THE CREATION OF AN ACADEMIC ADVISOR
EVALUATION TOOL AT A MIDWEST URBAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

Mari Straith Yancho

This dissertation is submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Community College Leadership

Ferris State University

October, 2014

THE CREATION OF AN ACADEMIC ADVISOR
EVALUATION TOOL AT A MIDWEST URBAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

by

Mari Straith Yancho

Has been approved

October, 2014

APPROVED:

Fredrick Michael Ennis, PhD   Chair

Sandra J. Balkema, PhD   Member

Lillie McCain, PhD   Member
                              Committee

ACCEPTED:

Roberta C. Teahen, PhD   Program Coordinator

ABSTRACT

The basis of this project was to create a series of evaluations that could assist supervisory staff in determining the readiness of new academic advisors to assume advising duties. The project itself grew out of empirical observation, as well as faculty and student dissatisfaction with the advising process at a midwestern urban community college.

The literature review indicated a lack of research related to the evaluation of academic advisors on an individual basis at Michigan community colleges, focused on strengths and weaknesses. Once identified, subsequent training was developed to address those areas of advisor weakness.

This project resulted in a 3-part assessment tool focused on three specific areas. The areas included general education requirements, specific degree program requirements, and an interpretation of transcripts to determine which courses students need to enroll in to meet degree requirements. This study did not address technology competency or interpersonal skills, often referred to as 'soft skills.' Pre-tests were developed to pinpoint advisor weaknesses, in order to implement training to address these specific areas, with the goal of improving the accuracy and efficiency of the institution's advising staff. After training, the pre-test was taken again as a post-test to evaluate whether the desired level of academic advisor mastery had been accomplished.

While the project was designed for new academic advisor trainees, it was piloted during the summer of 2012 with 22 current academic advisors as part of an employer sponsored project. Each participant in the study improved their pre-test to post-test score, supporting the project's effectiveness at raising advisor knowledge and skills.

DEDICATION

To Dennis, Gabe, and Caitie Rose, whose love and support sustained me throughout this whole program and dissertation, and who make everything worthwhile.

Even when I said I couldn't do it, you all said, "Yes, you can."   Okay….you win.

Love you, guys!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my three committee members, whose guidance and expertise provided me with the confidence and support I needed to see this project through to completion. My heartfelt thanks go…

To Dr. Lillie McCain:

Lillie, thank you for sharing your insights into James Marcia's research about the four Identity Statuses. His research opened my eyes as to how those statuses impact the community college students that we serve. I believe this has made me both a more knowledgeable and empathetic advisor, and I have shared your insights with other colleagues in the Advising Center. Thank you, too, for being the wonderful sounding board you were while I was gathering and compiling the data. We all miss you in the Advising Center… and I still tell people I want to be Lillie McCain when I grow up.

To Dr. Sandy Balkema:

Sandy, I can't thank you enough for being my APA formatting guru, goddess, and impresario! Just when I began to think the formatting would be the straw that broke this camel's back, you sent me a formatted version of the dissertation and seriously brought tears of joy to my eyes! You really can't know how grateful I am to you for that. Your revision suggestions, too, made the dissertation that much more professional. I will

always remember fondly your wonderful hospitality and lovely home, with great discussions at night after the day's work was done.

To Dr. Fredrick Michael Ennis:

Mike, I truly believe that there would not be a finished dissertation without you. You mentored, challenged, cajoled, and ultimately gave me the figurative kick in the pants I needed to get going and get it done. Our weekly meetings were often the highlight of my entire week (and I miss them!). You helped me narrow the broad scope of my project into a focused dissertation that I hope will serve as a catalyst for further research. When I wanted to quit, thinking that I would be letting you down was often all it took to get me back on track and keep me going. Your sense of humor and down-to-earth approach to developing and writing a dissertation made it a lot more fun and enjoyable than I think writing a dissertation is supposed to be! For this, and so much more, I am forever in your debt.

And, finally…

To Dr. Robbie Teahen:

Robbie, thank you for your kind words and encouragement. For me, you will always epitomize grace, and strength through adversity. I am honored to have been given the opportunity to meet and work with you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Project

Students are presented with many opportunities to help them succeed in meeting

their educational goals. One of the first, and most critical, areas where student success

can be strengthened or undermined is in the advising area. An effective advisor can help

cement the student's decision to enroll at that particular college, in that particular time, in

that particular field, and guide them to a fruitful decision. Hunter and White (2004)

consider academic advising to be "perhaps the only structured campus endeavor that can

guarantee students sustained interaction with a caring and concerned adult who can help

them shape a meaningful learning experience for themselves" (p. 20). This reflects

strongly on the importance of good advising. Conversely, it also highlights the negative

impact of poor advising. It is hard to determine exactly how much damage an inept

advisor can create; many of their advisees either drop out, move on to a different advisor,

or even a different institution (Cuseo, 2003).

In "Academic Advisement and Student Retention: Empirical Connections and

Systemic Interventions" (2007), Joe Cuseo highlights several studies that have served as

catalysts for further research regarding the impact of negative advising. He cites Astin

(1993), who found that only 40% of students surveyed nationwide were either "satisfied"

or "very satisfied" with the quality of academic advising they had received at their

college. He also cites Ender, Winston, & Miller (1984) who state, in their influential

work *Developmental Academic Advising,* "The greatest difficulty students cite with the quality of their academic experiences is advising."

Additionally, Metzner (1989) wrote:

Results revealed that students who perceived advising to be of "good quality" withdrew from the university at a rate that was 25% lower than that of students who reported receiving "poor advising." and they withdrew at a rate that was 40% less than that of students who received no advising at all. Further data analysis revealed that high-quality advising had a statistically significant, indirect effect on student persistence, which was mediated by its positive association with students' level of college satisfaction and its negative (inverse) association with students' intent to leave the university (pages 422-442).

Cuseo further states:

The research reviewed in this section points directly to the conclusion that students need from knowledgeable academic advisors to engage in effective educational planning and decision-making, and if the support is received, they will more likely persist to degree graduation. (p. 7)

A study by Hanover Research (September, 2011) of 13 universities was designed to improve retention and graduation rates, and highlights the importance of good academic advising. Among their results were these two findings:

1. The majority of factors proven to support student retention are related to academic goals, academic-related skills, and academic self-confidence. Thus, the presence of an academic advisor is essential in encouraging students to progress and achieve success in their academic careers (p. 3).

2. A significant number of institutions provide first year students with some form of advisor, mentor, or tutor. Many programs highlighted faculty advising for first year students, while other institutions reviewed in this report provide a peer mentor or tutor as an academic resource. These advisors and mentors may be assigned through the First Year Seminar, through a living-learning community, or simply based on students' academic interests (p. 4).

2

The report (2012) further cites academic advising with first-year transition programs as having "the strongest effect on retention rates at public institutions, as the three practices with the highest mean contributions to retention are related to academic advising" (p. 7). These three practices were:

1. Academic advising center (mean contribution rating of 3.98/5)
2. Increased number of academic advisors (3.98/5)
3. Advising interventions with selected student populations (3.93/5) (p. 7)

The last practice listed obtained a mean rating of 3.8 on a scale of 1-5; this was an integration of advising with first-year transition programs. Of the 13 practices most impacting retention, academic advising accounted for nearly 31% of the total, showing the definite need for a strong academic advising presence at every institute of higher education.

If academic advising plays such a critical role in student success, it may be assumed that all academic advising programs are staffed by fully-trained and dedicated professionals, who will provide their student clientele with only the best of academic advising advice; herein lies the problem. Noel-Levitz (2006) report that 42% of colleges and universities do not have any formal advisor training and development initiatives. They cite lack of funding as the most common issue. Yet, academic advisors need training to be fully competent in a job where the knowledge base is often changing on a daily basis. The lack of training leads to a lack of critical knowledge that results in incorrect information being disseminated to the student, who is relying on the advisor to be accurate. This, in turn, can affect retention (Pietras, 2010).

Therefore, it is crucial that academic advisors not only know and understand current program requirements and college policies relating to the academic advising process, but they must also keep abreast of program and policy changes that will affect the information they disseminate to students. Furthermore, academic advisors should be able to *demonstrate competency* in any and all areas for which they are responsible to their student clientele.

Project Objectives

The objective of this project was to develop and test a series of evaluations that will identify advisor strengths and weaknesses in areas of academic advising. Once the areas of weakness are known, training can be developed to overcome the deficit of knowledge in these specific areas, which will improve an advisor's performance and boost student satisfaction with the advising process as a whole.

Definition of Terms and Abbreviations

- Academic advising: "Advising is a process in which advisor and advisee enter a dynamic relationship respectful of the student's concerns. Ideally, the advisor serves as teacher and guide in an interactive partnership aimed at enhancing the student's self-awareness and fulfillment" (O'Banion, 1972).

- Academic Advisors: Academic advisors include faculty advisors, professional advisors, department advisors, cross-trained advisors, counselors, and peers who are employed by the institution

- Advanced Placement (AP): Upper level high school courses and tests in which a student can earn college credit

- Advising Center: A specific area in which Academic advising can be housed for all divisions and disciplines

- Advisor Assessment Test (A2T): The test developed to assess advisor knowledge

- General Education: "The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess" (The Higher Learning Commission, 2014).

- NACADA: National Academic Advising Association, a 501(c)(3) non-profit educational organization engaged internationally in the work of academic advising

Significance of the Project

As has been referenced in the Introduction, there is a strong link between academic advising and retention. A strong academic advising program has been shown to increase student retention, which is integral to degree completion. While few would argue that successful academic advising will help foster a climate of student success, the Noel-Levitz report (2006) highlights the fact that too few institutions are actively offering continual and on-going training to their academic advising staff. If professional development opportunities are not available to advisors, inevitably the overall quality of academic advising at the institution will suffer.

The project creates a means to measure and assess current individual advisor understanding of the internal criteria that is pertinent to the advising area of the given institution. This is but one small component of the myriad factors leading to a successful academic advising program, but one that is very often over-looked. If a hierarchy of the college educational learning process were created, it could follow along the lines of:

1. Academic advising — good advisors, who are made better through testing and training, which helps lead to

2. Student retention, which helps lead to

3. Graduation and/or completion of college goals, which leads to

4. Work-related success

As is expected, one of the primary focuses of the community college is that of degree or program completion. While an important consideration, looking beyond that degree or program completion, a college education can ultimately help to create an attitude of life-long learning and lead to an improved overall quality of life. This can be manifested in many ways: self-confidence, increased self-esteem, better and more job opportunities, just to name a few.

Two separate, yet uniquely related, areas that rely heavily upon student retention and success (aided by a successful academic advising program) are (1) potential earnings of students and (2) alumni/institution relationships.

The first area, earnings, explores the following questions:

Is a college degree necessary today? What happens when a student does not graduate? Does it really make that much difference in the lifetime earnings and success of an individual? The findings of a study conducted by the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce (2011) would strongly support that it does. According to the Center:

> The data are clear: a college degree is key to economic opportunity, conferring substantially higher earnings on those with credentials than those without. A 2002 Census Bureau study estimated that in 1999, the average lifetime earnings of a Bachelor's degree holder was $2.7 million (2009 dollars), 75 percent more than that earned by high school graduates in 1999. Today, we find similar numbers-but since 1999, the premium on college education has grown to 84 percent. In other words, over a lifetime, a Bachelor's degree is worth $2.8 million on average.

The results of this study clearly show that a college education can lead to a better standard of living for those individuals persistent enough to follow through to degree completion. However, the increase in lifetime earnings is not the only benefit to be derived from a college education, nor is the benefit only to the student.

Regarding alumni/institution relationships, in her article, "Continuing the Connection: Does Academic Advising Impact an Institution's Relationship with Alumni and Donors?" (1999), Sarah Ross emphasizes the importance that advising can have on the willingness of alumni to contribute to their alma mater. She offers as examples two stories of graduates from the University of Illinois (UI):

> In 1985, Gary Bielfeldt gave recognition to the influence his advisor had on his career by donating $115,000 to establish the Thomas Hieronymus Fellowship for the Study of Speculative Markets, which provides fellowships to University of Illinois students interested in that area of study. In1993, Bielfeldt further honored his mentor with a $1 million challenge grant to the College of ACES to establish the UI Office for Futures and Options Research and the Thomas Hieronymus Distinguished Professorship in Futures Markets. Bielfeldt and his wife have also demonstrated their benevolence to the UI by providing $6 million towards the construction of the UI athletic administration building, which is named in their honor.

> The second story:

> In 1995, former advisees of Dr. James Evans provided over $10,000 to establish a scholarship in honor of their academic advisor. He demonstrated his strong belief in undergraduates through his persistent and effective recruiting of outstanding undergraduate students and the mentoring he provided to more than 500 agricultural communications graduates. Evans' commitment to these undergraduates was exemplified when, upon his retirement, his former academic

advisees from across the United States and the world joined together to demonstrate their respect and esteem for their mentor and friend by establishing an endowed scholarship in his honor.

Had these two groups of alumni not been impressed with the advising and education they received at the University of Illinois, there would probably have been no endowed fellowships, no $1 million challenge grant, and certainly no $6 million contribution toward the construction of the University of Illinois athletic administration building. Ross relates two stories from one school; the potential impact if this type of student satisfaction could be reproduced nationwide among all schools is almost unbelievable. This is reinforced by Lisa A. Skari (2011), who reports that approximately 59% of all individual gifts going to higher education in 2009 came from former students (alumni and non-alumni), for a total of $12.1 billion. Obviously, this is an important resource for institutions of higher education, which continue to struggle with diminishing support from state and local sources. We cannot know how many alumni resources may potentially be lost due to individual dissatisfaction with the institution in general, and, more specifically, with dissatisfaction in the area of academic advising.

An excellent academic advising program can serve as both an invaluable resource to further the reputation of an institution and enable students to reach their educational goals. In the article "Academic Advising and Student Retention and Persistence" (2003), Charlie L. Nutt (2003) refers to Wes Habley's description of academic advising:

Academic advising is the very core of successful institutional efforts to educate and retain students. For this reason, academic advising…should be viewed as the "hub of the wheel" and not just one of the various isolated services provided for

students…academic advisors offer students the personal connection to the institution that the research indicates is vital to student retention and student success (n.p.).

To have an excellent academic advising program requires excellent academic advisors. This project presents a method to help all academic advisors achieve that essential level of excellence.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Funding and student persistence are two of the most common factors that hinder student success today. With the decrease in student retention and graduation rates, and increase in college costs and debt ratios, it is critical that students are provided with the highest quality education and most competent assistance available from the moment they enter the doors of a community college or university (Wild & Ebbers, 2002).

Increasingly, students are entering college uncertain of their choice of major. Michael J. Leonard of Penn State University cites research conducted by Penn State and other institutions that show up to 80% of students don't know what they really want to major in, and up to 50% change their majors at least once before graduation, and sometimes more (2010). This can significantly add to student loans, as can taking classes outside of the major field of study. In the article "Who Advises Best, Pros or Profs?" Jeffrey J. Selingo states:

> While students may treat advising as an afterthought, the cost of acting on bad advice can be considerable. Take the wrong class to satisfy a requirement and you may not have enough credits to graduate on time. Withdraw from a course and you may put financial aid in jeopardy because you aren't taking enough credits (*Education Life*, 2014).

The importance of a good academic advising program is expounded in the following sections: (1) The high cost of the lack of a college education, (2) Factors inhibiting student persistence, (3) The value of advising for student success, (4) The need for advisor training, (5) Types of organizational models for academic advising, (6) Types of academic advisors, (7) Academic advisor training, (8) Perceptions of academic advising effectiveness, (9) Evaluation versus assessment, and (10) Academic advisor evaluation.

The High Cost of the Lack of a College Education

The following information creates a theoretical base for the study, as very little community college advisor evaluation studies exist.

