choosing path | Very limited | Limited only by how much guidance students want | Limited only by how much guidance students want, but closely monitored |

The three styles of advising described here can also be used in combination by advisors, as “...no single advisor type can deliver quality advising to the increasingly diverse student population” (Reinarz, 2000, p. 213).

Advising At-risk Students

Students who are first-generation college students, members of an ethnic minority, academically disadvantaged, disabled, of low socioeconomic status, or on academic probation are considered “at-risk” of failing to graduate (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). Other students who have special advising needs include high-ability students, student athletes, adult learners, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender students (Harding, 2008). In considering the advising needs of a diverse group of students, it is important for advisors to consider the other entities on campus that may be advising students, such as coaches, advocacy groups, or special programs, and network with these units (Harding, 2008). As described earlier, intrusive styles of advising have been shown to be most effective in helping retain at-risk students (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Varney, 2012). Regular contact with faculty is known to be a very important factor in student motivation and involvement in their school, which helps explain why the increased level of involvement by advisors employing intrusive or proactive techniques would be effective in retaining at-risk students (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). However, it can be challenging, and counter to some cultural norms, for students from diverse cultural backgrounds to approach faculty members (Cox & Yamaguchi, 2010).

In building relationships with students from diverse groups that have historically been marginalized, it is critical for advisors to understand their own levels of cultural competence and potential biases (Harding, 2008). The various levels of cultural competence are as follows:

- Non-awareness of difference: advisors have no or limited experienced with diversity, seeing each student as an individual regardless of race, religion, class, or sexual orientation, and placing no value on differences where they exist.
- Awareness of difference: advisors recognize and see value in individual differences, but lack training in knowing how to apply knowledge of the importance of differences.
- Acceptance/acknowledgment of difference: advisors understand that different does not mean anything negative, and know that their responsibility is to learn more about such things
- Understanding cultural difference: advisors have taken steps to increase their cultural knowledge to better relate and understand their diverse students.
- Cultural adaptation: advisors possess the ability to apply their cultural knowledge to working with diverse students.
- Intercultural skillfulness: advisors have the tools, knowledge, and skills necessary to relate to a wide range of students (Harding, 2008).

Table 3: Advising At-risk Students

| Factors | Discussion |
|--|--|
| Intrusive or proactive style of advising | The purpose is to make progress toward graduation and overcome obstacles associated with being at-risk. Knowing that an advisor will contact students makes them more likely to keep up with their work, helps to teach college success skills, and provides follow-up for student as they complete college requirements. Increased contact with faculty is an important factor in increased student motivation and involvement in school. |
| Cultural competence for students from diverse cultural backgrounds | Provides students with advisors who see, value, have knowledge of and acceptance for, important cultural differences and how those differences will impact students' college experiences. |

Best Practices in Academic Advising

“Good advising is not simply seeing a student once a semester or twice a year to approve a course schedule” (Crockett, 1978, p. 33). Academic advising programs are most effective in obtaining positive results for students and institutions when they have administrative commitment, a clear set of guiding policies written in a handbook, recognition for quality advising, carefully selected and trained advisors, accessible student information, frequent and high quality student contacts, reasonable student caseloads, a well-structured referral system to campus services, and systematic and periodic evaluation (Crockett, 1978; Harrison, 2009; Metzner, 1989; Nutt, 2003). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education has identified the following components that should be included in a university’s academic advising program:

- A mission statement
- Delineation of program components
- Established leadership for the program
- An organization and management system
- Staff for delivering services
- Financial resources
- Facilities
- Legal considerations
- Ethical policies and procedures that ensure equal opportunity and access for students
- A structure for maintaining campus and community relations
- A capacity for assessment and evaluation (Lynch, 2000).

There are three main areas in which academic advisors should be trained: concepts of advising philosophies regarding students and the campus advising environment, information about campus course offerings, policies, and practices, and relational skills for connecting with advisees (Higginson, 2000; Koring, 2005). Training allows advising programs to further their goals and increase investment in advising outcomes (Higginson, 2000; Koring, 2005).

The best choice of an organizational structure for any particular institution’s academic advising program depends on what would work best for that institution (Reinarz, 2000). One feature that is critical regardless of structure, however, is that advising be valued by the administration of the institution (Reinarz, 2000). Valuing advising often means rewarding it: instructors and other advising staff should be rewarded and recognized for their contribution (Crockett, 1978; O’Banion, 1972; Reinarz, 2000). “Expecting that students will have all their

advising needs met by one faculty member for whom advising is only one of several responsibilities (not to mention a low-status and unrewarded activity) may be a disservice to students” (Allen & Smith, 2008, p. 623). Obtaining the most buy-in from faculty and other advising staff occurs through providing quality-based recognition and reward (Crockett, 1978; O’Banion, 1972; Pardee, 2000; Reinarz, 2000). In addition, priority should be put on evaluating advisors and the program overall, tracking the advising process and outcomes as described earlier.

Table 4: List of best practices in academic advising

| At the Level of the Institution | At the Level of the Individual Advisor |
|--|---|
| Demonstrate commitment from university administration | Have access to (and seek out) information about students |
| Establish a clear set of guiding policies | Engage in frequent and high quality student contacts |
| Provide recognition for quality advising | Assist students with program of study that is compatible with their interests, abilities, outside commitments, and career aspirations |
| Select and train advisors with care | Facilitate referral to other services and programs at the institution |
| Establish reasonable student advisee caseloads | Establish personal bonds with students |
| Possess a well-structured referral system to campus services | Possess cultural competence for working with students from diverse cultural backgrounds |
| Conduct systematic and periodic evaluation of advising | Be knowledgeable, nurturing, and approachable |

Advising at Humboldt State

Advising at Humboldt State University (HSU) is defined as: “a collaborative educational process where students and advisors are partners in planning academic, personal, and career goals that lead to academic success and self-directed, life-long learning,” (Humboldt State University, 2012a). HSU has implemented a split model of advising, in which undeclared students, and freshmen in the School of Business, are advised by professional advisors in the Advising Center (Humboldt State University, 2012a). Additional advising support for low-income and historically under-represented students is provided by the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) during students’ first year at Humboldt (Humboldt State University, 2012b). Once students have declared a major, they are then assigned to a faculty advisor within their major department. Students may change advisors within their major by filling out a basic advisor change form. In general all permanent faculty participate in academic advising, and some academic departments with heavier advising loads employ lecturers as advisors.

Students are required to contact their advisor at least once a semester in order to allow them to register for classes (Humboldt State University, 2012a). During these meetings students are given an access code so they can sign up for classes online, and they discuss their schedule for the following semester with their advisor. Short meetings to accomplish these two goals are typically held during registration time in November (for spring semester classes) and in April (for fall semester classes).