In a report published by The Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce (Carnevale, Rose, & Cheah), data from the 2007-2009 American Community Survey was analyzed for lifetime earnings for over 300 occupations in the United States. For the workforce who earned less than a high school degree, the lifetime average earnings, in 2009 dollars, was $973,000. The top ten occupations in this category were listed as driver/sales workers and truck drivers, janitors and building cleaners, cooks, construction laborers, maids and housekeeping cleaners, laborers and material movers, maintenance workers, other agricultural workers, other production workers, and carpenters.

With a high school diploma, the lifetime earnings went up to $1,304,000, an increase of $331,000 over those without a high school diploma. The top ten occupations with this group were driver/sales workers and truck drivers, secretaries and administrative

assistants, supervisors/managers of retail sales workers, janitors and building cleaners, laborers and movers, retail salespersons, nursing and home health aides, other production workers, other managers, and supervisors/managers of production workers.

Workers who took some college courses, but earned no degree, fared a bit better: $1,547,000 in lifetime earnings. The top ten occupations with this group were secretaries and administrative assistants, supervisors/managers of retail sales workers, other managers, drivers/sales workers and truck drivers, accounting and auditing clerks, supervisors/managers of administrative support workers, customer service representatives, retail salespersons, nursing and home health aides, and sales representatives in wholesale and manufacturing.

With an associate's degree, there is again a jump in lifetime earnings, to $1,728,000. The top ten occupations include registered nurses, secretaries and administrative assistants, supervisors/managers of retail sales workers, other managers, accountants and auditors, supervisors/managers of administrative support workers, customer service representatives, retail salespersons, medical technologists and technicians, and accounting and auditing clerks.

For the top ten occupations with a bachelor's degree, there is an increase of over $500,000 in lifetime earnings, to $2,268,000. This group includes elementary and middle school teachers, other managers, accountants and auditors, registered nurses, sales representatives in wholesale and manufacturing, supervisors/managers of retail sales workers, chief executives, financial managers, computer software engineers, and marketing/sales managers.

Again, there is a large increase-to $2,671,000, for those holding a master's degree. This group includes elementary and middle school teachers, other managers, education administrators, accountants and auditors, secondary school teachers, computer software engineers, registered nurses, postsecondary teachers, counselors, and chief executives. The study noted that many of the jobs held by the bachelor's and master's degree workers are common to both groups; the difference is that the lifetime earnings are substantially higher for those with master's degrees. Elementary and middle school teachers make $400,000 more than those with only a bachelor's degree, with computer software engineers making almost $300,000 more at the master's level.

At the doctoral degree level, the top ten occupations have a lifetime earnings average of $3,252,000. These occupations include postsecondary teachers, physicians and surgeons, physical scientists, lawyers and judges, education administrators, other managers, psychologists, medical scientists, pharmacists, and chief executives.

The study also listed another group; those who received specialized training for their occupations, particularly law and medicine. The average for those individuals with a Professional degree was $3,648,000, and includes lawyers and judges, physicians and surgeons, dentists, elementary and middle school teachers, pharmacists, veterinarians, accountants and auditors, other managers, postsecondary teachers, and registered nurses.

Between the lowest and highest lifetime earnings is an economic gap of $2,675,000, a very substantial difference. Even the difference between the lowest lifetime earnings group and those holding a bachelor's degree is noteworthy at $1,295,000.

The Georgetown University Center study concluded:

No matter how you cut it, more education pays. The data presented here show that there is a sizeable economic return to going to college and earning at least a two-

or four-year degree. The 33 percent of Bachelor's degree holders that continue on to graduate and professional schools have even more prosperous futures ahead. Moreover, the difference in earnings between those who go to college and those who don't is growing-meaning that postsecondary education is more important than ever. These numbers prove that higher education opens up the highest-paying jobs, but also that there is a range of pay within jobs and that more highly-educated people usually earn considerably more than their less-educated counterparts in the same occupation (p.20).

Factors Inhibiting Student Persistence

The Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce report clearly shows the high cost of the *lack* of a college education. There is another side to the story, however; that which concerns the high cost *of* a college education. The National Center for Education Statistics (2012) reports that tuition costs at public colleges and universities rose 42% between 2000-01 and 2010-11, from $7,586.00 to $13,564.00. The average Pell Grant is below $5,000, as it has been since 1977 (forbes.com, 2013). Jonathan Robe, research director at the Center for College Affordability and Productivity, states that college costs are multiplying faster than students can pay for it, and the average student loan debt was nearly $30,000 in 2011. Robe cites as reasons for the increase in college tuition:

- Supply and demand: universities are raising tuition yearly because they can. Families will still "pay to play."

- Marketing: "trophy faculty and got-have-it facilities" add little to the educational bottom line, but up tuition costs

- Administrative spending: up 61% in recent years, as opposed to 39% increase in instructional spending per student

- Decreased government aid: states are currently spending 28% less per student than in 2008 (p. 1)

14

With these statistics, it is not surprising that many students are unable or unwilling to go so deeply into debt to pursue an education.

For those individuals willing to take on the debt, another issue facing them is that of staying in college and completing their degree. Many students enter college with the need for remedial coursework to bring them up to college-level ability. The Community College Research Center (CCRC) reports that 58% of high school graduates entering college took at least one developmental course. Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey (2006) report that of these, only 28% went on to earn any degree or certificate within 8.5 years. Additionally, the CRCC states:

> In a sample of over 150,000 students in community colleges in the Completion by Design initiative (funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation), 13 percent of college-ready students earn a bachelor's degree in five years; this figure is 2.5 percent for students who are referred to developmental education (Sung-Woo Cho, CCRC Research Associate, personal communication, 2012).*

These figures are not surprising when considered in light of James Marcia's Identity States (Marcia, 1966 & 1980). Marcia describes 4 identity states that may mirror different college-readiness levels of students entering community colleges. The four states are the following:

1. Identity Achievement. These students have developed well-defined personal values and self-concepts. They are committed to an ideology and have a strong sense of ego identity. These are most often the students who have a clear understanding of their goals and are focused in their pursuit of the college education that will help them attain these goals. They also tend to major in more challenging college fields, such as engineering and the physical sciences.

2. Identity Moratorium. These individuals have acquired vague or ill-formed ideological and occupational commitments, but are still undergoing the identity search. They are beginning to commit to an identity, but are still developing it.

3. Identity Foreclosure. These individuals blindly accept the identity and values that were given in childhood by families and significant others. In this state, there is commitment to an identity, but not as a result of their own searching or crisis. Students in this group tend to focus more toward external rather than internal goals. They may pursue a college degree program that was prescribed for them, not one of their inherent choice.

4. Diffusion state. These individuals have no clear idea of their identity and are making no attempt to find that identity. There is no commitment and no searching. These students may find themselves changing majors several times, and may also find it difficult to follow through to degree completion. (Marcia, 1980).

Many students entering college today have not yet reached the identity achievement state described by Marcia. Thus, the levels of maturity vary among students, and the number of students at any identity outcome state is equally varied. This alone can make persistence from the first semester through to graduation difficult, if not almost impossible. It is very difficult for a student to follow through with a program of study without having a strong sense of where they are hoping to go career-wise. Often, these students are those requiring remedial coursework to prepare them for the rigor of their chosen program. Unfortunately, when many students choose to pursue a college degree, they have a vague concept of the work involved, find themselves unable to persevere through remedial coursework, and may be unable to even decide on a specific course of study.

In these situations, an understanding of Marcia's identity states may help a knowledgeable and effective advisor or counselor to better assist the student. This, in

turn, may help to make the difference between retention and failure. For these students particularly, the need for excellence in academic advising becomes even more apparent.

The Value of Advising for Student Success

The first national conference on advising was held in 1977, and the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) was established as a direct result of that conference. NACADA's creation "marked a significant turning point in according recognition to higher education academic advisors who consider their work to be purposeful and unique" (www.CAS.edu). Since then, the field of academic advising has grown in prominence as an integral part of student success in colleges and universities throughout the world. The National Academic Advising Association has more than 10,000 members in over 20 countries, highlighting the importance that academic advising holds universally (http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/About-Us/History.aspx).

NACADA (2006) affirms the critical role of the academic advisor in higher education, which supports institutional mission and anticipates the needs of 21st century students, academic advisors, and institutions. In their preamble, NACADA states:

> Through academic advising, students learn to become members of their higher education community, think critically about their roles and responsibilities as students, and prepare to be educated citizens of a democratic society and a global community. Academic advising engages students beyond their own worldviews, while acknowledging their individual characteristics, values, and motivations as they enter, move through, and exit the institution. Regardless of the diversity of our institutions, our students, our advisors, and our organizational structures, academic advising has three components: curriculum (what advising deals with), pedagogy (how advising does what it does), and student learning outcome (the result of academic advising).

NACADA is not the only organization that recognizes the intrinsic value of quality academic advising. Its tenets are reinforced by The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, which states:

> Academic advising is a crucial component of all students' experiences in higher education. Through advising, students can find meaning in their lives, make significant decisions about their futures, and access all that higher education has to offer. When practiced with competence and dedication, academic advising is integral to student success, persistence, and retention. (www.CAS.edu)

Tinto's *Leaving College* (1993) highlights the importance of quality academic advising as "perhaps one of the most underestimated characteristics of a successful college experience" (n.p.). He links advising with student retention as a critical component of a successful college experience. Along with NACADA, O'Banion, and other early works, Tinto's work helped establish the need for quality academic advising. This is supported by both Hunter and White (2004), and Richard J. Light (2001).

In "Could Fixing Academic Advising Fix Higher Education?" (2004), Hunter and White state, "Academic advising is perhaps the only structured campus endeavor that can guarantee students sustained interaction with a caring and concerned adult who can help them shape a meaningful learning experience for themselves" (p. 22).

In *Making the Most of College,* Richard J. Light (2001) emphasizes that "Good advising may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college experience" (p. 81).

While much attention in the past several years has focused on the importance of academic advising for student success, it is not generally a "new" concept. Over 40 years

ago, Terry O'Banion published an article in the 1972 Junior College Journal titled "An Academic Advising Model." The article, which served as a catalyst for many later articles and research on academic advising, delineates O'Banion's concept of the process of academic advising. He wrote, "The process of academic advising includes the following dimensions: (1) exploration of life goals, (2) exploration of vocational goals, (3) program choice, (4) course choice, and (5) scheduling courses" (O'Banion, 1972, p. 10). He further stated that:

> Any well-conceived program of academic advising will include activities related to each of these dimensions. It may be possible for each of these dimensions to be explored in a single day; most colleges, however, are likely to consider the process of academic advising as continuous, beginning before the student attends class and continuing throughout his stay at the college (p. 11).

O'Banion also discusses both the "merits and its difficulties" involved with using either counselors or instructors as the primary academic advising resource. He goes on to suggest combining "the professional competencies of counselors and instructors in such a way that the educational planning of students results in well-formulated goals and sound decisions."

Fast-forward 42 years, from O'Banion's historic research of 1972 to the 2013 national ACT report, "The Reality of College Readiness 2013" (2013). The report, based on 2011 ACT test scores nationwide, states that an "increased number of academic advisors" was one of the retention interventions practiced by those institutions with high retention rates (2013, p 10). This was true not only for two-year institutions, but four-year public and private schools, as well. Four-year institutions also listed "an academic advising center, advising interventions with selected student populations, and integration

of advising with first-year transition programs" as some of their highest-rated retention

practices (2013, p. 10).

These reports constantly reiterate and reinforce the importance of quality

academic advising as a critical component of student success and retention.

Types of Organizational Models for Academic Advising

Over the past 30 years, academic advising at the institutional level has been

defined in a variety of methods using a variety of staffing methods. According to Pardee

(2004), 3 basic types of advising models are used in community colleges. The types and

percentage in which they are used are:

1. Centralized: all advisors are housed in one area (32%)
2. Decentralized: advisors are located in their academic departments (14%)
3. Shared: a combination of centralized and decentralized (55%)

Pardee describes a *centralized model* is one in which all advisors, professional or

faculty, are located in the same academic or administrative unit. Students seeking the

expertise of an advisor in a centralized model will go to the same location, regardless of

the discipline or major field of study. Under Pardee's model, it is not uncommon for a

student to see several different advisors over the course of their enrollment at the

institution; whoever is scheduled for advising a particular day is whom the student will

see. This can have both positive and negative implications. Pardee emphasized that

among the positive implications is the fact that a student may receive a different

viewpoint about their best course of study, dependent upon the opinion of the specific

advisor to whom they are speaking. For example, Advisor "A" may recommend that a

student pursue general education credits before taking on core curriculum, and Advisor "B" may recommend a blend of both general education and core curriculum simultaneously. While neither path is totally right or wrong, one path may be better for a specific student than the other. Seeing other advisors also gives a student the opportunity to evaluate the advising they have been receiving and begin to identify an individual advisor with whom they may wish to work exclusively in future advising sessions.

Barbara Oertel (n.d.), however, recognizes some inherent disadvantages to the *centralized model.* She points out that advising costs are higher with the *centralized model,* and that students lose the advantage of being able to interact with teaching faculty outside the classroom.

Additionally, according to Oertel, there can be a lack of "connection" in the relationship between student and advisor when a student sees multiple advisors over several semesters, with each advisor trying to determine what is best for the student at that particular time.

In Southeastern Louisiana University's summary of their Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) (2004), the centralized advising center is referred to as a "home" for beginning students, presenting another positive aspect of the centralized model. It is not uncommon for students to "drop in" for advising on an "as-need" basis, since there are usually several advisors in the center at any given time. QEP states the premise that this model can utilize faculty resources more efficiently, as well as provide early assessment and intervention for at-risk students. Pardee (2004) cites the Sixth National Survey on Academic Advising by ACT in 2003 (Habley, 2004) that approximately 32% of two and four-year higher education institutions use this model.

Cuseo (2003) emphasized the value of a *decentralized model*, where all advisors, both professional and faculty, are located in their respective academic discipline. While professional advisors may be employed, advisors are most often professors from the student's own academic discipline. Cuseo believes that this model can be of great benefit to the student, because he/she is being advised by someone who is intimately knowledgeable about their program. Very few programs of study are so clear that there are no questions about seemingly small details that can hinder or derail a student's progress through their coursework. A professor in that discipline is much more likely to know the intricacies of a specific program than an advisor who is trained to cover a wider range of academic disciplines. This model also allows the student to develop a close, interpersonal relationship with their advisor, which will certainly help with retention (Cuseo, 2003).

Cuseo emphasizes that one drawback of a decentralized model is that it can be very difficult for students to arrange meeting times with these advisors, who are also responsible for teaching, grading, research, meetings, and a myriad of other duties and responsibilities. Additionally, Cuseo notes that not all good teachers make good advisors, and some teachers are not willing to give students the time necessary to develop a close relationship. David Crockett, in a Noel-Levitz report entitled "Modes and Models: Designing and Implementing a Successful Academic Advising Program" (n.d.), contradicts this with the statement that "advisors are accountable to their respective subunits/departments, where the activity takes place" (p.243).

Pardee's study (2004) cites the Sixth National Survey on Academic Advising by ACT in 2003 (Habley, 2004) that approximately 28% of two- and four-year higher education institutions use this model.

Pardee, Cuseo, and King describe a third advising model, the *shared model,* which is used by 55% of all institutions (Pardee, 2004). This model accounts for more than half of all academic advising conducted at the two-year and four-year institution level. In the shared model, advising duties are split (shared) with students seeing some advisors in the central location and others in the academic department of their major discipline.

A positive aspect of the shared model is that students again have the opportunity to interact with more than one academic advisor, allowing them to take advantage of the expertise of more than one individual. This same positive aspect, though, can be equally negative, particularly if students are unsure which advisor or advising area is the correct one to seek out when help is needed.