The Advising Center’s website provides links to campus resources, as well as an *Advisor Handbook* (Humboldt State University, 2012a). The handbook includes a description of academic probation criteria, general education, remediation, and major requirements. In addition, there are suggestions focused on getting

the most out of the advising relationship through communication, a clear delineation of advisor and advisee responsibilities, and a summary of the scope and sequence of advising. Although only required to meet once a semester, advisors and advisees are encouraged to connect more often so that they can receive the fullest benefits of the advising relationship (Humboldt State University, 2012a).

For students, a greater connection with their advisor is predicted to provide help planning for life and career goals, easier adjustment to campus life, assistance with arranging class schedules, better knowledge of academic policies and requirements, and referrals to campus services and resources (Humboldt State University, 2012a). Simple attempts to reach out to advisees through an introductory email, phone call, or visit can help make students feel more connected to the university, communicate an interest in their well-being and them as an individual, provide them with expert guidance on campus and community resources, and establish that faculty are approachable and helpful (Humboldt State University, 2012a).

Potential advantages to students in having more frequent meetings with their advisor include

- Have time to develop life and career goals
- Provide support in adjusting to campus life
- Schedule classes short- and long-term
- Explore career and internship possibilities
- Learn about academic requirements and policies
- Gain referrals to other campus resources/services
- Feel an interest in their well-being
- Find personal connection to university
- Have access to a campus expert on campus and community resources
- See that faculty and staff are helpful and approachable

The Advising Center at Humboldt State works to support faculty advising by offering advising workshops for faculty and other department staff, and visiting department meetings (Humboldt State University, 2012a). Advisors' practical responsibilities at HSU include providing accurate information about university policies, procedures, and requirements, welcoming and honoring students from diverse cultural backgrounds, establishing a safe and inclusive environment, providing an ear to students' concerns, helping students monitor their progress toward graduation, empowering students to advocate for themselves, referring students to appropriate campus resources and services, and demonstrating that learning is at the heart of the advising process (Humboldt State University, 2012a).

Advisees' responsibilities are also articulated in the *Advising Handbook*: to schedule regular appointments with their advisor, and arrive prepared at advising meetings, to gather all relevant information to aid in decision-making, to gain knowledge about college policies, procedures, and programs, to explore personal values and goals, to research, understand, and follow the requirements necessary to accomplish their academic goals, to participate fully in the advising experience, to become active contributors to the academic community, to ask questions if there is a lack of understanding, or a concern, and to accept responsibilities for their decisions (Humboldt State University, 2012a).

Table 5: Advisor and advisee responsibilities

| Advisor | Advisee |
|--|--|
| Provide accurate information about university policies, procedures, and requirements | Schedule regular appointments with their advisor |
| Welcome and honor students from diverse cultural backgrounds | Arrive prepared at advising meetings |
| Establish a safe and inclusive environment | Gather all relevant information to aid in decision-making |
| Provide an ear to students' concerns | Gain knowledge about college policies, procedures, and programs |
| Help students monitor their progress toward graduation | Explore personal values and goals |
| Empower students to advocate for themselves | Research, understand, and follow the requirements necessary to accomplish their academic goals |
| Refer students to appropriate campus resources and services | Participate fully in the advising experience |
| Demonstrate that learning is at the heart of the advising process | Become active contributors to the academic community |
| | Ask questions if there is a lack of understanding, or a concern |
| | Accept responsibilities for their decisions |

When students fall into academic probation (which, for undergraduate students, is earning by a 2.0 GPA or lower) HSU takes extra advising measures (Humboldt State University, 2012a). Once a 2.0 GPA is reached, the Office of the Registrar contacts students and asks them to meet with either the Learning Center (for freshmen and sophomores) or the Advising Center (for juniors and seniors). In these meetings, support staff work with students to create an “Academic Success Plan,” which requires review and signatures from students’ major advisors. Included in the plan is a list of recommended courses, resources, workshops, etc., intended to ensure that students have information and support to move out of probationary status and back into good standing.

Rationale for establishing a baseline of current advising practices

The current 6-year graduation rate in the California State University (CSU) system is 46%, and its target 6-year graduation rate for 2015 is 54%. Improving graduation and retention rates for students at HSU is the overall reason for this research on baseline advising practices in CPS. As described earlier, high quality advising is positively associated with increased student retention. Academic advising is not systematically assessed at HSU. This study provides an examination of advisors’ perceptions regarding best practices in advising, and it is hoped it will shed light on retention-related factors in advising.

Table 6: Average six year graduation rates by ethnicity for first-time undergraduates (FTUGs)

| Ethnicity | Graduate in 6 Years |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| American Indian | 27.4% |
| Black | 32.4% |
| Latino | 33.9% |
| Asian | 37.6% |
| Pacific Islander | 10.7% |
| Two or more | 39.0% |
| White | 45.6% |
| Unknown | 37.9% |

Source: FTUG Graduation Rate Analysis Report, Fall 2000-2005 Cohorts (Humboldt State University, 2011a).

Table 7: Average One, Two, and Three-year Retention Rates (2001-2008)

| Period | Rate |
|----------------------|-------------|
| One-year retention | 74% |
| Two-year retention | 60% |
| Three-year retention | 55% |

Source: HSU 2011 Retention Report (Humboldt State University, 2011b).

Research Methodology

Participants

The population surveyed consisted of academic major advisors who advised at least 20 baccalaureate students in the College of Professional Studies (CPS) at HSU since spring semester 2009. Institutional data on academic advising was provided by Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) at HSU. These data were used to identify the population of academic advisors and to develop the stratified sample. A total of 33 academic advisors were interviewed. This number included 30 faculty members and three staff members at the Advising Center who advise Business Administration freshmen.

Sampling design

After consulting data from the Institutional Research and Planning office concerning the rates of probationary status among undergraduate students in CPS, we found differentiation in probationary status across departments. This heterogeneity guided us to employ a departmental stratified sampling technique to choose interview subjects among college faculty and Advising Center staff.

We created strata by department level (or by major level if rates are specific to a certain major) and assessed probationary rates. Of advisors who had a minimum of 20 advisees since the spring semester of 2009, we identified a range of advisors (by probationary rate) within those strata to elicit possible style contrasts between advisors and across academic departments. This led us to a 69% sampling rate (33/48) within CPS. These 33 advisors were pulled from nine academic departments within CPS (and including the Advising Center): School of Business, Child Development, Economics, Kinesiology/Recreation Administration, Liberal Studies Elementary Education, Nursing, Psychology, and Social Work.

Interview instrument

The HSU advising assessment instrument was created by Steven Hackett, Anna Thaler Petersen, and Patrick Panelli to assess advisor style, training, and practices being used by academic advisors within the CPS (see appendix for the interview instrument). It consists of 15 mixed format questions, employing a five point scale

scale and open-ended questions. Questions were drawn from advisor experience and from factors identified in the scholarly advising literature cited earlier in this report. Open-ended questions were preset with a coding scheme according to ‘best practices’ identified in the literature. The instrument was tested in two pilot interviews, and average time to completion was 20 minutes.

Interview methodology

Anna Thaler Petersen and Patrick Panelli conducted and recorded 33 advisor interviews. Both interviewers were present at most interviews. For those interviews attended by only one interviewer, recordings were used to allow coding by the other. Interviews began with one interviewer reading the introductory informed consent paragraph, obtaining permission to record, and then moving forward with the interview questions. Follow-up questions were asked when appropriate.

Coding methodology

The research team worked together prior to conducting interviews to create categories of possible responses for the open-ended qualitative questions. Categories were created based on the literature and the team’s experience with the topic, and also informed by the first two pilot interviews.

Each interview was discussed by both interviewers to help assure inter-rater reliability. Responses to open-ended questions were categorized and coded by the interviewers. Some responses were found to align with more than one category, and were coded as such. On those occasions when the interviewers disagreed about the coding of a particular response, they discussed what they had heard, and listened to the recording of the interview to resolve any differences in interpreting and coding responses.

Analysis and Results

The survey inquired about the number of advisees carried by advisors in CPS. An effort has been underway for several years in CPS to reduce advising loads in departments with large numbers of majors relative to advising faculty. The question of how many advisees are assigned to an advisor is fluid and not always easy to answer, as advisees change advisor, graduate, or leave the university, sometimes mid-semester. In addition, the record-keeping software that advisors use occasionally over-reports the number of advisees, as it continues to list students who have left the university if their graduation or withdrawal has not yet been processed. In the interests of obtaining the most accurate count, therefore, the Oracle Business Intelligence (OBI) dashboard display of students’ Degree Audit Reports (DARs) was also used to obtain numbers of advisees. The actual mean number of advisees per faculty advisor in CPS is 43 (as of January 2013). While there has been an effort underway to reduce faculty advising loads, there is still a widespread sense that advising loads are too high. This is addressed later in the report.

Advisors were asked the extent to which they advise on university requirements (general education, American institutions, diversity and common ground, and so forth) on a five-point scale (1=not at all, 5=extensively), and the mean response was 4 with a departmental range from 3.3 (Business Administration) to 4.7 (Social Work). All advisors indicated they understand they are supposed to advise on university requirements outside the major. This result suggests that academic advisors in CPS understand that they are responsible for advising students regarding university requirements beyond the major, with important variation in the extent of such advising across department. Results are presented in the order that questions were asked.

Table 8: How do you use the DAR in advising students?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|---|-----------------|----------------|
| I don't use the DAR | 0 | 0 |
| I ask student to review her DAR prior to advising appt. | 14 | 42 |
| I review student's DAR before meeting with student | 4 | 12 |
| I review DAR with student in advising session | 27 | 82 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

From table 8 one can see that there is universal use of the DAR by academic advisors in CPS. A bit under half of the advisors ask their students to review their DAR before the advising appointment, and over 80 percent review the DAR with the student during an academic advising session.

Table 10: How did you become trained in academic advising?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Taught myself by reading about it | 15 | 46 |
| Learned by doing | 18 | 55 |
| Taught by Colleague/Mentor | 16 | 49 |
| Department manual/training | 5 | 15 |
| Advising Center Training | 6 | 18 |
| EOP | 0 | 0 |
| SDRC | 0 | 0 |
| Formal faculty development training | 3 | 9 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

Responses from the survey summarized in table 10 indicate that academic advisors in CPS learn how to advise students through a process of being self-taught (46%), learning by doing (55%), and being taught by a colleague or mentor (49%). Fewer than 20% receive any other form of advisor training. It is striking that there is such a mismatch between importance of academic advising to student retention and success on the one hand, and the informal and ad-hoc process of training academic advisors in CPS.

Table 11: What do you perceive to be the primary purpose of academic advising here at HSU?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|---|-----------------|----------------|
| Help Students achieve life goals | 12 | 36 |
| Career Planning | 7 | 21 |
| Ensure successful progression to degree | 31 | 94 |
| Mentoring | 16 | 49 |
| Schedule Classes | 10 | 30 |

* Despite wording of question, advisors could indicate more than one response.

From table 11 we can see that nearly all academic advisors in CPS see ensuring successful progression to degree as the primary purpose of academic advising. Other attributes of academic advising, such as mentoring, career planning, helping students create a class schedule, or helping students achieving life goals are not seen as the primary purpose of academic advising by a majority of advisors interviewed for this study. This may be due in part to the large number of advisees assigned to many advisors, and the relatively brief amount of time (24 minutes) provided for advising sessions.

Table 12: What are your goals for your first appointment with a new advisee?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|---|-----------------|----------------|
| Get to know student interest and goals | 27 | 82 |
| Establish roles and responsibilities of advisee and advisor | 4 | 12 |
| Determine at-risk status | 8 | 24 |
| Introduction to the major and options | 20 | 61 |
| Help plan upcoming class schedule | 15 | 46 |
| Create major contract | 7 | 21 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

As shown in table 12, getting to know their new advisee's interests and goals is the goal for over 80% of academic advisors interviewed for this study. We can see that 61% use this first contact to introduce the new advisee to the major and its options, and 46% help the new advisee plan their upcoming class schedule. It is noteworthy that only 24% of advisors attempt to determine their new advisee's at-risk status. Nearly 80% of academic advisors wait until a later advising session to create a major contract for a new advisee.

Table 13: What are your goals for advising appointments with established advisees?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|--|-----------------|----------------|
| Schedule classes for next semester | 11 | 33 |
| Progression Review check-in | 30 | 91 |
| Career Planning | 15 | 46 |
| Connect student with needed services at HSU | 8 | 24 |
| Check on state of student's personal circumstances | 13 | 39 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

Nearly all (30 of 33) academic advisors interviewed for this report consider progression review check-in to be a goal for advising appointments with established advisees. From table 13 one can see that other possible goals such as scheduling classes, career planning, connecting students with needed services, and checking in on a student's personal circumstances are all considered to be goals for fewer than half of the academic advisors in this study.

Table 14: How do you advise "at-risk" students differently than other students?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|--|-----------------|----------------|
| I don't | 12 | 36 |
| Connect student with services @ HSU | 9 | 27 |
| Contact student more frequently | 4 | 12 |
| Provide more mentoring | 17 | 52 |
| Connect with student outside of academic setting | 1 | 3 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

Before asking advisors how they advise at-risk students, we provided them with the following definition: being a first-generation college student, an ethnic minority, academically disadvantaged, having disabilities, being of low socioeconomic status, and being on academic probation (Heisserer & Parette, 2002). Slightly over half of the academic advisors we interviewed in CPS indicate that they provide more mentoring for students who are at-risk as compared to other advisees, as shown in table 14. One notable result is that a bit over one-third of all advisors interviewed in this study do not advise at-risk students any differently than their other advisees, and only 12% see their at-risk advisees more frequently than other students. Only somewhat more than a quarter of advisors refer at-risk students to other campus services.