Pardee (2004) also differentiates between two separate types of shared models, the *supplementary model* and the *split model.* In the supplementary model, students are assigned a department advisor who will help them with discipline-specific questions and issues. For more generic needs (transfer information, degree audit, etc.) they will consult with an advisor in the advising center.

According to Pardee, King, and Miller (2012), the most widely used model is the split model. The model again uses both advising center and department advisors. With this model, the advisors in the advising center take care of specific areas or types of students. Freshmen, undeclared major students, and academic probation students are

types of students that are often the responsibility of the advising center. Once students have moved into their discipline area, they will be assigned an advisor in that discipline area.

David Crockett concludes the Noel-Levitz report with the following: "There is no 'best' or universally 'right' organizational model for the delivery of advising services, and each institution must select the model that is most appropriate for their institutional culture and situation" (p.287).

Types of Academic Advisors

According to NACADA, "Academic advising, based in the teaching and learning mission of higher education, is a series of intentional interactions with a curriculum, a pedagogy, and a set of student learning outcomes" (2006). However, as they indicate, there is no standard advisor "type" that exists at community colleges and universities nationwide; rather, these intentional interactions are carried out by a wide variety of academic advisors. Each institution utilizes the type of academic advisor (or combination) that it feels will best advance its mission and the success of its student population.

Pardee (2004), King, and Frost (2000) differentiate the different types of academic advisors in very different ways. Pardee uses the following descriptors:

- Faculty advisors: these are teaching members of the college community who are also trained in academic advising

- Professional advisors: these are non-teaching members of the college community whose job responsibility lies wholly with academic advising

24

- Department advisors: these are full or part-time advisors whose *only* advising responsibilities are to work with students studying in the advisor's own academic area or division (Pardee, 2004)

- Cross-trained advisors: advisors who advise in more than one academic area (also sometimes referred to as generalists)

- Counselors: these are full or part-time counselors who are either Limited Licensed Professional Counselors (LLPC) or Licensed Professional Counselors (LPC). In addition to advising duties, they are also licensed to do counseling work, and can work with students encountering personal/emotional issues that may impact their chances of college success. They may also work with students who are uncertain of their career goals, helping them to establish interest areas and provide professional guidance.

According to Margaret King, most colleges and universities have both counselors and advisors on their staff. King (2002) cites the practice of cutting counselors and hiring more advisors as part of a cost-cutting measure, which begs the question, "Who will be qualified to help troubled students?"

Susan Frost (2000) references another type of advisor: peer advisors, who are also students at the college who do academic advising. Frost believes that peer advisors have an advantage over professional or faculty advisors in that they can more closely understand the student position and institution culture better. However, she also notes that they are often less knowledgeable about program requirements and academic issues. As a result, Frost emphasizes the critical need for training for peer advisors. She also emphasizes two difficulties with peer advising: (1) Peer advising is not as widely accepted throughout the field of academic advising; without the extensive training necessary to ensure competency and accuracy, it is likely that peer advisors will disseminate incorrect information to students that may impede their academic progress. (2) Additionally, peer advisors generally have a very limited period of time at their

25

institution, which creates the need for continual training of new peer advisors, as well as the ongoing search for students willing to become peer advisors.

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) takes a different viewpoint. The Council calls for Academic Advising Programs staff (AAP) to "hold an earned graduate or professional degree in a field relevant to the position they hold or must possess an appropriate combination of educational credentials and related work experience" (2011). The CAS Standards for Academic Advising (2005) list specific outcomes for academic advising. The Council further cites some advisor standards as follows:

- AAP members must engage in continuing professional development activities

- Advisors should have an understanding of student development, student learning, career development, and other relevant theories in education, social sciences, and humanities.

- Advisors should have a comprehensive knowledge of the institution's programs, academic requirements, policies and procedures, majors, minors, and support services.

- Academic advisors should demonstrate an interest and effectiveness in working with and assisting students and a willingness to participate in professional activities (n.p.).

These Standards and Guidelines for Academic Advising have been developed by CAS and endorsed by the National Academic Advising Association (White, 2006). In conjunction with CAS, the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) also cites six core values of academic advising. These values emphasize and highlight the critical importance of the role of the academic advisor in higher education:

- Core Value 1: Advisors are responsible to the individuals they advise.

26

- Core Value 2: Advisors are responsible for involving others, when appropriate, in the advising process.

- Core Value 3: Advisors are responsible to their institutions.

- Core Value 4: Advisors are responsible to higher education in general.

- Core Value 5: Advisors are responsible to their educational community.

- Core Value 6: Advisors are responsible for their professional practices and for themselves personally. (NACADA, 2005)

While the NACADA standards reiterate the word "responsible" in each of the statements, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) focuses on "seven basic principles that form the foundation for CAS member association codes: autonomy, non-malfeasance, beneficence, justice, fidelity, veracity, and affiliation" (2014). CAS also states that … "student learning and development are fundamental to mission and program" (p.1). NACADA and CAS both reaffirm the professionalism with which academic advising must be approached, regardless of the academic advising model an institution utilized (faculty, professional, departmental, cross-trained, counselor, or peer).

The Need for Academic Advisor Training

If academic advising holds such a critical role for student success within an institution, it would be a logical assumption that each institution has a well-developed academic advisor training program. Research, however, has refuted that assumption. In the Noel-Levitz report "Modes and Models: Designing and Implementing a Successful Academic Advising Program," David Crockett quotes Wes Habley:

A recurrent theme in all six ACT national surveys is that training, evaluation, and recognition/reward have been, and continue to be, the weakest links in academic advising throughout the nation. These important institutional practices in support of quality advising are at best unsystematic and at worst nonexistent (p. 8).

In her NACADA Clearinghouse article, "Advisor Training and Development" (2005), Heidi Koring references the fact that "even rudimentary advisor training is absent from many institutions." She cites the ACT's Fifth National Survey of Academic Advising (1984), where Habley and Morales reported that "many institutions are providing only a minimum of training to those involved in advising" (p.4). The 30-year old survey sadly underscores the fact that academic advising is often still mired in the past.

This is again reinforced by a NACADA Clearinghouse article by Julie Givans Voller, "Implications for professional development" (2011). She writes:

Even though the success of advising hinges upon the strength of training provided from pre-service until the end of an advisor's career, the number of institutions supporting comprehensive training and development programs for advisors is low. […] Data from the survey (not shown) reveals fewer than one half (47%) of institutions offer two or more external and two or more internal training or development activities, which embody the definition of comprehensive. Moreover, less than one half of the respondents indicated receiving pre-service training and individualized development and nearly one tenth received no training or development (n.p.).

Givans also cites the need for special attention to be given to new academic advisors:

According to the survey, 40% of institutions provide pre-service training to new academic advisors. This finding suggests that college students may know more about the institution than their advisors do, creating compounded negative consequences: Students may not receive the information and support they need, new advisors may become frustrated and disengaged, and institutions may earn a reputation for ineffective advising (n.p.).

These negative consequences are compounded yet further by another consequence: according to Charlie Nutt (2003), students who feel that their institution provides ineffective advising will be less inclined to use academic advising services, which can lead to retention issues, and may cause a student to become disenchanted with the institution as a whole. This can ultimately result in a student leaving that particular institution, or higher education altogether. This being the case, why then are institutions not placing more emphasis on academic advisor training?

A potential answer to this question is provided by Voller (2011), Koring (2005), and Crockett (n.d.), who suggest that time, money, and lack of training are three primary reasons given why institutions are not supplying sufficient advisor training. King (2000) emphasizes, however, that this lack of training will cause academic advisors to be less effective to the students they are trying to serve. Vollars (2012) supports this when she states:

> Coordinated training and development of academic advisors is important because all students, regardless of major or luck of the draw, deserve to have access to advisors who are knowledgeable and up-to-date on the policies, procedures, theories, and resources that help them succeed. Training and professional development for advisors helps students by setting expectations for advisor job knowledge and performance, while providing advisors with the tools and practice needed to meet those expectations. (n.p.)

To be fully effective, Habley, King, Cuseo, Koring, and Vollars all emphasize that academic advisors must be well trained in several different areas. Habley (1986), who has written widely on the topic of academic advising, states, "without understanding (conceptual elements), there is no context for the delivery of services. Without information, there is no substance to advising. And, without personal skills (relational), the quality of the advisee/advisor relationship is left to chance" (p. 76). Habley emphasized that all three areas are critical for effective advisors, and recommended that formal training accompany the acquisition of these skills.

King's work in 2002 reinforced Habley's foundational work by stating, in *Academic Advising: a Comprehensive Handbook* (2002), that advisor training must address three areas:

1. Conceptual

   a. A good advisor should understand the concepts of developmental advising, to comprehend which, if any, developmental courses a student should/must take in order to be successful in further courses

   b. A good advisor should understand the needs of all student levels, to help them determine which courses are necessary for their success

   c. A good advisor should understand and subscribe to the tenets of academic advising, attempting to help each student further their goals

2. Informational

   a. Advisors should know the requirements for transfer degrees (Associate in General Studies, Associate in Arts, Associate in Science)

   b. Advisors should know the requirements for students' specific degree programs

   c. Advisors should understand the requirements and responsibilities a student has to continue to make satisfactory academic progress (SAP)

   d. Advisors should know the basics of financial aid, being careful not to give a student erroneous information

     e. Advisors should know when a student needs to be referred elsewhere for more specific information, and how to put them in touch with that person or area

     f. Advisors should know when they don't know, and be willing to seek answers from additional sources

3. Relational

     a. Advisors should have (or develop) superior listening skills

     b. Advisors should approach each student open-mindedly

     c. Advisors should see in each student untapped potential, and the ability to help shape that potential

     d. Advisors should offer sound advice, even when it differs from what the student wants to hear. (pp. 289-297)

The University of Memphis (New Advisor Training, 2012) adds two additional areas for good academic advising practice: personal and technological. While the personal area is closely related to the relational area cited by King, the technological aspect of academic advising is an area that has changed dramatically within the last two decades: "Gaining an understanding of available technologies and deploying them in the proper manner will allow an advisor to improve the process of academic advising by improving communication and increasing the time spent on crucial developmental learning opportunities" (Multari, 2004). Without strong technological skills, academic advisors will find it difficult to function effectively in today's society, and thus will be ill equipped to provide superlative assistance to their students.

Perceptions of Academic Advising Effectiveness

In a presentation entitled "What's Going on in Academic Advising: Student vs. Advisor Perceptions," delivered on April 12 at the 2013 NCA HLC Annual Meeting,

presenters Betsy Griffin, Ph.D. and Darlena Jones, Ph.D. shared some insights regarding

how students view the effectiveness of academic advising, compared to the advisor's

perception of their effectiveness. First-year students at both two- and four-year

institutions were surveyed, as well as transfer-bound students at two-year institutions. To

summarize, at four-year institutions, Griffin and Jones (2013) reported:

    a. A large disconnect between students and advisors on advising information

    b. Advisors are much more positive with their delivery of information than
       students report receiving

    c. All faculty/staff are less positive with overall advising than students

    d. The largest disconnect between students and advisors for "discussing future
       enrollment plans" (p.5)

The results at two-year institutions were similar. Griffin and Jones found the main

difference to be that there was a large disconnect between students and advisors on every

measure (not just advising), and that students and all faculty/staff have approximately the

same view with overall advising.

Again, similar results were found with the transfer-bound students at two-year

institutions:

    a. A large disconnect between students and advisors on advising information

    b. Advisors are much more positive with their delivery of information than
       students report receiving

    c. Nearly one-half of students are not receiving the information needed

Their conclusion: while advisors believe they are doing a good job of delivering

their message, students and faculty/staff aren't hearing the same message (2013). In

closing, they suggested rewarding faculty advising, *training for advising,* and educating students on the purpose of advising.

Their key point: if students are dissatisfied with the quality of academic advising they receive, they often have difficulties in acclimating to college life, and the rigors of academia which must be mastered to become a graduate of their institution. This key point is reinforced in the October 31, 2012 edition of *The Mentor,* where author Krista M. Soria links academic advising with success and retention of first-year students. She highlights research conducted on students' perceptions of effective academic advising:

> Students place a premium on academic advising, and a large study of 81,094 students from eighty-seven four-year public colleges and universities found that students rate academic advising as the most important priority among twelve campus-related characteristics-even higher than campus personnel rate academic advising (Noel-Levitz, 2011). Yet for decades, national surveys have found that academic advising is one of the college experiences rated lowest in student satisfaction (Allen & Smith, 2008, p. 397-411). Since student retention is linked to satisfaction, efforts to learn more about the effects of students' satisfaction with academic advising are therefore critical for higher education institutions seeking to improve retention rates (n.p.).

Additional literature focuses on the importance of advising for specific groups or cohorts of students, beyond the essential role for first-year students. In her dissertation work, Tamera Pullins studied the link between sophomore retention and student satisfaction. She found:

> Students who were satisfied with their institutions' campus climate were nearly 50% more likely to persist than their dissatisfied peers. Further, as sophomores' grade point average increased one point, their likelihood of persisting increased about 46%. [...] Key predictors of sophomore retention differed across public and

private institutions; advising satisfaction was significantly predictive of retention in public institutions. […] Programs designed to address advising issues specific to sophomores were also recommended (n.p.).

Faye Allard and Sangeeta Parashar of Montclair State University provided another example of the prominence students place upon academic advising in their article in the Penn State *Mentor,* an online scholarly peer-reviewed publication about academic advising in higher education (2012). Allard and Parashar conducted an online survey with mixed methodology about student satisfaction with academic advising.

Their findings were shocking: many students (who also participated in focus groups) strongly believed in a conspiracy theory that universities were consciously delaying their graduation, in order to gain more money from the students. Their comments related to substandard academic advising.

One of the students commented:

Many students (at this university) complain about not being able to finish in four years. Most of their remarks are my advisor screwed me, they did not tell me I had to take this class, I had no idea this was a requirement, (this university) just wants my money so I can stay longer (n.p.).

According to Allard and Parashar, students were "very vocal" about "advising horror stories," including comments like these:

Students being pushed into courses they had no interest in taking; faculty failing to alert students to take courses that they needed to graduate; or worse, students being given incorrect advice that resulted in graduation delays. "I was told false information by three different people and found out I never needed to take a certain class. Which means I would of (sic) been able to graduate this summer.

Now I have another year, which is money out of my pocket because all these advisors that I am supposed to be looking to for help told me the wrong thing (n.p.).

Allard and Parashar suggest that their study shows the need for academic advising at their institution (and others) to undergo an overhaul. They recommend utilizing a voluntary system for faculty advising, following student recommendations that "only faculty who want to advise should." Hiring professional advisors is also given as a potential solution to the problem.

They conclude with the following statement: "Improving the efficiency of advising is not only vital in reducing the "horror stories" shared by students, but should be a central concern of any institution of higher education" (n.p.).

Evaluation versus Assessment

In the article "Evaluation and Assessment of Career Advising" (2009a), Rich Robbins states that there are distinctions between assessment and evaluation in higher education: "Evaluation is centered around the performance of the individual academic advisor, while assessment is concerned with the academic advising program and services overall, primarily the achievement of student learning outcomes (SLOs)" (n.p.). Robbins views evaluation as "episodic" while viewing assessment as "a holistic and continuous process" (n.p.).

While there is a large body of research regarding academic advising assessment, the majority of it appears to be based on student satisfaction surveys. Szymanska (2011), for example, stresses that while student satisfaction surveys can provide an institution with a "litmus test" of how they are faring, too often students don't know what they don't

know. In a report for the American Federation of Teachers: Higher Education, March 2011, Lake Research Partners state:

> Specifically, students say they need and want more help to understand the academic requirements and expectations they face, and more help plotting and executing their plan to meet their goals-which generally includes either graduation or transfer to a four-year college (p. 17).