It is worth noting that those advisors who said they do not advise at-risk students differently than others can be divided into two groups – one in which advisors said “I don’t treat them differently” and the other in which advisors indicated that they treat all students as though they are at-risk, being mindful that everyone has challenges, and that it’s best to work from a strengths-based perspective. Of the 11 advisors who don’t treat at-risk students differently, there was always evidence of good intentions toward advisees: often advisors feel that it’s better to treat everybody equally than to distinguish. They try to give everyone full support, avoid bias, and they believe that students do not want to talk about their struggles. In addition, of the 11 that do “nothing”, seven specifically mentioned that they do not know which of their advisees are at-risk.

Among those who named strategies for working with at-risk students, three objected to the nature of the question, saying that treating people “differently” comes from deficit-based thinking and can be offensive. One advisor pointed out that it’s not desirable to be called “at-risk”, and that it’s evidence of a neo-colonial attitude to describe others that way. Another advisor talked about treating everyone like they’re human, and that no one wants to be treated differently because they’re ‘special’. The third focused solely on low performers to answer the question, pointing out that the term “at-risk” can be offensive.

Table 15: How do you identify "at-risk" students among your advisees?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|---|-----------------|----------------|
| Nothing | 9 | 27 |
| The student tells me | 12 | 36 |
| I use information on the student's DARS | 18 | 55 |
| From checking in with my advisees | 14 | 42 |
| I get an Academic Success Plan for a student on probation | 7 | 21 |
| The student performed poorly in my class | 3 | 9 |
| A colleague or Student Affairs told me the student was struggling | 3 | 9 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

From table 15 we can see that most academic advisors attempt to identify at-risk advisees in some way or another. Just over half use information from the advisee’s DAR, while 42% identify at-risk status from checking in with their advisee, and 36% find out when the advisee tells them. External information such as receipt of Academic Success Plans resulting from advisees being on probation, or receiving information from colleagues or from Student Affairs, is evidently not very important in helping advisors identify at-risk students. Just over a quarter of advisors do not identify at-risk status at all. Perhaps providing academic advisors with better “early warning” information on at-risk students and their needs, combined with targeted advisor training, would make a difference.

Table 16: To what extent do you use a particular advising style?*

| Advising Style | Mean Response | Standard Deviation |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Prescriptive | 3.76 | 1.15 |
| Proactive/Intrusive | 3.12 | 1.11 |
| Developmental | 4.27 | 0.88 |

* On a five-point scale in which 1=not at all and 5=extensively.

Academic advisors were asked the extent to which they use the three broad categories of advising style summarized from the scholarly advising literature earlier in this report – prescriptive, proactive/intrusive, and developmental. As with at-risk status, we defined each advising style before we asked advisors the extent to which they utilize a particular style. Of the three, one can see from table 16 that developmental is used the most extensively overall, with a mean response of 4.27/5. Social Work and the Advising Center use the developmental style most extensively. A prescriptive style was somewhat less extensively used overall, with a mean response of 3.76/5. Business Administration and Psychology use the prescriptive style most extensively. The proactive/intrusive advising style is used the least with a mean response of 3.15/5. Business Administration and the Advising Center report using the intrusive/proactive style most extensively. Eleven advisors were reluctant to choose one particular style of advising, and explained that they thought the most appropriate style depended on the student, and that they might try different styles depending on what the student needed at different stages in their academic career.

Table 17: How do you ensure that students from diverse cultural backgrounds feel comfortable coming to talk with you?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|--|-----------------|----------------|
| Nothing | 20 | 61 |
| Explicitly tell them to feel comfortable coming to talk with you | 7 | 21 |
| Share information from your personal life to help them relate to you | 5 | 15 |
| Arrange office to seem more hospitable | 3 | 9 |
| Put up signs re: safe zone, hate free zone, etc. | 1 | 3 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

A majority of academic advisors interviewed for this report do not take any specific actions to ensure that students from diverse cultural backgrounds feel comfortable coming to speak with them. From table 17 one can see that a few advisors explicitly tell such students to feel comfortable coming to talk with them, or share information from their personal life to help such students relate to them, or arrange their office to be more hospitable. Of those whose responses did not fall under one of the above categories, there were only five that specifically said they did nothing different for students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Twelve respondents

indicated that they make efforts to ensure that students feel comfortable through creating an informal, friendly, and welcoming environment for them. Two respondents indicated that because their backgrounds were culturally diverse that they felt students would feel an ability to relate to them and thus feel more comfortable coming to talk with them.

Table 18: What do you consider to be the key best practices in academic advising, both for “at-risk” and other students?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|---|-----------------|----------------|
| Get to know student interests and goals | 29 | 88 |
| Communicate expectations to advisee prior to advising session | 5 | 15 |
| Have student review DAR | 19 | 58 |
| Have student prepare draft class schedule prior to meeting | 3 | 9 |
| Direct students to HSU services as needed | 22 | 67 |
| Have more frequent meetings with at-risk students | 8 | 24 |
| Follow-up contact between advising sessions | 2 | 6 |
| Monitor & review successful student progression to degree | 32 | 97 |
| Create graduation plans with semester by semester schedule | 10 | 30 |
| Other | 3 | 9 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

As shown in table 18, nearly all academic advisors in CPS consider monitoring and review of student progression to degree, and getting to know a student’s interests and goals, to be key best practices in academic advising. A bit more than half consider directing students to campus services, and having students review their DAR, as best practices. Only 30% see creating graduation plans with semester-by-semester schedules to be a best practice, and just under a quarter see having more frequent meetings with at-risk students as a key best practice. Less than one in six advisors interviewed for this report stated that communicating expectations to advisees prior to an advising session was a key best practice. Fewer than one in 10 see having students prepare a draft class schedule before an advising session, or providing follow-up contact between advising sessions, as key best practices.

Table 19: Do you perceive that you are responsible for the following duties as an academic advisor?

| Advisor Responses* | <i>n</i> | Percent |
|---|-----------------|----------------|
| Connecting students to emotional/psychological support? | 31 | 94 |
| Integrating life goals, academic pursuits, and career aims? | 33 | 100 |
| Academic planning for successful progression to degree? | 33 | 100 |
| Connecting with students outside of the academic setting? | 18 | 55 |
| Referring to academic or non-academic campus services? | 33 | 100 |
| Life coaching/mentoring on success skills? | 29 | 88 |
| Providing information about academic major requirements? | 33 | 100 |
| Providing information about how to navigate through the HSU system to get important support, services, and other needs met? | 30 | 91 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

Academic advisors interviewed for this report see themselves as having a wide range of responsibilities with regard to their advisees. Of the list given above, connecting with students outside of the academic setting is the only item over which advisors lack consensus; only about half indicate that that is one of their responsibilities. In several cases there is some interesting departmental variation in these results. Advisors in Economics assign a relatively low rating to emotional/psychological support, referral to academic or non-academic campus services, and to providing information on how to navigate through the HSU system, for example, while advisors in Child Development assign a much higher rating to these same categories. Psychology advisors assign a particularly low importance value to connecting with students outside of the academic setting.