While Szymanska, Robbins, and Zarges discuss the importance of assessing advising, there appears to be a dearth of research regarding individual academic advisor evaluation as a viable way to track advisor knowledge and competency, with follow-up training to improve weak areas. Several colleges and universities have created thorough and detailed descriptions of the scope of academic advising at their institution, yet none have been found that require evaluation as a part of the job description. For example, the University of North Carolina-Charlotte has an in-depth, 49-page *Advisor Manual for Faculty and Staff Advisors* (2013). However, there is no reference to individual advisor evaluation. Instead, the manual:

> *…recommends* that faculty and staff advisors participate in advisor development sessions at the university and college/departmental levels to keep up with institutional, college and departmental policy and curriculum changes…. Colleges and departments are encouraged to provide ongoing professional development regarding academic advising within their college and major(s) (p. 10).

The UNCC advising manual lists both periodic workshops and monthly meetings under advisor development; all faculty and staff advisors are "welcome to participate" (p. 9).

The premise would appear to be that advisors would take advantage of these opportunities to learn and enhance their knowledge base. However, there does not appear to be a requirement to do so.

While assessment and evaluation make up a large part of higher education — instructors assess students, deans assess instructors, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) assesses entire institutions — very little has been written about evaluating the caliber of an advisor. Cuseo (2007) references Beal and Noel (1980), who more than 30 years ago identified "inadequate academic advising" as the greatest impediment to student retention (p. 5). Yet, advising seems to be left "out-of-the-loop" when it comes to evaluation. Regarding this oversight, Cuseo cites Creamer & Scott (2000), who stated:

> The failure of most institutions to conduct systematic evaluations of advisors is explained by a number of factors. The most potent reason, however, is probably that the traditional reward structure often blocks the ability to reward faculty who are genuinely committed to advising (p. 39).

Academic Advisor Evaluation

Research clearly shows the importance of academic advising as a keystone of student success and student dissatisfaction with the academic advising process as a whole; thus, it is also apparent that the caliber of academic advising needs to be raised amongst individual advisors; i.e., improving advisors will improve the advising process. The University of Wisconsin-Madison has taken steps to do just this. In 2013, UW-Madison created the Office of Undergraduate Advising (OUA), whose intent is to improve advising from within, by advising the advisors (2013). They believe that this will lead to greater student satisfaction, which in turn should encourage more student participation with academic advising at their institution.

37

So, how can the caliber of advising be raised? One conclusion drawn from the literature review about advising and advising models is that academic advisors should be evaluated on a regular basis. In 2005, South Dakota State University's Assessment of Undergraduate Academic Advising Effectiveness (AAAC) began developing a plan whereby academic advisors would self-evaluate and be evaluated by students on at least a yearly basis. The purpose was to develop and implement a plan to assess the effectiveness of undergraduate academic advising (2005). This correlates with Szymanska's recommendations that evaluation should be done by both students and advisors, through a combination of training and testing, in order to improve their skills, and ensure that they are up-to-date on any and all program changes at their respective institutions (2011). The format of a written evaluation will highlight both strengths and weaknesses. Weak areas, once identified, can be addressed and corrected. By implementing this process at an institution, a message is sent to all stakeholders that academic advising is a critical component of student success and all advisors will maintain high standards of competency (NACADA).

One example of an advisor and evaluation program to address the need for ongoing advisor training was created in 2011 at Valdosta State University by W. Kohle Paul and J. Michael Kitchens (2013). The program, titled the Master Advisor Series, was begun in part because of a lack of advisor development opportunities and a reduction in employee travel funds. By keeping the program in-house, Paul and Kitchens were able to tailor it to directly address advising issues and needs at Valdosta State University. The program is exemplary because it not only recognized the need for ongoing advisor training, but it also created a program to directly meet those needs for improvement in

academic advising at Valdosta State University. Additionally, it created a *measurable* means to evaluate learning improvement of the advising staff who participated in the program.

The program's inception began with a seven item advising needs assessment that was emailed to every advisor. The results showed that 53% of advisors were interested in a professional development program. In addition, they preferred to spend 10-15 hours on the program, and wanted to complete it within one or two semesters. The most requested in-service topics included working with BANNER, academic transcripts, and developmental advising. These findings supported the work of Vollars, Cuseo, and King, as regards the importance of ongoing academic advisor development opportunities.

From the initial assessment, Paul and Kitchens created 8 professional development courses. Two core classes were required, along with 6 elective courses. The core classes covered (2013):

Advising 101

- The historical background of advising

- Advising's influence of student retention, progression, and graduation

- The theory and practice of developmental advising

- Utilizing campus resources and knowledge of university policies and procedures

Understanding and Working with Academic Transcripts and BANNER

- Understanding how to interpret transcript symbols and language

- Knowledge of common course substitutions and course substitution policies and procedures

- Utilizing BANNER *and Degree Works to enhance the advising process*

The 6 elective courses were the next 6 most frequently requested topics from the needs assessment survey and covered:

- Career advising
- Advising the probation student
- Advising the millennial generation
- Advising students with disabilities
- Advising international students
- Advising the adult learner

Of the 6 elective courses, 4 were required to complete the Master Advisor Series. All courses were created and taught in collaboration with various campus departments (admissions, registrar, etc.). Elective courses were 2 hours long, with the 2 core courses lasting 150 minutes each.

A pre-test was administered to advisors participating in the program, with a post-test conducted after the program's completion. Results revealed that

> Advisors who completed the Master Advisor Series were rated significantly higher (M=80.15, SD=2.75) than their colleagues (M=69.64, SD=2.38) on developmental advising behaviors. Analysis of Variance between Groups (ANOVA) also revealed there was a significant effect of MAS completion on post-test satisfaction with advising scores after controlling for pre-test satisfaction with advising scores and number of visits with an advisor, $F(1.59)=5.28$, $p<.05$, h2=.09. Advisors who completed the MAS had a significantly higher score (M=3.30, SD=.21) than their colleagues (M=2.64, SD=.18) on advising satisfaction (n.p.).

Even though the statistics show the Master Advisor Series to be highly successful for both advisors and students, the process was not accepted with open arms; many

advisors were resistant to the concept of accountability, particularly if they are not dedicated to continual improvement of their own advising skills.

Summary

The literature review began with a comparison of lifetime earnings based on an individual's level of educational degree attainment, according to Carnevale, Rose, and Cheah (n.d.). It was shown that there is a significant difference between those individuals who do not study formally beyond high school and those who do.

Two strong factors that were found to inhibit meeting higher education goals can be attributed to an inability to afford tuition costs in today's economy, and a lack of persistence through to degree completion (retention). Retention is especially a problem for those students who require one or more developmental courses to bring them up to college readiness, as shown by Attewell, Lavin, Domina, & Levey (2006).

As indicated by studies from 1977 through the present time, an effective academic advising program was shown to be critical in assisting student retention, and several advising models (centralized, decentralized, and shared) have been used effectively. Various types of academic advisor models were described (Pardee, Oertel, Cuseo), along with a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each. Ultimately, each institution must assess which advising model and advisor type will work best to advance its specific academic advising goals.

The differences between evaluation and assessment found that, while assessment of academic advising programs is a regular part of administrative expectations, evaluation of advisors on an individual basis is not often an expectation of job requirements or responsibilities.

The importance of effective academic advising highlights the need to provide successful advising training opportunities. The Master Advisor Series at Valdosta State University is an example of an exemplary program that has demonstrated its success in raising academic advising standards there, and can be adapted for use at other institutions of higher learning.

Finally, the implementation of individual advisor evaluation, coupled with training initiatives, can pave the way to increase academic advisor knowledge and skills, which will enhance an institution's reputation and create greater student satisfaction with the advising process as a whole.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapters 1 and 2 demonstrated the need for high academic advising standards at all institutions of higher learning, and the impact poor advising can have on both students and institutions. Furthermore, the chapter highlighted the need for continuous and on-going academic advisor training, which is deficient at many institutions. This chapter will describe the advising situation at a midwestern urban community college that led to (1) recognition of a systemic problem in the area of academic advising, (2) the process leading to developing an advising evaluation model, (3) the components of the advising evaluation model, and (4) the steps taken to pre-test and then to implement the advising evaluation model.

The Institution

For this project, an evaluation approach was designed for an urban community college of approximately 10,500 students. The student demographics for the Fall 2013 school year were as follows (Michigan Department of Technology, Management & Budget, 2014):

- 60.44% are white 19.77% African American, 3.6% Hispanic, with the remainder divided among other ethnic groups or unknown

- 65.16% attend school part-time, with 37.52% full-time

- 59% are female, with 41% male

- The majority of students (53.14%) are between the ages of 20-29, with the next three greatest percentages of age groups being 30-39 (16.78%), 40-49 (10.84%), and 18-19 (11.85%)

The Problem

The problem was identified over a period of several months of observation by the academic advising staff and through student interaction and feedback regarding their advising experience. Additionally, empirical observation showed that students following government programs such as the Trade Adjustment Allowance (TAA) and Trade Readjustment Allowance (TRA) needed more accurate plans of study for their majors. Inaccurate information could create difficulties for students who were only allowed a finite number of semesters for program completion.

As seen in the literature review, there is general dissatisfaction with the caliber of academic advising overall at the community college level. According to information gathered from other campuses, the college in this study is not at all atypical as to student satisfaction. Rather, it faced the same difficulties cited by the 2006 Noel-Levitz study, which reported that 42% of colleges and universities offer no formal training and development initiatives. At this institution, before the current program was developed, faculty interested in advising were offered 16 hours of training with an advisor from their academic discipline. During this informal training period, they would also advise students under the guidance of the discipline advisor. When both the discipline advisor and the advisor trainee felt competency had been attained, the trainee would be placed in the schedule and would begin advising students. After this initial training, there was no formal training, except for 2 half-day professional development sessions each year.

The existing training process was ineffective, at best. Once new advisors were placed into the advising schedule, there was no follow-up as to whether core advising competencies were present, or whether the information disseminated to students was accurate.

This was the protocol for advisor training for several years, and raised concerns among the advising staff, bringing up the following questions: How can the caliber of academic advising be raised when there is no accountability for new advisors? How can we determine what we don't know and find a means to address those areas? And, finally, how can we *evaluate* the knowledge and competency level of our advising staff, to ensure that our student population is receiving excellent customer service from every advisor?

Instrument Design Process

In an attempt to assist the administration of the college in determining when new advisor trainees had sufficient knowledge and training to begin advising duties, it was proposed to the Executive Dean of Student Services that definitive tests could be developed to evaluate advisor readiness. This assessment tool would give administration more confidence that academic advising currently being offered by new advisors was both thorough and correct. With the approval and support of the Executive Dean, the creation of a series of evaluations began.

The first task was to determine what information was deemed critical in order to advise successfully. Many conversations were held with a focus group comprised of current advisors, counselors, and administrators; anyone involved in the advising process

in some way was invited to provide feedback as to what the evaluations should encompass.

When those conversations were concluded, a preliminary outline of the contents of the Advisor Assessment Tool (A2T) was created. Again, the group was asked for feedback. Three areas of assessment became apparent during the previous stages: (1) overall (general) advising knowledge, (2) specific discipline knowledge, and (3) the ability to interpret student transcript information in order to best assist the student. A fourth area, the use of technology, was not included in this project, but remains an integral part of an academic advisor's responsibilities.

Using King's 3-tiered concept of academic advising (2000), the project was developed in accordance with these individual areas of competency. For each concept, a different evaluation was created which will assess advisor knowledge of that particular area. The areas include the following:

- Conceptual: the evaluation for the area of General Advising. This information encompasses advising facts that should be known by all advisors, that are college-wide, and that are not specific to one division, discipline, or program of study.

- Informational: the evaluation for this area encompasses advising facts that are specific to one division, discipline, or program of study. Advisors must demonstrate content knowledge of all programs offered within the division.

- Relational: the evaluation for this area encompasses the analysis of the best sequence of courses for a student, based on their developmental, personal, and program needs.

Two of the three areas, conceptual and informational, are considered to be objectively-based. Therefore, the format for these sections should be very straightforward with discreet questions, including true/false, fill in the blank, matching, multiple choice,

etc. The third area, relational, is considered to be continuously/subjectively-based in that there is more than one interpretation of the best course for an individual student. The third section, therefore, asks more open-ended questions, examining how the advisor interprets placement test scores, transfer credit, and other areas that are not objectively oriented.

The Use of the ADDIE Design Model

Besides utilizing King's 3-tiered concept of academic advising as previously discussed, the overall design of the project followed the ADDIE design theory model:

1. Analysis
2. Design
3. Development
4. Implementation
5. Evaluation.

The first phase of Analysis was completed by working with the advisory group that was initially involved in the needs analysis. The second phase, Design, recognized the need for a multi-pronged approach (3 individual sections) that would address the areas of competency. Questions pertinent to each section were developed over the course of 5 months. As each section was undergoing development, constant and continual conversations with the content experts in each area were held. Questions, answers, and formatting were discussed with the project developer and respective experts. Through this process, there was a continuous and ongoing validity process to ensure that the questions asked, and answers to be given, would be correct and understandable.

The pilot study allowed for phase 4, Implementation, and the opportunity for the fifth phase, Evaluation, when test results led to revision of questions whose content or construction was considered unwieldy or awkward. Evaluation of the pre-test material content and feedback from those involved in the pilot program highlighted the need to restructure some of the questions on the initial test. (Some questions were considered confusing.) When the questions were restructured, subsequent post-testing elucidated fewer comments from participants about confusion when completing the test.

Instrument Design: Components

During the design phase of the A2T, the developer identified 3 areas (sections) of competency:

- Section 1, the first of the objective sections, tests advisor knowledge and competency in basic college information that should be known by all advisors. Examples include the type and number of credits required for graduation with an Associate in General Studies, an Associate in Arts, and an Associate in Science degree. Additionally, general questions regarding other areas such as Financial Aid, Satisfactory Academic Progress, and Academic Probation, to name only a few, are included in this section. Section 1 requires application of memorized facts, and allows no outside assistance, such as computers or other references.

- Section 2 is also based on objective information, and tests advisor knowledge and competency in their specific division area. For example, a Fine Arts advisor who teaches Photography also answers questions regarding Media Arts and Entertainment (Associate & Certificate), Graphic Design, Associate in Fine Arts-Music, Associate in Fine Arts-Studio Art, Music Technology, and any other programs that fall within the Fine Arts division.

- Section 3 is the only subjective section of the test. This section is set up as a case study that asks the advisor to answer a series of questions based on studying an unofficial transcript for 4 students, who are at different stages of their college career and development. This section allows the advisors to demonstrate analytical and evaluation skills; interpret the transcript; and derive the best course choices for the student based upon the transcript, which shows placement test levels, courses taken and/or completed with the grade, current GPA, etc. While there are no "wrong" answers, there are still degrees

of "correctness," and this section seeks to determine how the advisor processes information from various information sources to develop a set of recommendations for the student.

The 3 sections of the A2T are supported by Bloom's Taxonomy for the cognitive domain as cited by Slavin (2011). The 5 levels include:

1. Knowledge
2. Comprehension
3. Application
4. Analysis
5. Synthesis
6. Evaluation

Section 1 involves rudimentary knowledge of the basic skill sets an academic advisor needs. However, Section 2 requires higher application of a variety of skill sets. Finally, Section 3 entails the need to use analysis, synthesis, and evaluation to process student information (via academic records and transcripts), in order to best determine subsequent steps for each individual student. If an advisor is unable to engage in the higher levels of the taxonomy, it is unlikely that they will be able to project the current and future needs of the student. Chapter 4 will describe each of these components in detail.

Implementation Procedure

The advisor knowledge tests are designed to be used for assessing new advisor readiness. Faculty members wishing to become academic advisors will be given a brief

overview of the responsibilities of academic advising. Upon completion of this overview, Section 1 will be administered to them as a "pre-test."

When the Section 1 pre-test is administered, it will be graded on a percentage-correct basis. They will then begin advisor training, consisting of Blackboard™ modules, one-on-one mentor/training sessions, and group training sessions when feasible. Group training is recommended initially, because of the opportunity to share and discuss the information across a wide platform. After group training, the trainee can begin working under the aegis of a seasoned academic advisor, who is a specialist in the trainee's discipline area. While working with the seasoned academic advisor, the trainee will be given the opportunity to advise students in their discipline. This will give them experience in "real-life" advising, while protecting the students from potentially incorrect advice.

Once training is completed, and the trainee feels prepared, the entire Advisor Assessment Test (A2T) will be administered. The results of the A2T will provide administration feedback on Section 1 (this time as a post-test) and scores on Sections 2 and 3, which will help determine if the trainee is ready to assume academic advising duties in the Advising Center. Since Section 3 involves interpretation of the student's unofficial transcripts, care must be taken that the advisor trainee's interpretation is in accordance with the best plan for the student.

The outline below illustrates the steps that will be used in the advisor training process, as described on the previous page.

Procedure Outline

Step	Task
I.	Receive administrative permission to begin academic advisor training
II.	Complete Section 1 (pre-evaluation)
III.	Review the results of Section 1 pre-evaluation
IV.	Attend group training session(s)
V.	Work individually with an advisor mentor
VI.	Begin advising students, while under mentor supervision
VII.	Complete Section 1 (post-evaluation)
VIII.	Complete Sections 2 and 3
IX.	Compile raw score percentages for each section
X.	Compare mean difference between Section 1 as pre-evaluation and post-test
XI.	Review scores for Sections 2 and 3
XII.	If scores meet approval of administration, the advisor may be assigned advising duties
XIII.	If scores do not meet approval of administration, advisor may retrain and retake all evaluations
XIV.	If still unsuccessful, reassess whether academic advising is a good venue for the individual

Pilot Testing and its Implications

While the A2T is intended as an evaluation for new academic advisors, interest in the project grew during the summer of 2012. The Executive Dean wished to add more advisors to the pool of current advisors, and also wished to offer cross-training opportunities to current advisors. He requested that a pilot of the project be conducted in the summer of 2012. Current advisors wishing to cross-train in other disciplines were given Sections 1 and 2 as a pre-test.

Results were disappointing; while several advisors scored very well on the pre-test, many others were deficient in their knowledge of basic advising components, enough so that the Executive Dean decided to use the pre-test as a training/evaluation process, rather than continue with the initial plan to do cross-training.

With the baseline percentage recorded, training began in the fall of 2012 through a combination of PowerPoint® presentations coupled with one-day training sessions. The content experts conducting the training sessions were program coordinators and highly experienced academic advisors/counselors in the specific programs. The training was not a specific component of the A2T project described in this dissertation; rather, it was developed as a *result* of the pilot pre-test scores, and was based upon the questions in Sections 1 and 2.

When training was completed, Section 1 was re-administered late fall 2012, along with Section 2. There was an increase in advisor accuracy of up to 45%, providing evidence to the effectiveness of the project and encouraging its continued use, particularly as a training method for academic advising trainees.

Due to the desire of the Executive Dean to focus on Sections 1 and 2, the third section was not administered as part of the pilot project. Rather, the impetus was on developing stronger core competency and knowledge for the current academic advising staff.

Data Analysis

Analysis of each section of the A2T can provide valuable insights into advisor readiness. Each of the 3 sections was important on its own merit, since each section defines a specific area of expertise. This provides administration with an understanding of an individual advisor's areas of strength, as well as those areas requiring additional training for competency. The three combined sections can provide administration with an overall estimation of an individual advisor's competencies.

The criterion for data analysis of the individual sections is as follows:

- All three sections will be graded "blind." At no time should the person grading the test be aware of whose test is being graded. Sections 1 and 2 will be graded by one person. Section 3 will be graded by a committee of at least three, but no more than five. The committee on section 3 will first assign individual grades, and then caucus, reaching a consensus for each question.

- Sections 1 and 2 are to be completed by the advisor trainee concurrently. Section 3 can be completed by the advisor trainee with sections 1 and 2, or at a later date.

- All test sections will be taken in the Testing Center, found in the institution's library.

- Sections 1 & 3 are to be completed from memory. There will be no notes or computer use allowed by the advisor trainee.

- Section 2 will be first completed from memory. Upon completion, the advisor is allowed 15 minutes to use a computer to check/change answers, as needed.

Sections 1 and 2 are based on objective questions: true/false, multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank, etc. Section 3, however, involves interpretation of student records, including placement test scores, external transcripts, current and overall GPA, developmental course requirements/recommendations, repeated/failed classes history, etc. Because the questions in this section request that the advisor make recommendations to the student that are subjective in nature, the committee format provides for a wider viewpoint of "correct" interpretations of given data.

Limitations

Several potential limitations of the project should be considered. First, the state of academic advising is in an ongoing state of flux as degree requirements change, programs are added or eliminated, and the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) revamps minimum requirements, currently an 8-year cycle for the Academic Quality Improvement Program

(AQIP) and 5 to 10 years for the Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality (PEAQ) (Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, 2014). Therefore, the evaluations detailed in this project are valid for a limited time frame, due to changes in the academic advising standards.

This assessment approach does not include the technology skills that each advisor needs to possess in order to gather critical information for individual students and to navigate the computer software integral to course selection, registration, matriculation, etc. Each institution wishing to implement advisor evaluation as detailed in this project will need to determine what their specific needs and requirements are as regards technological knowledge on the part of the academic advisor.

Another possible limitation to the instrument described here is that there is a lack of research about the evaluation of individual academic advisors. Most studies focused college level academic advising center around student satisfaction surveys. While these surveys may provide insight into students' perceptions about their school's advising program, they do not directly address all factors related to an advisor's performance, including the issue of advisor knowledge and competency.

Finally, each institution will have its own criteria of what is required of an academic advisor as determined by employment contracts, administrative requirements, and self-evaluation of the academic advisor. This project, therefore, is intended to serve as a template of what *can* be implemented at any institution to help advisors become a greater asset to the student population they serve.

The project's format can be modified to fit the needs of any college or university interested in developing similar evaluations. Chapter 5 provides additional

recommendations for options institutions may consider when designing and

implementing their own Advisor Assessment Tool (A2T).

CHAPTER 4: THE ADVISOR ASSESSMENT TOOL (A2T)

Introduction

This chapter contains a detailed description of the product created through this project. The final refined A2T was modified based on the experiences with the pilot process as described in Chapter 3. This includes changes made in subject content areas and re-structuring of test questions for increased clarity and comprehension.

Section 1: General Advising Degree/Certificate Information

The A2T process begins with the implementation of Section 1: Pre-Test segment of the advising instrument. Section 1 evaluates the advisor trainee's knowledge of general college data, relative to the advising process. This includes, but is not limited to, requirements for transfer degrees, placement test results as they impact course sequence, Advanced Placement (AP) and Michigan Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers (MACRAO) guidelines, etc.

It is expected that the initial score for Section 1 (pre-evaluation) may be quite low for new advisor trainees. In creating the instrument, the developer assumed that some of the trainees may not have been exposed to the material in this section prior to the training. It is expected that a substantially higher score will be produced on the post-evaluation.

Pre-test scores will be tabulated and recorded. When the advisor trainee finishes the training process, Section 1 will be re-administered, this time as a Post-Evaluation.

Scores will again be tabulated, recorded, and compared to Pre-Evaluation scores. Section

1 of the Pre- and Post-Test is shown here:

Advisor Training: Pre-Test
Section 1: General Advising Degree/Certificate Information

1. What is the *minimum* number of general education credits necessary for an Associate's degree?
    a. 10
    b. 14
    c. 18
    d. 30

2. What is the *minimum* number of credit hours required for an Associate's degree?
    a. 50
    b. 62
    c. 93
    d. it depends upon the chosen degree program

3. What is college policy regarding placement into developmental classes?
    a. placement testing results are guidelines only
    b. students must take all developmental course levels they test into
    c. students may waive developmental placement if they feel competent in that area
    d. Math & English developmental are mandatory; Reading is optional

4. What is the *minimum* number of credits a student must earn in order to receive a Certificate of Achievement?
    a. 25
    b. 30
    c. it depends upon the certificate program

5. Students who have taken ACT tests in high school can use their ACT scores to:
    a. waive some/all placement tests, with the approval of the Placement Testing & Assessment Center
    b. receive credit for some college courses, with the approval of the Placement Testing & Assessment Center
    c. waive some college English courses, with the approval of the Placement Testing & Assessment Center

6. Students are placed into the correct Math course level by:
    a. the student's self-assessment of his/her math competency level
    b. high school transcripts
    c. an assessment appointment with a Science/Math advisor
    d. college placement tests

7. How many transfer credits may a student bring from other accredited institutions *that will apply* towards graduation?
    a. 24
    b. 32
    c. 45
    d. there is no limit on the number of credits transferred and applied

8. List the *minimum number* of specific general education credits necessary in each discipline for an Associate in General Studies degree. (ex. 0, 1, 2, etc.)
- Composition = ___
- Humanities = ___
- Social Sciences = ___
- Math = ___ (or test out)
- Science = ___
- Information Technology = ___

9. Is there a minimum number of credits a student must earn *at this institution* in order to receive an Associate's degree?
    a. Yes
    b. No

10. If you answered No to question 9, skip to question 11. If you answered Yes to question 9, how many credits must be earned specifically *at this institution*?
    a. 30
    b. 32
    c. 45
    d. there is not a minimum number of credits needed; a student needs only to have *some institutional* credits towards their program. The remainder can consist of transfer credits from outside accredited institutions.

11. Which of the statements below are required to enroll in online courses? (Circle all that apply.)
    a. proven prior experience with online formats
    b. for current students, a GPA of 2.0 or higher
    c. completion of DLES 100 with a grade of "S"
    d. current student status (no guest students)

12. What are the criteria for a student being placed on Academic Probation? (Circle all that apply.)
    a. they have not passed 67% of their classes
    b. they have been disciplined for an infraction of college rules
    c. their GPA is below 2.0
    d. they have at least 12 attempted credits
    e. they have exceeded 93 credits towards the 1st Associate's degree
    f. all of the above
    g. none of the above

13. What are the criteria for a student not making Satisfactory Academic Progress? (Circle all that apply.)
    a. they have not passed 67% of their classes
    b. they have been disciplined for an infraction of college rules
    c. their GPA is below 2.0
    d. they have at least 12 attempted credits
    e. they have exceeded 93 credits towards the 1st Associate's degree
    f. all of the above
    g. none of the above

14. Which is the new sequence of MATH courses required to satisfy graduation requirements for an Associate in Arts degree, assuming placement test scores of Math 021?
    a. Math 021& Math 110
    b. Math 021, 082, 110, & 120
    c. Math 021, 072 or 082, 115 or 120
    d. Math 021, 072 or 082, 115 or 120, & 130
    e. none of the above

15. List the *minimum number* of specific general education credits necessary in each discipline for an Associate in Arts degree.   (ex. 0, 1, 2, etc.)
    - Composition = ___
    - Humanities = ___
    - Social Sciences = ___
    - Math/Science = ___
    - Information Technology = ___

16. List the *minimum number* of specific general education credits necessary in each discipline for an Associate in Science degree.   (ex. 0, 1, 2, etc.)
    - Composition = ___
    - Humanities = ___
    - Social Sciences = ___
    - Math/Science = ___
    - Information Technology = ___

17. What is the MACRAO transfer agreement?
    a. it is an agreement of course transferability among community colleges nationwide
    b. it is an agreement of course transferability among *Michigan* community colleges
    c. it is an agreement of course transferability between community colleges and universities nationwide
    d. it is an agreement of course transferability between *Michigan* community colleges and universities

18. Which degrees fulfill the MACRAO transfer agreement requirements? (Circle all that apply.)
    a. Associate in General Studies
    b. Associate in Arts
    c. Associate in Science
    d. Associate in Applied Science
    e. All certificates

19. When the requirements for MACRAO have been met, it will be recorded on the student's transcripts:
    a. automatically
    b. upon student or advisor request
    c. upon request of the university to which the student transferred

20. Which degrees require that a student takes courses in more than one area of a specific academic discipline (i.e. HUM or SOC)? (Circle all that apply.)
    a. Associate in General Studies
    b. Associate in Arts
    c. Associate in Science
    d. Associate in Applied Science
    e. All certificates

21. When a student asks questions regarding their financial aid loans and awards, the advisor should:
    a. pull up the appropriate screen in Datatel in order to see the student's correct loan and award amount
    b. give the student the website fafsa.gov to get current up-to-date information directly from the government
    c. call the Financial Services staff member who has been assigned to that student
    d. refer the student to Student Financial Services for financial questions

22. What is the maximum number of credits that can be taken in Fall or Winter without divisional dean approval?
    a. 12
    b. 15
    c. 18
    d. 20

23. What is the maximum number of credits that can be taken in Spring or Summer without divisional dean approval?
    a. 6
    b. 9
    c. 12
    d. 15

24. How can students who have taken AP *exams* in high school receive credit for them at college level?
    a. request that their high school counselor send their transcripts to the Admissions office
    b. ask the Placement Testing center to review their high school transcripts and post the results to their college transcript
    c. contact College Board to request transcripts of all AP test results, listing this institution as the recipient
    d. all of the above
    e. none of the above; college credit is not given for high school AP classes or exams

25. Students who are nearing their program completion should seek help from:
    a. the Registrar's office
    b. the Registration area
    c. the information kiosk on the first floor of the Prahl center
    d. an academic advisor

26. All new and returning students fall under the most current general education guidelines.
    a. True
    b. False

27. Students who have been academically dismissed for the first time must:
    a. write a letter of appeal to request readmission
    b. wait one semester before reapplying
    c. wait one year before reapplying
    d. attend a different college or university and successfully complete 12 credit hours of instruction that will transfer back to this institution

28. When completing a degree audit for a student, the correct mnemonic in Datatel is:
    a. TRCL
    b. TSUM
    c. PSPR
    d. SACP
    e. STAD
    f. RGN

29. When recording what transpired during an advising session with a student, the correct mnemonic in Datatel is:
    a. TRCL
    b. TSUM
    c. PSPR
    d. SACP
    e. STAD
    f. RGN

30. When changing a program of study for a student, the correct mnemonic in Datatel is:
    a. TRCL
    b. TSUM
    c. PSPR
    d. SACP
    e. STAD
    f. RGN

Section 2: Specific Division Area Requirements —Technology

Section 2 of the Instrument covers the advisor trainee's knowledge of a specific division of the college, for example, the Technology division. The Technology division includes several specific sub-disciplines: Air Conditioning/Heating/Refrigeration, Building & Construction, CADD (Computer Assisted Drafting and Design), Electronics and Electrical Technology, Welding, and many degrees and certificates offered in the areas of computing.

Section 2 is to be completed initially by the advisor trainee without the use of computer/website assistance. However, given that each division encompasses many separate disciplines, it was deemed appropriate to allow the use of computer/website assistance *after* the evaluation has been completed, for a time period of 15 minutes. This helps to ensure that the trainee knows the overall division requirements well, but may need to use the website for quick referencing and checking of answers. Answers may be changed during the 15-minute time period.