Table 20: What should HSU do to support advising and foster student progression and success?

| Categories of qualitative feedback from advisors* | Number of advisors who said similar things |
|---|---|
| Advisors should receive professional training | 13 |
| Faculty should have smaller advising loads | 8 |
| Advising tools, particularly the DAR, need improvement (integrated information, timely incorporation of major contract/substitutions) | 7 |
| Advising should be a more important element of faculty assessment | 7 |
| The way the advising system is organized should be reconsidered | 7 |
| Students would benefit from more effective advising | 6 |
| Faculty need more time for advising | 5 |
| Faculty academic advisors should be allowed to focus on major requirements, not GEAR or financial aid | 4 |
| HSU should place a higher value on advising | 4 |
| HSU should do some things to make advising easier | 2 |
| Students should be more knowledgeable about requirements and prepared for an advising session | 2 |
| Advising should be done by people who value it | 2 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response.

When time allowed, advisors were asked an open-ended question near the end of the interview – what should HSU do to support advising and foster student progression and success. The research team asked 85% of interviewees this question, and grouped responses by similar category; the results are shown in table 20.

A number of these suggestions are broadly congruent with the best practices in academic advising from the scholarly literature. In particular, many of those interviewed for this report advocated for advisor training; suggested smaller advising loads; called for assessment of advising; wanted the university to place a higher value on advising; and noted that advising should be done by those who value advising – all of which are recognized as best practices in the advising literature.

Some interesting ideas arose with regard to the modal response to this question– one faculty advisor suggested an “advisor of the year” award. Another called for formal, scaffolded advisor mentoring system in which new advisors are apprenticed with experienced and effective advisors. Still another called for better “bridging and connection” between student support programs and coaches on the one hand, and departmental faculty involved with advising on the other. The next most common response from advisors concerned decreasing advisee loads. This issue resonates with other feedback in the table above, including providing sufficient time for advising, as those faculty with larger advising loads will necessarily have less time in which to advise each student. In addition, more effective academic advisors tend to attract more advisees, which can lead to perverse incentives.

Table 21: Is there anything else related to advising that you'd like to share with me today?

| Categories of qualitative feedback from advisors | Number of advisors who said similar things |
|---|--|
| Advising best practices need to be considered and incorporated into HSU's advising system | 9 |
| Advising is important | 5 |
| Faculty should be the ones to advise | 5 |
| Students are responsible for their academic experience, and we can help them have a good one | 5 |
| Advisors should receive professional training | 3 |
| Advising tools, particularly the DAR, need improvement (integrated information, timely incorporation of major contract/substitutions) | 2 |

The final question in the interview was open-ended, allowing academic advisors to offer insights that they had not yet had an opportunity to share. Note that while there is a great deal of similarity in responses in table 20 and 21, this is partly due to different individuals providing similar answers or comments to the two open-ended questions. The modal response was that advising best practices need to be widely adopted (likely through professional development training) at HSU. Another categorical response was that advisors need to be trained. This idea of incorporating and adopting advising best practices, and training advisors, is closely aligned with the modal response in table 20, which called for formal advisor training.

Summary and Discussion

Following are some key findings and discussion points from this report:

- *Most CPS academic advisors are self-trained, learned by doing, or were mentored by a colleague.* Self-training, learning by doing, or mentoring can result in widely different advising practices, even within a given department, and can perpetuate less effective or even dysfunctional practices. Without training, advisors may not be aware of the different possible approaches to advising, or have the opportunity to fully develop their philosophy of advising. The modal response to the question of what HSU should do to support advising was for the university to provide better advisor training.
- *Some CPS academic advisors are uncertain how to appropriately identify or advise at-risk students.* While the scholarly literature suggests more frequent contact and proactive/intrusive advising, fully a third of the advisors we interviewed do not advise at-risk students very differently than other students. More than a quarter of advisors do nothing to identify at-risk students and more than a third report that they rely on the student telling them of their at-risk status. This is likely an area in which a strong centralized system of identifying at-risk students and implementing specific interventions could be fruitful.
- *Most CPS academic advisors did not identify any approach used to make students from diverse cultural backgrounds feel comfortable with an office visit.* The advising literature indicates that first-generation students and students from some underrepresented minority backgrounds are less likely to feel comfortable approaching faculty for advising and support. As HSU becomes increasingly diverse, this is another area where the past practice of advisor self-training, learning by doing, and collegial mentoring may be inadequate, and where specialized training could be fruitful.
- *Many CPS academic advisors see the need for more effective advising methods, but also express concern about how this will be implemented in the context of high advising loads:* A greater emphasis

on effective advising in the context of what many faculty see as high advising loads creates concern about adding to already high faculty workloads.

Recommendations for the future:

To improve advising outcomes, HSU needs to make a more robust commitment to excellence in academic advising. The results of this study point to a need for:

- *Systematic and ongoing faculty development in advising techniques.* Learning communities and forums such as the Institute for Student Success offer two likely vehicles for such faculty development. Targeted formal training and mentoring of new faculty advisors would allow for integration of advising best practices and ensure that students are provided with the best possible guidance.
- *Availability of systems that can track student performance during a semester:* Academic Early Warning (combined with better information from a revamping of the Degree Audit Report System (DARS)) will allow for more effective coordinated advising and retention of at-risk students.
- *Increased utilization of intrusive advising styles for at-risk students:* In situations where early detection systems indicate students are struggling, intrusive/proactive advising should be used to follow up with advisees, connect them with necessary support services, and help them improve their academic performance.
- *Specialized training in working with students from diverse cultural backgrounds:* Making provisions for students from diverse backgrounds to be comfortable with office visits merits concrete training and knowledge building. In order to ensure the success and timely graduation of HSU students, it is essential that they feel comfortable seeking out help and guidance, especially those students who are first-generation college attenders, or from underrepresented minority backgrounds. Increasing the cultural competence of academic advisors can help with this, and can be accomplished through trainings from relevant offices at the university.
- *In the context of faculty concerns about high advising loads, an effort should be made to set firm caps on the number of advisees and to adopt technologies and approaches that simplify the advising process:* Concerns about large advising loads can be mitigated in part by meaningful caps on the number of advisees, and by initiatives including Academic Early Warning, a new and improved DARS, and a more effective system of integrated student support. The latter would involve coordinated interventions with at-risk students, career support, and information systems to improve the ability of students to effectively navigate the system.