Upon completion of Section 2, the answers are submitted, graded, and recorded. An example of a Section 2 evaluation involving the Technology area is included below:

Advisor Training: Pre-Test
Section 2: Specific Division Area Requirements- Technology

1. Circle the field of study that does not currently offer an Associate's degree.
   a. Air Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration Technology
   b. Building & Construction
   c. CAD & Design
   d. Electronics & Electrical Technology
   e. Welding

2. Students completing an Associate's degree in a technology area may also qualify for an:
   a. Associate's in General Studies
   b. Associate's in Arts
   c. Associate's in Science
   d. No other degree

3. To fulfill the above degree requirements, some technology programs also require an additional class in:
   a. Composition
   b. Humanities
   c. Social Sciences
   d. Math
   e. Science
   f. Info Tech

4. Which of the following Associate's degree programs also offer a Certificate program? (Circle all that apply.)
   a. Air Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration Technology
   b. Applied Technology
   c. Automotive Technology
   d. Building & Construction
   e. CAD & Design
   f. Electronics & Electrical Technology
   g. Fire Protection Technology
   h. Industrial Technology
   i. Mechanical Operations Technology
   j. Welding

5. Which programs are offered *only* as Certificate programs? (Circle all that apply.)
   a. Air Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration Technology
   b. Applied Technology
   c. Automotive Technology
   d. Automotive Undercar Repair
   e. Building & Construction
   f. CAD & Design
   g. Electronics & Electrical Technology
   h. Fire Protection Technology
   i. Machine Tool Technology
   j. Mechanical Operations Technology
   k. Operations & Production Technology
   l. Robotic Programming & Control
   m. Sustainable Construction
   n. Transportation, Distribution, & Logistics Technology
   o. Welding

6. A student interested in any of the electrical certificates or degrees should take which course(s) in their first semester?
   a. ELEC 131 - Residential Wiring
   b. ELEC 133 - Electrical Circuits
   c. ELEC 110 - Electrical Industry Orientation
   d. a and b

7. Which program is recommended for students seeking a degree in Robotics?
   a. Electronics and Electrical Technology Emphasis in Robotics
   b. None - does not offer a robotics degree
   c. MDES - Mechanical Operations
   d. Go to ITT

8. Which program is recommended for students seeking a degree in Controls?
   a. Electronics and Electrical Technology
   b. None - does not offer a robotics degree
   c. MDES - Mechanical Operations
   d. d. Go to ITT

9. What is required for students wanting to become a state of Michigan-certified electrician?
   a. Completion of the AAS in Electronics and Electrical Technology
   b. Completion of the Certificate of Achievement in Electrical Technology for Apprentice Electricians
   c. Completion of the Certificate of Achievement in Electrical Technology for Apprentice Electricians plus a state recognized apprenticeship (8000 hours)
   d. Electricians are not required to have degrees or certifications

10. What is the minimum MATH level required to complete the AAS degree in Electronics and Electrical Technology?
    a. MATH 120
    b. MATH 130
    c. MATH 140
    d. MATH 145
    e. MATH 170

11. Which electronics and electrical courses are ALWAYS offered in the Spring term? (Circle all that apply.)
    a. ELEC 131 and ELEC 133
    b. ELEC 139
    c. Contact program coordinator
    d. ELEC 231

12. Which 200-level course is offered only in the Fall?
    a. ELEC 231
    b. ELEC 233
    c. ELEC 235

13. Which 200-level courses are offered only in the Winter?
    a. ELEC 231
    b. ELEC 233
    c. ELEC 235

14. Which IT course is recommended to meet the General Education Requirements for Electronics and Electrical Technology?
    a. COMG 150
    b. COMG 153
    c. COMG 162
    d. COMS 170

15. What type of student should take RFID 180 instead of ELEC 150?
    a. An industrial electrician
    b. A student interested in computer applications / pre-engineering
    c. Electrician Apprentices
    d. Students interested in specializing in residential electrical systems

16. Which Michigan universities offer Engineering Technology programs for transfer students in the Electronics & Electronic Technology program?
    a. U-M Flint
    b. Eastern Michigan University
    c. Ferris State University
    d. Michigan State University
    e. Wayne State University

17. Which program is concerned primarily with the practical application of support to industrial activities, including work in design, manufacturing, maintenance and testing?
    a. Applied Technology
    b. Industrial Technology
    c. Manufacturing Simulation Technology
    d. Mechanical Operations Technology

18. Which program is concerned primarily with students who have completed a recognized apprenticeship program and have earned journeyman status in their field?
    a. Applied Technology
    b. Industrial Technology
    c. Manufacturing Simulation Technology
    d. Mechanical Operations Technology

19. How many credits will students entering the above program be granted toward the Associate of Applied Science degree for successful completion of the apprenticeship?
    a. No credits are granted because of their prior background
    b. 15
    c. 20
    d. 25

20. Which program is designed for students who have progressed in their careers and achieved an advanced classification/status in a recognized technical field, accompanied by a minimum of 5 years of full-time work experience?
    a. Applied Technology
    b. Industrial Technology
    c. Manufacturing Simulation Technology
    d. Mechanical Operations Technology

21. What is the minimum GPA for all Automotive Technology Occupational Specialty courses?
    a. there is no minimum GPA requirement for all occupational AUTO TECH specialty courses, but a student must have a 2.0 or higher cumulative GPA for graduation
    b. 1.5 allowed for a maximum of 2 classes
    c. 2.0
    d. 2.5
    e. 3.0

22. What two AUTO courses serve as prerequisites for the other Occupational Specialty courses? (Circle the correct answers.)
    a. AUTO 119- Engine Theory& Repair
    b. AUTO 131- Manual Transmissions & Drive Axles
    c. AUTO 141- Suspension & Alignment
    d. AUTO 151- Brakes & Braking Systems
    e. AUTO 161- Electrical Theory
    f. AUTO 182- Ignition & Fuel Systems
    g. AUTO 191- Automotive Fundamentals

23. Prior to Summer 2012, the course number for AUTO 119 was:
    a. AUTO 111
    b. AUTO 115
    c. AUTO 120
    d. AUTO 125

24. The MATH prerequisite for AUTO 161 is:
    a. There is no MATH prerequisite for AUTO 161
    b. Complete MATH 021or place into MATH 082
    c. Complete MATH 120
    d. Complete MATH 128

25. Two introductory courses that introduce students to CAD & Design are:
    a. CADD 100- Mechanical Blueprint Reading w/CADD
    b. CADD 110- Architectural Blueprint Reading w/CADD
    c. CADD 120- 2D CADD Applications
    d. CADD 130- Parametric Modeling Fundamentals
    e. CADD 160- Fundamentals of Design

26. Students with previous significant CAD experience may be waived from: (Circle all that apply.)
    a. CADD 100- Mechanical Blueprint Reading w/CADD
    b. CADD 110- Architectural Blueprint Reading w/CADD
    c. CADD 120- 2D CADD Applications
    d. CADD 130- Parametric Modeling Fundamentals
    e. CADD 160- Fundamentals of Design

27. Students wishing to be waived from introductory CADD classes need to:
    a. Inform their advisor that they have the prerequisite skills, so that they may be registered for the next level of CADD classes
    b. Request that the Dean of Technology waives the prerequisites for them
    c. Consult with the CAD & Design coordinator to determine if classes may be waived
    d. All students must complete all course levels to maintain the proper sequence of learning

28. Which CAD & Design class is considered to be the primary prerequisite class for the program?
    a. CADD 100- Mechanical Blueprint Reading w/CADD
    b. CADD 110- Architectural Blueprint Reading w/CADD
    c. CADD 120- 2D CADD Applications
    d. CADD 130- Parametric Modeling Fundamentals
    e. CADD 160- Fundamentals of Design

29. What is the minimum MATH level required to complete the AAS degree in CAD & Design?
    a. MATH 120
    b. MATH 130
    c. MATH 128 or 140
    d. MATH 140 or 145
    e. MATH 170

30. Which certificate program places emphasis on design principles that apply to developed industries such as furniture, defense, agricultural, automotive, appliance, heavy equipment, as well as emerging fields like alternative energy?
    a. CAD & Design- Architectural Certificate
    b. CAD & Design- Mechanical Certificate
    c. CADD/CAM certificate

31. Which area of classes is NOT part of the Occupational Specialty Courses for a Building & Construction Associate's degree or certificate? (Circle all that apply.)
    a. ACHR
    b. BCON
    c. CADD
    d. ELEC
    e. FIRE
    f. MECH
    g. TECH
    h. WELD

32. What is the minimum MATH level required to complete the AAS degree in Building & Construction?
    a. MATH 120
    b. MATH 130
    c. MATH 128 or 140
    d. MATH 140 or 145
    e. MATH 170

33. For the Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Associate's degree and Certificate program, which ACHR course is NOT a prerequisite for subsequent courses?
    a. ACHR 140
    b. ACHR 141
    c. ACHR 142
    d. ACHR 143
    e. ACHR 144

34. Which two courses are prerequisites for ACHR 242- Heating Systems II?
    a. ACHR 140 & 141
    b. ACHR 141 & 142
    c. ACHR 141 & 143
    d. ACHR 141 & 144

35. Which two courses are prerequisites for ACHR 243-Sealed System Service?
    a. ACHR 140 & 141
    b. ACHR 141 & 142
    c. ACHR 141 & 143
    d. ACHR 141 & 144
    e. ACHR 141 & 147

36. Which ACHR course is specifically designed to prepare students for the EPA section 608 of the Clean Air Act certification exam?
    a. ACHR 143- Sealed System Installation
    b. ACHR 147- Refrigerant Handling
    c. ACHR 241- Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Controls II
    d. ACHR243- Sealed System Service

37. What is the minimum MATH level required to complete the AAS degree in Air Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration?
    a. MATH 115
    b. MATH 120
    c. MATH 130
    d. MATH 128 or 140
    e. MATH 140 or 145
    f. MATH 170

38. In the Welding certificate program, each WELD course will have qualification tests for AWS (American Welding Society) certification.
    a. True
    b. False

39. Which computer course is the basic entry-level prerequisite for all computer-related Associate degree programs?
    a. COMG 099- Computer Fundamentals
    b. COMG 150- Introduction to Computer Technology
    c. COMG 153- Computers: A Practical Approach
    d. COMG 154- Intermediate Practical Computer Skills

40. What is the minimum MATH level required to complete the AAS degree in any Computer-related program?
    a. MATH 110
    b. MATH 120
    c. MATH 130
    d. MATH 128 or 140
    e. MATH 170

41. Several computer courses are offered in a format called OEOE. Courses of this type:
    a. Require completion of DLES-100 prior to registration
    b. Are taught with the same methodology as WWW courses
    c. Allow the student the ability to work at his/her own pace
    d. Are accelerated courses designed for upper-level students

42. The Communications Technology Associate degree and Certificate program require a concentration in one of which three areas?
    a. Broadcasting
    b. Business & Marketing
    c. Graphic Design
    d. Media Arts
    e. Photography

43. Students interested in pursuing a Communications Technology Associate degree may also be interested in the following Associate's degree, which offers many similarities:
    a. Broadcasting
    b. Business & Marketing
    c. Graphic Design
    d. Media Arts
    e. Photography

44. Which computer-related Associate degree allows students to customize a technology program that will suit their needs, allowing them to choose courses in their interest area?
    a. Communications Technology
    b. Computer Information Systems
    c. Computer Network Administration
    d. Computer Network Engineering
    e. Computer Operations Technology

45. Which computer-related Associate degree program requires ACCT 201-Principles of Accounting?
    a. Communications Technology
    b. Computer Information Systems
    c. Computer Network Administration
    d. Computer Network Engineering
    e. Computer Operations Technology

46. Of the two Computer Networking Associate degrees, which has more specific COMS and COMN course requirements?
    a. Computer Network Administration
    b. Computer Network Engineering

47. Students wanting to pursue a Computer Science Bachelor's degree at the university level are advised to:
    a. Complete the Computer Science certificate here prior to transferring
    b. Complete the Computer Information Systems (CISY) Associate degree to meet university transfer requirements
    c. Concentrate on General Education, Math and Physics courses to meet university transfer requirements
    d. Take at least 3-4 courses in each computer area (COMG, COMI, COMM, COMN, COMS, COMT, COMW) to meet university transfer requirements

Section 3: Interpreting an Unofficial Student Transcript

It is expected that Section 3 will be administered to the advisor trainee only after training is complete. Through the training process and individualized work with an advisor mentor, the advisee should be able to successfully interpret a student's unofficial transcript. Care should be taken to follow program prerequisites and course sequence, not repeat courses already completed, and help the student choose elective classes based on both his/her program and individual interest areas. If a student has a low GPA, or is encountering problems during the course of a semester, an advisor should be able to make sound recommendations on ways to help the student overcome those difficulties.

It is possible that a trainee can score 100% each in Sections 1 and 2, yet not be a good academic advising candidate because of a lack of interpretative skills in Section3.

Section 3 involves 4 individual student transcripts. Each case is an actual student record. The four cases were chosen to show the diversity of students attending a public community college. Section 3 transcripts follow the questions below.

Section 3: Interpreting an Unofficial Student Transcript

The examples below are taken from actual student records. All identification has been removed to protect the students' privacy.

Study each example, and then write your answers to the questions following Example I, given below.

The 4 examples each have the same set of 20 questions as shown in Example #1.

Questions

1. What is the student's current GPA?
2. Is the student showing success? How do you know?
3. According to the placement test results, what is his/her Reading comprehension level?
4. Is developmental reading appropriate for this student? If so, which class is recommended? Is it required?
5. According to the placement test results, what is his/her English writing level?
6. Is developmental writing appropriate for this student? If so, which class is recommended? Is it required?
7. According to the placement test results, what is his/her Mathematics level?
8. Is developmental Math appropriate for this student? If so, which class is recommended? Is it required?
9. What is the student's Academic Program? Would you recommend any other programs of study instead of, or in addition to their current program?
10. Has the student brought in any transfer credit from another institution? If so, how many credits, and what requirements have been fulfilled?
11. If any classes have been failed, do you recommend repeating them soon? Why or why not?
12. Is the student showing success at midterm (if applicable)? If not, what recommendations will you give them?
13. What general education requirements have been met?
14. What general education requirements are still needed?

15. How many credits has the student completed towards graduation?
16. Should a degree audit be done at this time? Why or why not? (What are the criteria for running a degree audit?)
17. Should a Fresh Start be done for this student? List below the time requirement for a Fresh Start, and whether or not this student qualifies, if needed.
18. Are there any upcoming scheduled classes that you would recommend the student NOT take at this time? Why?
19. Assuming the student has made regular use of the Advising Center, do you feel that the advising he/she has received been of good quality? If no, what would you do differently?
20. Should any of his/her general education courses be repeated for transferability? Why?

Transcript #1:

					Billing Residence: In District Credit Classes		
GPA 0.00		**HONOR PTS** 0			**Grad Stat:** Y	**Orient**: Received 02-AUG-11	
HIGH SCHOOL: LOCAL SCHOOL							

PLACEMENT TEST							
TITLE	**DATE**	**SCORE**	**STATUS**	**STATUS DATE**	**CC COURES**	**CC EQUIV**	
Educational Development Plan	7/20/11						
Recommend- Engl Reading	7/20/11	16					
Recommend- Mathematics	7/20/11	21					
Recommend- Engl Writing	7/20/11	98			ENGL-095	Equivalency	

ACT/SAT TEST		
TITLE	**START DATE**	**SCORE**

ACADEMIC PROGRAM / TITLE					
PROGRAM	**TITLE**	**STATUS**	**TERM**	**START - DATE**	**DESC**
ELED03	Elem. Ed. Transfer		2011	9/6/11	In-District Credit Classes

DEGREES, AWARDS AND HONORS			
DATE	**DEGREE**	**MAJOR**	**HONORS**

EXTERNAL TRANSCRIPTS				
TERM	**COURSE**	**SCHOOL NAME**	**CC COURSE**	**CRED**

CC GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS TAKEN PRIOR TO 1998/3

TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**

CC TRANSCRIPTS					
TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**	**GRADE**	**ATTEMPT**	**COMPL**
2012/2	GEOG 142	World Regional Geography	0.0	4	0
2012/2	HIST 155	U.S. History-1877 - present	0.0	3	0
2012/2	PSYC 281	General Psychology	0.0	3	0
2012/2	SOCY 191	Intro to Sociology	0.0	3	0
2012/3	CASD 122	College Survival Skills	NS	0	0
2012/3	HREL 151	Interperson/Multi Comm	0.0	3	0
2012/3	MH 021A	Whole Numbers	NS	0	0
2012/3	MH 021B	Fractions and Decimals	NS	0	0
2012/3	MH 021C	Signed Numbers/Equation	NS	0	0
2012/3	MH 021D	Percents, Proportions,Data	NS	0	0
2012/3	MH 021E	Geometry & Measurement	NS	0	0
2012/3	PEAC 106	Physical Conditioning	NS	3	0
2012/4	ASL 101	American Sign Language	0.0	3	0
2012/4	RDNG 016	Essential Reading Skills	NS	0	0
SUMMARY				19	0

MOTT SCHEDULE	

TRANSFER CREDIT:	0.00
CC COMPLETED CREDIT:	0
TOTAL ACCUMULATED CREDIT:	0
TOTAL CREDIT TOWARD GRADUATION:	0.00

This first transcript demonstrates a second-semester student who is in danger of academic dismissal. Developmental reading, writing, and math are indicated by the placement test scores. The first semester courses reflect poor choices, either on the part of the advisor or the student who may have insisted on a full-time load when more appropriate choices were not available. The second semester reflects more appropriate choices, but the student does not show adequate process.

The second transcript demonstrates a current student with an excellent GPA (3.64). Only developmental writing was recommended, was taken, and passed. Courses appear to be following the Business Management track, which is the chosen academic program.

Transcript #2:

						Billing Residence: In District Credit Classes	
GPA 3.64			**HONOR PTS** 102			**Grad Stat:** Y	**Orient:** Received 1-APR-11
HIGH SCHOOL: LOCAL SCHOOL							

	PLACEMENT TEST						
TITLE		**DATE**	**SCORE**	**STATUS**	**STATUS DATE**	**CC COURES**	**CC EQUIV**
Pl Test - Comprehension		4/7/11	14				
Recommend- Engl Reading		4/7/11	100				
Recommend- Mathematics		4/7/11	110			GED 021	Equivalency
Recommend- Engl Writing		4/7/11	99			ENGL-098	Equivalency
Recommend- Engl Writing		4/7/11	99			ENGL-095	Equivalency

ACT/SAT TEST		
TITLE	**START DATE**	**SCORE**

ACADEMIC PROGRAM / TITLE					
PROGRAM	**TITLE**	**STATUS**	**TERM**	**START - DATE**	**DESC**
GENS1	General Studies	Changed Mind	2011/4	5/4/11	In-District Credit Classes
MGMT2	Busn Management	Active		7/27/11	

DEGREES, AWARDS AND HONORS			
DATE	**DEGREE**	**MAJOR**	**HONORS**

EXTERNAL TRANSCRIPTS				
TERM	**COURSE**	**SCHOOL NAME**	**CC COURSE**	**CRED**

CC GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS TAKEN PRIOR TO 1998/3		
TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**

CC TRANSCRIPTS						
TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**	**GRADE**	**ATTEMPT**	**COMPL**	
2011/4	BUSN 106	Business Math	4.0	3	3	
2011/4	BUSN 104	Intro to Business	3.5	3	3	
2012/1	BUSN 251	Business Law I	4.0	3	3	
2012/1	MGMT 181	Principles of Management	4.0	3	3	
2012/1	BUSN 255	Principles of Marketing	4.0	3	3	
2012/2	ASL 101	American Sign Language I	3.0	3	3	HUM
2012/2	COMG 153	Computers-Prac. App.	3.5	3	3	CAC
2012/2	COMM131	Fund. Of Public Speaking	4.0	3	3	HUM
2012/2	ECON 221	Principles of Econ.-(macro)	3.0	4	4	SOC
SUMMARY				28	28	

MOTT SCHEDULE						
TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**	**MID GRADE**	**CRED**	**CONT HRS**	
2012/3	ENGL 099	Basic Writing	S	3	3	
2012/3	MATH 110	Beginning Algebra	4.0	4	4	
2012/3	PSYC 281	General Psychology	2.0	3	3	SOC
2012/4	DLES 100	DL Preparedness		0	0	
2012/4	MGMT 184	Intro to Entrepreneurship		0	0	WAC

TRANSFER CREDIT:	0.00
CC COMPLETED CREDIT:	28
TOTAL ACCUMULATED CREDIT:	28
TOTAL CREDIT TOWARD GRADUATION:	28.00

The third transcript demonstrates a student who has completed 58 credits toward graduation. A degree audit is in order here; however, the 1.99 GPA will hold back graduation until the GPA exceeds 2.0, so the student is currently on academic probation. Additionally, a quick review of the transcript shows that developmental math was not passed successfully, which will mean at least two additional semesters to complete math requirements. A close scrutiny of the transcript is recommended, since reading has not been brought up to college readiness. This can have a large impact on the student's difficulty with passing college-level courses, such as basic psychology (0.0), the human body (1.0), and similar general education type courses.

Transcript #3:

				Billing Residence: In District Credit Classes			
GPA 1.99		**HONOR PTS** 133		**Grad Stat:** Y		**Orient**: Received 02-AUG-06	
HIGH SCHOOL: LOCAL SCHOOL							

PLACEMENT TEST							
TITLE	**DATE**	**SCORE**	**STATUS**	**STATUS DATE**	**CC COURES**	**CC EQUIV**	
Educational Development Plan	7/26/06						
Pl Test - Comprehension	7/26/06	7					
Recommend- Engl Reading	7/26/06	16					
Recommend- Mathematics	7/26/06	21					
Recommend- Engl Writing	7/26/06	99			ENGL-098	Equivalency	
Recommend- Engl Writing	7/26/06	99			ENGL-095	Equivalency	

ACT/SAT TEST		
TITLE	**START DATE**	**SCORE**

ACADEMIC PROGRAM / TITLE					
PROGRAM	**TITLE**	**STATUS**	**TERM**	**START - DATE**	**DESC**
CRJU1	Criminal Justice	Active	200 7/2	9/5/06	In-District Credit Classes

DEGREES, AWARDS AND HONORS			
DATE	**DEGREE**	**MAJOR**	**HONORS**

EXTERNAL TRANSCRIPTS				
TERM	**COURSE**	**SCHOOL NAME**	**CC COURSE**	**CRED**

CC GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS TAKEN PRIOR TO 1998/3		
TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**

CC TRANSCRIPTS						
TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**	**GRADE**	**ATTEMPT**	**COMPL**	
2007/2	ENGL 099	Basic Writing	S	0	3	
2007/2	CRJU 161	Intro Law Enf & Adm	1.0	0	0	
2007/2	HREL 151	Multi-Cultural Comm.	2.5	3	3	SAC
2007/2	ENGL 010	Reading Improvement	S	0	3	CAC
2007/3	COMG 153	Computers-Prac. App	W	0	0	CAC
2007/3	ENGL 101	English Composition 101	1.5	3	3	
2007/3	PSYC 281	General Psychology	1.0	3	3	SOC
2007/3	PSYC 280	General Psychology Lab	4.0	1	1	SOC
2007/3	CRJU 151	Intro Security Adm	4.0	3	3	
2008/2	PEAC 123	Basketball	4.0	2	2	
2008/2	ENGL 102	English Composition II	2.0	3	3	
2008/2	SOCW 132	Progs Comm Welfare	2.0	3	3	MES
2008/2	BIOL 150	The Human Body	1.0	4	4	NTL
2008/3	CORR 102	Client Rel in Corr	1.5	3	3	
2008/3	SOCY 191	Intro Sociology	1.5	0	0	SOC
2008/3	MUS 182	Jazz Appreciation	1.5	3	3	HUM
2008/3	CRJU 152	Prin-Loss Prevent	3.5	3	3	
2008/4	MATH 021	Basic Math	U	0	0	
2009/2	PSYC 281	General Psychology	0.0	3	0	SOC
2009/2	CRJU 161	Intr Law Enf & Adm	2.0	3	3	
2009/2	CORR 101	Intro Corrections	0.0	0	0	
2009/2	SOCY 191	Intro Sociology	2.0	3	3	SOC
2009/3	BUSN 251	Business Law I	2.0	3	3	
2009/3	SOCW 133	Child Welfare	0.0	3	0	
2009/3	BUSN 104	Intro to Business	2.5	3	3	
2010/2	CORR 101	Intro Corrections	3.0	3	3	
2010/2	PSCN 171	Intro to American Govt	W	0	0	SOC
2010/2	CASD 123	Stress Management	4.0	2	2	
2010/2	GEOG 142	World Regional Geog	1.0	4	4	

2010/3	CRJU 286	Comp Crime & Cyber Law	2.0	3		3		
2010/3	CRJU 163	Patrol Admin & Proc	3.0	3		3		
2010/3	CRJU 263	Tech Crim Invest	0.0	3		0		
SUMMARY				67		64		

MOTT SCHEDULE								
TERM	**COURSE**	**TITLE**	**MID GRADE**	**CRED**	**CONT HRS**		
2012/3	**BUSN 251**	**Business Law I**	**1.5**	**3**	**3**		
2012/3	CASD 121	Study and Learning Skills		1	1		
2012/3	COMG 153	Computers Prac App	0.0	3	3	CAC	
2012/3	MATH 021	Basic Math	U	5	5		
2012/3	COMM 131	Fund of Public Speaking		3	3	HUM	
2012/3	PSYC 281	General Psychology		3	3	SMC	

TRANSFER CREDIT:	0.00
CC COMPLETED CREDIT:	64
TOTAL ACCUMULATED CREDIT:	64
TOTAL CREDIT TOWARD GRADUATION:	58.00

The fourth and last transcript demonstrates a student who began as a pre-nursing student but has subsequently switched over to small business management. This was probably a wise decision, given the competitiveness of the nursing program and the student's relatively low GPA of 2.25. The current midterm grades indicate that intervention may be necessary, as three of the four current classes are below passing level. If the student is unable to raise the grades before the end of the semester, he/she will probably be on academic probation, which may impact future governmental funding.

Transcript #4:

			Billing Residence: In District Credit Classes
GPA 2.25	**HONOR PTS** 27		**Grad Stat:** Y **Orient**: Received 11-AUG-11
HIGH SCHOOL: LOCAL SCHOOL			

PLACEMENT TEST

TITLE	DATE	SCORE	STATUS	STATUS DATE	CC COURES	CC EQUIV
Educational Development Plan	8/10/11					
Pl Test - Comprehension	8/10/11	6				
Recommend- Engl Reading	8/10/11	16				
Recommend- Mathematics	8/10/11	21				
Recommend- Engl Writing	8/10/11	101			ENGL-099	Equivalency
Recommend- Engl Writing	8/10/11	101			ENGL-098	Equivalency
Recommend- Engl Writing	8/10/11	101			ENGL-095	Equivalency

ACT/SAT TEST

TITLE	START DATE	SCORE

ACADEMIC PROGRAM / TITLE

PROGRAM	TITLE	STATUS	TERM	START - DATE	DESC
PREN2	Pre-Nursing	Changed Mind	2012/2	9/6/11	In-District Credit Classes
SBM2	Sm Bus Management	Active		8/16/11	

DEGREES, AWARDS AND HONORS

DATE	DEGREE	MAJOR	HONORS

EXTERNAL TRANSCRIPTS

TERM	COURSE	SCHOOL NAME	CC COURSE	CRED

CC GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS TAKEN PRIOR TO 1998/3

TERM	COURSE	TITLE

CC TRANSCRIPTS

TERM	COURSE	TITLE	GRADE	ATTEMPT	COMPL	
2012/2	ENGL 101	English Comp 1	3.0	3	3	
2012/2	PSYC 281	General Psychology	1.5	3	3	SOC SMC
2012/2	BUSN 104	Intro to Business	2.0	3	3	
2012/2	MKT. 153	Sales Promotion Methods	2.5	3	3	
SUMMARY				12	12	

MOTT SCHEDULE

TERM	COURSE	TITLE	MID GRADE	CRED	CONT HRS	
2012/3	**BUSN 251**	**Business Law I**	**1.5**	**3**	**3**	
2012/3	CASD 121	Study and Learning Skills		1	1	
2012/3	COMG 153	Computers Prac App	0.0	3	3	CAC
2012/3	MATH 021	Basic Math	U	5	5	
2012/3	COMM 131	Fund of Public Speaking		3	3	HUM
2012/3	PSYC 281	General Psychology		3	3	SMC

TRANSFER CREDIT:	0.00
CC COMPLETED CREDIT:	12
TOTAL ACCUMULATED CREDIT:	12
TOTAL CREDIT TOWARD GRADUATION:	12.00

Conclusion

When used with new advisor trainees, the three combined sections of the A2T should enable administration to determine whether the trainee has sufficient knowledge to begin advising duties. Prior to the creation of the A2T at this institution, there was no source that established any sort of academic advising standard for advisors. With the A2T, administration can determine a baseline percentage of accuracy, if desired, that will either allow or disallow academic advising duties to begin. This will help to deter any complaints of bias as to who will be given work as advisors, and who will not. Those who do not meet the minimum percentages established by administration may continue training (with administration approval) and re-test at a later date.

The A2T is not considered to be a definitive testing method, but only a tool for setting the groundwork for minimum academic advising standards at the institution. Continuous and ongoing training and professional development opportunities are critical for continued success of any academic advising program.

CHAPTER 5: IMPLICATIONS OF IMPLEMENTING AN ADVISING TOOL / METHOD

Introduction

Academic advising has been shown to be one of the most critical components of a successful college experience, but too often one of the most neglected areas within the college environment. It is no longer satisfactory to assume that academic advising staff is knowledgeable and competent in all areas of their subject manner. Studies and surveys have found this to be untrue. The fault, if any, lies not necessarily with advisors or their institutions, but with a system that has for years accepted and expected no accountability for substandard academic advising.

The Advisor Assessment Tool (A2T) addresses the need to determine what, if any, inadequacies exist in individual academic advisors. This is the first step in creating a training method to address deficient areas, increasing advisor knowledge and competency. This, in turn, will lead to a higher caliber of academic advising at an institution, which will provide a greatly increased value of advising for students utilizing the academic advising center.

Advising Improvements following Implementation

Implementing the Advisor Assessment Tool (A2T) has had an effect on how the institution assesses and monitors advisors and their role. When the pre-test was administered in the summer of 2012, initial scores for Section 1 ranged from 36-84%

correct, with an average of 57%. A total of 30 advisors and counselors took part in the initial pilot. Training was developed and initiated after the test scores were tabulated. Following advising training sessions, post-test results ranged from 43-90% correct, with an average of 66%. Some advisors raised their individual accuracy by as much as 25% on their post-test scores.

The pre-test and post-test scores show that the process of test-train-test works to improve the knowledge base of academic advisors in this specific scenario.

Conclusions

Again, quoting Charlie Nutt (2003), "Academic advising is the very core of successful institutional efforts to educate and retain students." Every strong institution requires a strong core; therefore, the days of unmonitored academic advising *must* give way to a new mission and philosophy in advising that accepts nothing less than the best from its advisors for its students, whose continued success should be the heart of the field of academic advising.

If ongoing and regular academic advisor evaluations, coupled with on-going training opportunities, become a standard component of job requirements for maintaining and improving competency, the accuracy, professionalism, and reputation of those individuals involved in advising will increase significantly. By the same token, it is likely that advisors that are not dedicated to continual self-improvement may cease advising students, since in all likelihood they will not be willing to expend the time and effort needed to advance and improve their skills and knowledge. Either scenario is in students' best interests. Students must be able to trust that their academic advisor will disseminate

only correct, accurate information that will help them in achieving their educational and career goals in as concise a time frame as possible.