Sources Cited

- California State University. (2010). California State University launches bold graduation initiative to increase number of students earning degrees: Effort also aimed at helping more underserved students complete college [Press release]. Retrieved from <http://www.calstate.edu/pa/news/2010/release/2graduation-initiative.shtml>
- Crockett, D. S. (1978). Academic advising: A cornerstone of student retention. *New Directions for Student Services*, 1978(3), 29–35. doi:10.1002/ss.37119780306
- Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13(1), 12–17.
- Cuseo, J. (2003). Academic advisement and student retention: Empirical connections and systematic interventions. Retrieved from <http://www.geocities.ws/jccadjunct/advret.html>
- Cuseo, J. (2012). Assessment of academic advisors and academic advising programs. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved from https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Commissions/C32/documents/Cuseo_Marymount1.pdf
- Habley, W. (2000). Current practices in academic advising. In V. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (pp. 35–43). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Habley, W. (2004). The status of academic advising: Findings from the ACT sixth national survey. *National Academic Advising Association*.
- Harding, V. N. (2008). Students with specific advising needs. In W. R. Habley & V. Gordon (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (pp. 189–203). John Wiley & Sons.
- Harrison, E. (2009). What constitutes good academic advising? Nursing students' perceptions of academic advising. *The Journal of Nursing Education*, 48(7), 361–366.
- Heisserer, D. L., & Parette, P. (2002). Advising at-risk students in college and university settings. *College Student Journal*, 36(1), 69.
- Higginson, L. (2000). A framework for training program content. In V. N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (pp. 298–307). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Humboldt State University. (2011a). FTUG graduation rate analysis. Retrieved from <http://www.humboldt.edu/irp/downloads/FTUG%20Graduation%20Rate%20Analysis.pdf>
- Humboldt State University. (2011b). 2011 retention report. Retrieved from http://www.humboldt.edu/irp/retention_report.html
- Humboldt State University. (2012a). Humboldt State University Advising Handbook. Retrieved from <http://www.humboldt.edu/advice/index.html>
- Humboldt State University. (2012b). Educational Opportunity Program. Retrieved from <http://www.humboldt.edu/eop/applying.html>
- Koring, H. (2005). Advisor training and development. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved November 21, 2012, from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/adv_training.htm#over
- Lynch, M. (2000). Assessing the effectiveness of the advising program. In V. N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (pp. 324–338). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Metzner, B. S. (1989). Perceived quality of academic advising: The effect on freshman attrition. *American Educational Research Journal*, 26(3), 422–442. doi:10.2307/1162981
- National Academic Advising Association. (2011). *Faculty advising summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/documents/Faculty-advising-summary.pdf>
- Nutt, C. (2003). Academic advising and student retention and persistence. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/retention.htm>
- O'Banion, T. (1972). An academic advising model. *Junior College Journal*, 42(6), 62–69.
- Pardee, C. (2000). Organizational models for academic advising. In V. N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (pp. 192–209). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reinarz, A. G. (2000). Delivering academic advising: Advisor types. In V. N. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (pp. 210–219). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Robbins, R., & Zarges, K. M. (2011). Assessment of academic advising: A summary of the process. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/assessment-Robbins-Zarges.htm>
- Varney, J. (2012). Proactive (intrusive) advising! *NACADA*. Retrieved November 21, 2012, from <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/ePub/AAT35-3.htm#5>

APPENDIX A: Tables with Data Aggregated by Department

Note: When aggregating outcomes by department we used the rule of three -- we reported only those departments with a minimum of three responses, to ensure adviser confidentiality. Therefore, we will not report the responses given by Liberal Studies Elementary Education or the Nursing Department. This also resulted in the Recreation Administration adviser responses being combined with the Kinesiology responses into a KIN/REC category. “ADV” refers to Advising Center staff.

Table 1A: How much time do you usually take, on average, in a given advising session during registration period?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 30 | 0 |
| BUS | 6 | 21 | 9.7 |
| CD | 3 | 25 | 5 |
| ECON | 3 | 27 | 5.8 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 21 | 13 |
| PSYC | 6 | 18 | 6 |
| SW | 3 | 35 | 8.7 |

Table 2A: To what extent do you use Intrusive/Proactive Advising (1-5)?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 3.7 | 0.6 |
| BUS | 6 | 3.7 | 1 |
| CD | 3 | 2.67 | 1.15 |
| ECON | 3 | 2.7 | 1.5 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 3.6 | 0.5 |
| PSYC | 6 | 2.5 | 1.4 |
| SW | 3 | 2.7 | 1.5 |

Table 3A: To what extent do you use Prescriptive Advising (1-5)?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 3.7 | 1.5 |
| BUS | 6 | 4.5 | 0.8 |
| CD | 3 | 2.7 | 0.6 |
| ECON | 3 | 3.7 | 0.6 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 3.9 | 1.1 |
| PSYC | 6 | 4.3 | 0.5 |
| SW | 3 | 2.3 | 1.5 |

Table 4A: To what extent do you use Developmental Advising (1-5)?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |
| BUS | 6 | 4.2 | 0.8 |
| CD | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| ECON | 3 | 3.7 | 0.6 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 4.3 | 0.5 |
| PSYC | 6 | 3.8 | 1.6 |
| SW | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |

(Tables 5A-13A utilize the following)

Would you please tell us to what extent you feel responsible for each of the following advising duties (1=not at all, 5=extensively)?

Table 5A: Connecting students with emotional/psychological support?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 4.3 | 0.6 |
| BUS | 6 | 4.8 | 0.4 |
| CD | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |
| ECON | 3 | 3.3 | 1.5 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 3.7 | 1.4 |
| PSYC | 6 | 3.5 | 2 |
| SW | 3 | 5 | 0 |

Table 6A: Integrating life goals, academic pursuits, and career aims?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| BUS | 6 | 4.5 | 0.8 |
| CD | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |
| ECON | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 4.6 | 0.5 |
| PSYC | 6 | 4.3 | 0.8 |
| SW | 3 | 5 | 0 |

Table 7A: Academic planning for successful progression to degree?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| BUS | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| CD | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| ECON | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 4.9 | 0.4 |
| PSYC | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| SW | 3 | 5 | 0 |

Table 8A: Connecting with students outside of the academic setting?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| BUS | 6 | 2.3 | 1.6 |
| CD | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| ECON | 3 | 2.3 | 1.5 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 2.9 | 1.8 |
| PSYC | 6 | 1.3 | 0.5 |
| SW | 3 | 2 | 1.7 |

Table 10A: Referring to academic or non-academic campus services?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| BUS | 6 | 4.7 | 0.5 |
| CD | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| ECON | 3 | 3.3 | 0.6 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 3.7 | 0.8 |
| PSYC | 6 | 4.5 | 0.8 |
| SW | 3 | 5 | 0 |

Table 11A: Life coaching/mentoring on success skills?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 2.7 | 0.6 |
| BUS | 6 | 4.3 | 0.5 |
| CD | 3 | 4.3 | 1.2 |
| ECON | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 2.9 | 1.6 |
| PSYC | 6 | 2.8 | 1.6 |
| SW | 3 | 4 | 1.7 |

Table 12A: Providing information about academic major requirements?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|
| ADV | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |
| BUS | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| CD | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| ECON | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 5 | 0 |
| PSYC | 6 | 5 | 0 |
| SW | 3 | 5 | 0 |