Recommendations

Colleges and universities planning to hire additional academic advising staff may find the evaluation methodology presented in this dissertation helpful as a screening tool for job applicants. While the content contained within the scope of advising responsibilities can be learned, it is much more expedient to hire academic advising staff that have at least a rudimentary understanding and knowledge of the skill sets necessary to advise students successfully.

It is recommended that any institution wishing to implement academic advisor evaluation also plan to implement concurrent training. There is very little point in an institution evaluating the current knowledge and competency level of its academic advisors unless there is also a plan in place to help them improve their skills.

Once the training has been implemented to target specific areas of weakness brought out by the pre-testing phase, a window of time for the post-test should be given. Improvement from pre-test to post-test should be measured; if the two scores do not show sufficient improvement, additional training/post-testing should be initiated.

This project only addressed only the creation of the evaluations, which were based on demonstrated need at a specific institution. Further research can be taken into the area of training methodology. Each institution desiring to implement this process will need to determine all aspects of training, including target areas, scope of subject manner, training formats and delivery methods that will advance its own institutional goals.

Training should be seen as a continual, ongoing process that will change frequently, and constantly evolve.

As shown in Chapter 3, the training that evolved after the pre-test was administered was a direct result of the poor test results on the pre-test. As such, the training was institution specific. Future evaluations may uncover unique areas of inefficiencies that will need targeted training.

The correct and appropriate use and knowledge of technology was also not covered in this project, yet is an integral part of the tools an academic advisor must use to work effectively. Knowledge of technology is extremely broad-based, covering not just basic computer navigational skills, but also the ability to use a myriad of software programs designed specifically for the entire academic advising process. Today, advisors today must be competent and comfortable with navigating their institution's website, using the plethora of resources available therein, as well as being able to direct students to find resources on their own. The more knowledgeable an advisor is about the technology necessary to the advising process, the better prepared he/she will be to use those sources quickly during an advising session. Moreover, computer competency with outside internet resources will lend itself to an advisor who is able to assist a student beyond the confines of their particular institution, adding greatly to the value of an academic advising session. Advisors who are not comfortable with technology will find themselves very handicapped and poorly equipped to satisfactorily assist today's students.

A recommendation for further research is that of the development of a series of technology-based training sessions. This will most likely be site-specific training, since

each institution uses a different combination of software programs to create the necessary reports, tables, or graphs that are used within the institution. As the training is developed, tests should also be created that will evaluate whether the knowledge has been comprehended and assimilated, and if an academic advisor is readily able to utilize the tools at hand.

The formats for training sessions can be developed according to what is most expedient and productive for the institution. Face-to-face training can be one of the most effective ways to disseminate information; it allows for questions and discussions that can provide immediate feedback to participants. It also provides the opportunity to share and discuss different viewpoints on academic advising topics. However, face-to-face training requires coordination of schedules of a potentially large group of individuals, which can be difficult to arrange.

Online training eliminates scheduling problems, since it can afford individuals the opportunity to take their training at a time convenient to them. With online training, it is often very easy to go back over sections that were not fully comprehended initially. However, there are drawbacks to online training. It can hinder the ability to receive immediate answers to questions not covered in the training and there is often little or no opportunity to discuss different approaches to academic advising issues. Additionally, the online format can leave the learner with a superficial comprehension of the materials being taught, without the depth of knowledge that face-to-face instruction can provide.

Another recommendation is to provide incentives for academic advisors who seek additional training opportunities and challenges. Experienced advisors who are willing to take on additional advising responsibilities should be compensated in some format. This

could be linked to a pay increase, preferential scheduling hours, flex time, etc. The willingness of the institution to recognize and reward excellent academic advisors can incentivize others to improve their own skills.

Finally, it is the hope that this project dissertation will serve as an impetus toward the implementation of academic advisor evaluation as a regular and expected component of improvement initiatives in the field of academic advising, and will be present in some form at all institutions of higher education.

REFERENCES

ACT. (2013). The reality of college readiness 2013. Retrieved from
    http://www.act.org/readinessreality/13/pdf/Reality-of-College-Readiness-
    2013.pdf

ADDIE Model. (n.d.) Retrieved from http://www.learning-theories.com/addie-
    model.html

Advisor manual: Undergraduate academic advising for faculty & staff advisors. (2013).
    Retrieved from
    http://advising.uncc.edu/sites/advising.uncc.edu/files/media/Advisor-Manual.pdf

Allard, F. (2012). Higher education: a conspiracy? How students view their chances at a
    four-year institution. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal.* Retrieved from
    http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/2012/08/higher-education-conspiracy/

Allen, J.M., & Smith, C.L. (2008). Importance of, responsibility for, and satisfaction with
    academic advising: a faculty perspective. *Journal of College Student
    Development,* 49, 397-411.

Attewell, P., Lavin, D., Domina, T., & Levey, T. (2006). New evidence on college
    remediation. Retrieved from
    http://www.gse.uci.edu/person/domina_t/docs/JHE%20remediation%20final.pdf

Bailey, T., Jeong, D.W., & Cho, S.W. (2010). Referral, enrollment, and completion in
    developmental education sequences in community colleges. Retrieved from:
    http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/referral-enrollment-completion-
    developmental-education.html

Billups, F.D. (2008). Measuring college student satisfaction: a multi-year study of the
    factors leading to persistence. *University of Connecticut
    DigitalCommons@UConn.* Retrieved from
    http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=nera
    _2008

Brooks, S. (2013). New office supports the academic advisors who support students.
    Retrieved from http://www.news.wisc.edu/21609

Burton, J., Wellington, K. (1998). The O'Banion model of academic advising: an
    integrative approach. *NACADA Journal, 18 (2),* 13-20. Retrieved from

https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/portals/0/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/documents/18-2-Burton-Wellington-pp13-20.pdf

Campbell, S.M., & Nutt, C.L. (2008). Academic advising in the new global century: supporting student engagement and learning outcomes achievement. *Association of American Colleges and Universities, 10,1.* Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/peerreview/pr-wi08/pr-wi08_acadv.cfm

Carnevale, A. P., Rose, S.J., & Cheah, B. (n.d.) The College Payoff. Retrieved from https://georgetown.app.box.com/s/cwmx7i5li1nxd7zt7mim

Community College Research Center. (2014). *Community college FAQs.* Retrieved from http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Community-College-FAQs.html

Creamer, E. C., & Scott, D. W. (2000). Assessing individual advisor effectiveness. In V. N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & Associates, Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook (pp. 339-348). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crockett, D. (n.d.). Modes and models: designing and implementing a successful academic advising program. Noel-Levitz. Retrieved from http://www.dixie.edu/reg/SEM/DCrockettModesandModels.pdf

Cuseo, J. (2007). Academic advisement and student retention: empirical connections and systematic Interventions." NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources web site, April 23, 2007. [http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/Retention.htm]

Cuseo, J. (2003). Assessment of academic advisors and academic advising programs. *NACADA Clearinghouse.* Retrieved from http://uwc.edu/sites/default/files/imce-uploads/employees/academic-resources/esfy/_files/assessment_of_academic_advisors_and_academic_advising_programs.pdf

Ender, S.C., Winston, R.B., Jr., & Miller, T.K. (1984). Academic advising reconsidered. In R. B. Winston, Jr., T.K. Miller, S.C. Ender, T. G. Grites, & Associates, *Developmental academic advising.*

Frost, S. (n.d.). Academic advising in higher education. Retrieved from http://www.answers.com/topic/academic-advising-in-higher-education

Frost, S. (2000). Historical and philosophical foundations for academic advising. In *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook.* Ed. Gordon, V. & Habley, W.R. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Griffin, B., & Jones, D. (2013). What's going on in academic advising: student vs. advisor perceptions. *John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education.* Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/Mi/Downloads/GMON0415n_Griffin%20(2).pdf

Habley, W.R. (1995) Advisor training in the context of a teaching enhancement center. In R.E. Glennen and F.N., Vowell (Eds.) *Academic Advising as a Comprehensive Campus Process.*

Habley, W. R. (Ed.). (2004). The Status of Academic Advising: Findings from the ACT Sixth National Survey (pp. 14-26). *National Academic Advising Association.* Retrieved from htt;://www.nadada.ksu.edu/Resources,Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Organizational-Models-for-Advising.aspx#sthash.iV0h886D.dpuf

Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. (2014). Maintaining accreditation through the program to evaluate and advance quality (PEAQ). Retrieved from www.ncahlc.org/PEAQ/peaq.html.

Hanover Research. (2011). *Improving student retention and graduation rates.* Retrieved from http://www.mybrcc.edu/intranet/attachments/article/110/Improving%20Student%20Retention%20and%20Graduation%20Rates.pdf

Higher Learning Commission. (2014). Policy title: criteria for accreditation. Retrieved from http://policy.ncahlc.org/Policies/criteria-for-accreditation.html

Hunter, M.S., & White, E.R. (2004). Could fixing academic advising fix higher education? *About Campus.* 9 (1) 20-25.

King, M.C. (2002).Community college advising. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources*. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Two-year-college-advising.aspx.

King, M.C. (2000). Designing effective training for academic advisors. In V.N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, & Associates (Eds.), *Academic advising: a comprehensive handbook* (pp. 289-297). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kohler, N. (2011). Really bad advice; how guidance is failing our students. *Maclean's.* Retrieved from http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/2011/11/02/really-bad-advice/#more-32995

Koring, H. (2005). Advisor training & development. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advisor-Training--Development.aspx

Lake Research Partners. (2011). Exploring student attitudes, aspirations & barriers to success. *For the American Federation of Teachers: Higher Education.* Retrieved from https://www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/studentfocusgrp0311.pdf

Leonard, M. J. (2010). Major decisions. Retrieved from dus.psu.edu/md/mdintro.htm

Light, R.J. (2001). The power of good advice for students. *The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal.* Retrieved from http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/010501rl.htm

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Vol 3*(5). May 1966, 551-558. Retrieved from http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=buy.optionToBuy&id=1966-07584-001

Marcia, J.E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology.* (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.

Marcia, J.E., & Friedman, M.L. (1970). Ego identity status in college women. *Journal of personality.* (pp. 38, 249-263).

McClellan, J.L. (2007). Content components for advisor training: revisited. *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advisor-Training-Components.aspx

Metzner, B.S. (1989). Perceived quality of academic advising: the effect on freshman attrition. *American Education Research Journal, 26,* 422-442. Retrieved from http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/2012/10/advising-satisfaction/#sthash.bDkJQpfL.dpuf

Michigan Department of Technology, Management & Budget. (2014). Census Statistics and Demographic Data-Education. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.michigan.gov/cgi/0,4548,7-158-54534_51913_51920---,00.html

Miller, M.A. (2012). Structuring our conversations: shifting to four dimensional advising models. In Carlstrom, A. & Miller, M.A., *2011 national survey of academic advising.* (Monograph No. 25). Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association. Retrieved from the *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources* Web site: http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Structuring-Our-Conversations-Shifting-to-Four-Dimensional-Advising-Models.aspx

Multari, R.J. (2004). Technology in higher education academic advisement. *The Mentor-an academic advising journal.* Retrieved from http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/040107rm.htm

NACADA. (2006). NACADA: the global community for academic advising-concept of academic advising. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Concept-of-Academic-Advising-a598.aspx

NACADA. (2011). 2011 NACADA national survey of academic advising. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/2011-NACADA-National-Survey.aspx

Noel-Levitz. (2011). National student satisfaction and priorities report: four-year public colleges and universities-Form A. Retrieved from http://dus.pus.edu/mentor/2012/10/advising-satisfaction/#sthash.bDkJZpfL.dpuf

Nutt, C. L. (2003) Academic advising and student retention and persistence. Retrieved from http://www,nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/retention.htm.

O'Banion, T. (1972). An academic advising model. *Junior College Journal, 42,* 62-69. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/The-definition-of-academic-advising.aspx#sthash.daeUyxuI.dpuf

Oertel, B. (n.d.). Creating the case for a new academic advising model at Winona State University: a review of the literature. Retrieved from http://www.isac.org/dotAsset/5aaa670f-29d9-4f4b-828e-9fa7a6157a41.pdf

Pardee, C.F. (2004). Organizational structures for advising. Retrieved from the *NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources* Web site: http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/ClearinghouseView-Articles/Organizational-Models-for-Advising.aspx

Paul, W.K., & Kitchens, J.M. (2013). The master advisor series at Valdosta State University: development and evaluation. *Academic Advising Today, 36 (4).* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Academic-Advising-Today/View-Articles/The-Master-Advisor-Series-at-Valdosta-State-University-Development-and-Evaluation.aspx#sthash.WDgUzEdu.dpuf

Pietras, S.A. (2010). The impact of academic advising on gpa and retention at the community college level. Retrieved from http://www.isu.edu/acadaff/pdf/Retention%20Documents/Pietras_AdvisingGPARetention_diss.pdf

Pullins, T. L. (2011). Predicting the retention of college sophomores; the importance of satisfaction. Retrieved from eric.ed.gov/?id=ED536549

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/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Assessment-of-academic-advising.aspx

Ross, S.S. (1999). Continuing the connection: does academic advising impact an institution's relationship with alumni and donors? Retrieved from http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/991025sr.htm

Selingo, J. J. (2014). Who advises best, pros or profs? *Education Life.* (April 11, 2014.) Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/13/education/edlife/who-advises-best-pros-or-profs.html

Skari, L.A. (2011). Who gives? Characteristics of community college alumni donors. Retrieved from https://research.wsulibs.wsu.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/2376/2915/Skari_wsu_0251E_10169pdf?sequence=1

Slavin, R.E. (2011). Aligning objectives and assessment. *Educational Psychology* (pp. 405-406). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Soria, K.M. (2012). Advising satisfaction: implications for first-year students' sense of belonging and student retention. *The Mentor-an academic advising journal.* Retrieved from http://dus.psu.edu/mentor/2012/10/advising-satisfaction/

South Dakota State University. (2005), Assessment of undergraduate academic advising effectiveness. Retrieved from http://www.sdstate.edu/accreditation/upload/Academic-Advising-Assessment-Datapdf.pdf

Southeastern Louisiana University. (2004). A quality enhancement plan for Southeastern Louisiana University: a summary. Retrieved from http://www2.southeastern.edu/sacs/qep/qep_summit_exec_summary9_28_04.pdf

Szymanska, I. (2011). Best Practices for Evaluating Academic Advising. Retrieved from http://advising.uncc.edu/sites/advising.uncc.edu/files/media/Best-Practices-Evaluating-Academic-Advising.pdf

The role of academic advising programs (CAS standards contextual statement). (2011). *Council for the advancement of standards in higher education.* Retrieved from https://www.shsu.edu/~sam_www/documents/council%20for%20advancement%20of%20standards%20in%20higher%20education.pdf

Thurmond, K.C., Miller, M.A. (2006). The history of NACADA. Retrieved from www.nacada.ksu.edu/About-Us/History.aspx

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition.* University of Chicago Press.

Tuition costs of colleges and universities. (2011). *National Center for Education Statistics.* Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=76

University of Memphis. (2012). New advisor training. Retrieved from http://www.memphis.edu/advising/docs/training.php

Voller, J.G. (2012). Advisor training and development: why it matters and how to get started. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Adviosr-training-and-development-Why-it-matters-and-how-to-get-started.aspx

Voller, J.G. (2011). Implications of professional development and reward for professional academic advisors. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Implications-for-professional -development-2011-Natinal-Survey.aspx

White, E.R. (2006). Using CAS standards for self-assessment and improvement. Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Using-CAS-Standards-for-self-assessment.aspx

Wild, L. & Ebbers, L. (2002). Rethinking student retention in community colleges. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25: 503-519. Retrieved from http://www.cfder.org/uploads/3/0/4/9/3049955/rethinking_student_retention_in_community_colleges.pdfxxds