Table 13A: Providing info about how to navigate through HSU system to get important services, support, and other needs met?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|
| ADV | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| BUS | 6 | 4.2 | 1.6 |
| CD | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| ECON | 3 | 2.3 | 1.5 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 4 | 0.8 |
| PSYC | 6 | 3.5 | 1.5 |
| SW | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |

Table 14A: How do you use the DAR in advising students?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|------|-----|---------|----|------|----|----|-----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| I don't use the DAR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| I ask student to review her DAR prior to advising appt. | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 33 |
| I review student's DAR before meeting with student | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| I review DAR with student in advising session | 3 | 100 | 4 | 67 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 100 | 6 | 86 | 4 | 67 | 3 | 100 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 15A: To what extent do you advise on GEAR and GE Requirements (1-5)?

| Dept | <i>n</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| ADV | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| BUS | 6 | 3.3 | 1.2 |
| CD | 3 | 4.3 | 0.6 |
| ECON | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| KIN/REC | 7 | 3.9 | 1.4 |
| PSYC | 6 | 3.7 | 1.4 |
| SW | 3 | 4.7 | 0.6 |

Table 16A: To what extent do you advise on GEAR and GE (1-5)?

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----|----------|----|----------|----|----------|----|----------|-----|----------|----|----------|----|
| Advisor Response | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % | <i>n</i> | % |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 |
| 5 | 3 | 100 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 3 | 100 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 |
| I don't advise on GE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| It is not my responsibility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 17A: How did you become trained in academic advising?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|------|----|---------|----|------|----|----|----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Taught myself by reading about it | 1 | 33 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 43 | 4 | 67 | 1 | 33 |
| Learned by doing | 3 | 100 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 57 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 |
| Taught by colleague/mentor | 1 | 33 | 3 | 50 | 2 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 33 |
| Department manual/training | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 |
| Advising Center training | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 2 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| EOP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| SDRC | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Formal faculty development training | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 18A: What do you perceive is the primary purpose of academic advising here at HSU?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|---------|-----|------|----|----|-----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Help students achieve life goals | 2 | 67 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 5 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 |
| Career planning | 1 | 33 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ensure successful progression to degree | 2 | 67 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 5 | 83 | 3 | 100 |
| Mentoring | 3 | 100 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 57 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 |
| Schedule classes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 19A: What are your goals for your first appointment with a new advisee?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|---------|----|------|----|----|-----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Get to know student interests and goals | 3 | 100 | 5 | 83 | 3 | 100 | 1 | 33 | 6 | 86 | 4 | 83 | 3 | 100 |
| Establish roles and responsibilities of advisee and advisor | 1 | 33 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Determine at-risk status | 1 | 33 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 100 |
| Introduction to the major and options | 0 | 0 | 4 | 67 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 5 | 71 | 4 | 67 | 0 | 0 |
| Help plan upcoming class schedule | 0 | 0 | 6 | 100 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 43 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 |
| Create major contract | 0 | 0 | 5 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 20A: What are your goals for advising appointments with established advisees?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|---------|----|------|----|----|-----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Schedule classes for next semester | 1 | 33 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| Progression review check-in | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 6 | 86 | 5 | 83 | 3 | 100 |
| Career planning | 2 | 67 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| Connect students with needed services at HSU | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 2 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 |
| Check on state of student's personal circumstances | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 21A: How do advise "at-risk" students differently than other students?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|--|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|------|----|---------|----|------|----|----|-----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Nothing | 1 | 33 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 1 | 14 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| Connect students with services at HSU | 1 | 33 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 17 | 3 | 100 |
| Contact student more frequently | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Provide more mentoring | 2 | 67 | 4 | 67 | 2 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 5 | 71 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 |
| Connect with student outside of academic setting | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 22A: How do you identify at-risk students among your advisees?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|------|----|---------|----|------|----|----|----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| I don't | 0 | 0 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 14 | 4 | 67 | 1 | 33 |
| The student tells me | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| I use information on the student's DAR | 3 | 100 | 4 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 4 | 57 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| From checking in with my advisees | 1 | 33 | 3 | 50 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 43 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| I get an Academic Success Plan for a student on probation | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The student performed poorly in my class | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| A colleague or Student Affairs told me the student was struggling | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 67 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 23A: Which of the 3 styles described (prescriptive, intrusive, or developmental) would work best with at-risk students?

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|---|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|------|----|---------|----|------|----|----|----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Prescriptive | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| Proactive/Intrusive | 1 | 33 | 2 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 4 | 57 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| Developmental | 1 | 33 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 |
| Spectrum (All 3 may be appropriate at different stages) | 1 | 33 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 29 | 2 | 33 | 2 | 67 |

Table 24A: How do you ensure that students from diverse cultural backgrounds feel comfortable coming to talk with you?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|--|-----|----|-----|----|----|----|------|-----|---------|----|------|----|----|----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Nothing | 2 | 67 | 5 | 83 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 100 | 1 | 14 | 5 | 83 | 2 | 67 |
| Explicitly tell them to feel comfortable coming to talk with you | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 |
| Share information from your personal life to help them relate to you | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arrange office to seem more hospitable | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 |
| Put up signs re: safe zone, hate free zone, etc. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 25A: What do you consider to be the key best practices in academic advising, both for “at-risk” and other students?*

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|---------|-----|------|----|----|-----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Get to know student interests and goals | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 2 | 67 | 7 | 100 | 3 | 50 | 3 | 100 |
| Communicate expectations to advisee prior to advising session | 1 | 33 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| Have student review DAR | 2 | 67 | 5 | 83 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 43 | 3 | 50 | 3 | 100 |
| Have student prepare draft class schedule prior to meeting | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Direct students to HSU services as needed | 2 | 67 | 3 | 50 | 3 | 100 | 2 | 67 | 5 | 71 | 2 | 33 | 3 | 100 |
| Have more frequent meetings with at-risk students | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 2 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 43 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 |
| Follow-up contact between advising sessions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Monitor and review successful student progression to degree | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 6 | 83 | 3 | 100 |
| Create advising plans with semester by semester schedule | 0 | 0 | 6 | 100 | 1 | 33 | 1 | 33 | 7 | 100 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Advisors could indicate more than one response, and so column response rates can exceed 100%.

Table 26A: Do you perceive that you are responsible for the following duties as an academic advisor?

| | ADV | | BUS | | CD | | ECON | | KIN/REC | | PSYC | | SW | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|---------|-----|------|-----|----|-----|
| Advisor Response | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Connecting students to emotional/psychological support? | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 4 | 67 | 3 | 100 |
| Integrating life goals, academic pursuits, and career aims? | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 |
| Academic planning for successful progression to degree? | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 |
| Connecting with students outside of the academic setting? | 3 | 100 | 3 | 50 | 2 | 67 | 2 | 67 | 5 | 71 | 2 | 33 | 1 | 33 |
| Referring to academic or non-academic campus services? | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 |
| Life coaching/mentoring on success skills? | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 5 | 71 | 4 | 67 | 3 | 100 |
| Providing information about academic major requirements? | 3 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 3 | 100 | 7 | 100 | 6 | 100 | 3 | 100 |
| Providing information about how to navigate through the HSU system to get important support, services, and other needs met? | 3 | 100 | 5 | 83 | 3 | 100 | 2 | 67 | 7 | 100 | 5 | 83 | 3 | 100 |

Appendix B: Advising Interview Questionnaire

This instrument was used by the interviewers to tabulate advisor responses, and it was not given to interviewees. The boxes after some questions represent categories of likely answers that aided in recording responses by the interviewer, and were not shared or suggested to those being interviewed.

Academic Advising Interview Interviewer: _____ Advisor: _____

Thank for taking the time to talk with me today. The College of Professional Studies is conducting a study of academic advising practices. In that context I'd like to ask you some questions about your experience with academic advising, and your opinions about best practices. I would like to record this interview to assure I correctly tabulate your responses – is that ok? Please note that your participation is voluntary and you can end this interview at any time. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential, and only aggregated responses will be reported in a study to be shared with the campus community. Individual response sheets and recordings will be kept in a secure storage site and will be destroyed at the end of the study. Do you have any questions? Note that you can contact Anna Thaler Petersen via HSU email or telephone if you do. Ready to start?

1. How many advisees do you have right now? How many do you usually have (on average in last few years)?

Current advisee count = _____

Average advisee count last few years = _

2. How much time do you usually take, on average, in advising students in a given advising session during registration time each semester?

_____ minutes. Notes

3. How do you use the DAR in advising students?

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| I don't use the DAR | I ask student to review her DAR prior to advising appt. | I review student's DAR before meeting with student | I review DAR with student in advising session |
|---------------------|---|--|---|

Notes

4. On a scale of 1-5, (1=not at all, 5=extensively) to what extent do you advise on GEAR and GE requirements?

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____

Notes

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| I don't advise on GE requirements. | I'm not supposed to advise on GE. It's not my job. |
|------------------------------------|--|

5. How did you become trained in academic advising?

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Taught myself by reading about it | Learned by doing | Taught by colleague/mentor | Department manual/training |
| Advising Center training | EOP | SDRC | Formal faculty development training |

Notes

6. What do you perceive is the primary purpose of academic advising here at HSU?

| | | |
|---|-----------|------------------|
| Help students achieve life goals | | Career planning |
| Ensure successful student progression to degree | Mentoring | Schedule classes |

Notes

7. What are your goals for your first appointment with a new advisee?

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| Get to know student interests and goals | Establish roles and responsibilities of advisee and advisor | Determine at-risk status |
| Introduction to the major and options | Help plan upcoming class schedule | Create major contract |

Notes

8. What are your goals for advising appointments with established advisees?

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Schedule classes for next semester | Progression review check-in | Career planning | Connect student with needed services @ | Check on state of student's personal circumstances |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|--|--|

Notes

9. "At-risk" students are a focus of national research efforts. Here's what we mean by "at-risk" – being a first-generation college student, an ethnic minority, academically disadvantaged, having disabilities, being of low socioeconomic status, and being on academic probation (from *Advising At-Risk Students in College and University Settings*).

a. How do you advise "at-risk" students differently than other students?

| | | | | |
|---------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Nothing | Connect student with services @ HSU | Contact student more frequently | Provide more mentoring | Connect with students outside of academic setting |
|---------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---|

Notes

b. How do you identify “at-risk” students among your advisees?

| | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| I don't | The student tells me | I use information on the student's DAR | From checking in with my advisees | I get an Academic Success Plan for a student on probation | The student performed poorly in my class | A colleague or Student Affairs told me the student was struggling |
|---------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|

Notes

10. Now I'm going to ask you about your style of advising. I'm going to define a type of advising according to the existing literature, and ask to what extent (on a scale of 1-5) you employ that style in your own advising work.

- a. Prescriptive advising is intended to assist students in making most efficient use of time in progressing to degree. It is characterized by a relationship in which the advisor makes a recommendation about the student's academic progress regarding course choice or progression to degree, and the student follows the advisor's recommendation. On a scale of 1-5 (1=not at all, 5=extensively), to what extent do you do prescriptive advising?

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

Notes

- b. Another style of advising is called Proactive/Intrusive. It involves: deliberate intervention to enhance student motivation, using strategies to show interest and involvement with students, intensive advising designed to increase the probability of student success, working to educate students on all options, and approaching students before situations develop. On a scale of 1-5 (1=not at all, 5=extensively), to what extent do you employ “intrusive or proactive” advising?

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

Notes

- c. The last style of advising we'd like to hear from you about is called Developmental advising. This involves a shared responsibility approach that involves both student and advisor in promoting initiative and growth in the student. The advisor directs students to proper resources, facilitating development of greater independence, decision-making, and problem-solving. On a scale of 1-5 (1=not at all, 5=extensively), to what extent do you use developmental advising?

1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5

Notes

- d. Which of the three styles I described to you would, in your opinion, work best with "at-risk" students?

| | | |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Prescriptive | Proactive/Intrusive | Developmental |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------|

Notes

11. Next question! How do you ensure that students from diverse cultural backgrounds feel comfortable coming to talk with you?

| | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Nothing or not sure | Explicitly tell them to feel comfortable coming to talk with you | Share information from your personal life to help them relate to you | Arrange office to seem more hospitable | Put up signs re: safe zone, hate free zone, etc. |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|

Notes

12. Now that we've covered most of the questions in this interview, can you reflect upon what you consider to be the key best practices in academic advising, both for "at-risk" and other students?

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Get to know student interests and goals | Communicate expectations to advisee prior to advising session | Have student review DAR | Have student prepare draft class schedule prior to meeting | Direct students to HSU services as needed |
| Have more frequent meetings with at-risk students | Follow-up contact between advising sessions | Monitor & review successful student progression to degree | Create advising plans with semester by semester schedule | Other |

Notes

13. We'd like to get a sense for what advisors perceive as their responsibilities in academic advising. Would you please tell us 'yes' or 'no' for whether you think you're responsible for each of the possible advising duties? In addition, on a scale of 1-5 (1=not at all, 5=extensively), to what extent do you feel responsible for each of the following advising duties:

a. Connecting students to emotional/psychological support?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

b. Integrating life goals, academic pursuits, and career aims?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

c. Academic planning for successful progression to degree?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

d. Connecting with students outside of the academic setting?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

e. Referring to academic or non-academic campus services?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

f. Life coaching/mentoring on success skills?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

g. Providing information about academic major requirements?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

h. Providing information about how to navigate through the HSU system to get important support, services, and other needs met?

Responsible? Yes No

1_____2_____3_____4_____5

14. Is there anything else related to advising that you'd like to share with me today?

Great! Thank you so much for your time, once again. This information will greatly help us to ensure that student and faculty advising needs are being met.