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**CLAS Advising Task Force Workload Recommendations**

The Charge:

*Recommend equitable and effective workload distribution strategies for this important task.*

**I. Background and Context for the Recommendations**

The task force and its subcommittee initiated the work on this charge by first becoming familiar with the national standards put forward by the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). Because these national standards are based on a wealth of institutional research over the years and have been vetted by ongoing discussions amongst advisors at many institutions, we felt that our recommendations would have a solid foundation if aligned with these standards.

NACADA clearly identifies academic advising as a form of teaching and recommends that it be given training and support on a par with teaching in the classroom. It should also be reviewed by the same standards used for classroom teaching for the reasons indicated below (1).

Good advising and good teaching both:

* Require appropriate preparation
* Emphasize the development of good rapport with the students
* Require clear communication
* Emphasize sensitivity and appropriate response to the audience
* Require respect for diverse points of view
* Provide students with various models for learning
* Have long-term influence on student outcomes
* Create interest through personal enthusiasm/passion
* Assess student progress

Engaging in academic advising is critical to the professional development of the teaching faculty because the process of advising informs our teaching. In the classroom setting, the professor is always “apart” from the students to some degree, regardless of class size or the intimacy of the discussions that take place. Each student in the class makes some choice about the level of engagement and participation and can just as easily rest in anonymity as project competence, real or imagined. The practice of academic advising provides an excellent opportunity for professors to understand their audience singularly and collectively, to gain insight into the student perspective and to appreciate the students’ competing demands and pressures outside the classroom that sometimes dilute the learning process. Advising is a window into the learning process that allows us to discover the means to best engage our students for meaningful life-long learning and to encourage the intellectual practice of making meaningful connections across disciplines of study.

For all of these reasons, the Advising Task Force recommends that advising be considered as a facet of the faculty member’s teaching responsibilities and that it be included as part of the workload assigned to teaching. We believe it is important to establish this point at the beginning because it is the premise that has shaped the recommendations formed through the work of the task force.

**II. Recommendations**

*A. Clearly define the expectations for advising*

The resources from NACADA(6) identify 3 types of information that the faculty should be equipped with for effective advising:

* Advisors should understand the concepts of advising such as how it helps students learn and why it is so integral to student retention and time to graduation.
* Advisors should have a firm command of the information needed for advising – the “nuts and bolts” – such as academic policies, procedures, curriculum requirements and campus resources (*the new online advising manual will help with this*).
* Advisors must have the relational skills needed for effective communication, questioning, mentoring and relationship-building with their advisees.

To this end, we make the following recommendations:

1. A comprehensive faculty advisor development program should be instituted as a joint effort between the CLAS Academic Advising Center and selected senior faculty advisors. This would build upon the training currently being offered to new faculty members, providing support and additional training to the faculty after they begin advising. To receive training only once implies that college students and the university environment do not change in the course of an academic career. Like any profession, skills and knowledge can become outdated if not intentionally refreshed from time to time.

In the CLAS Standards and Criteria for Personnel Evaluation ([*www.gvsu.edu/clas/for-faculty-and-staff-60.htm*](http://www.gvsu.edu/clas/for-faculty-and-staff-60.htm)), personal professional development in the area of scholarship is defined as “c*ontinued learning in one’s field; acquiring, developing or maintaining the knowledge, skills, or expertise necessary for one’s continued professional engagement.”* We recommend that professional development be expected for academic advising as well. Regular professional development opportunities in the area of advising should be made available to the faculty. This might include topical workshops, webinars or support for attending relevant conferences. While some opportunities are already being offered to the campus community, a strong and consistent message from the administration is also needed to encourage the faculty to regularly participate in these opportunities. Professional development in the area of advising should be expected/required as part of the expectations for teaching.

1. We recommend strengthening and expanding positive collaboration between professional and academic advisors using their combined expertise to maximize the impact of advising on student outcomes. This will require improved communication and a culture of parity between faculty and staff in the process of advising.
2. Expectations for faculty advising must be clearly articulated when describing faculty teaching responsibilities. We recommend that the College establish standards and criteria for quantity and quality of advising. Each unit will then develop promotion and merit review criteria for advising, aligned with the College standards but appropriate to the specific needs of the department. As with other areas of review, the College Personnel Committee will refer to the criteria set by the unit for the evaluation of faculty from that unit.
3. We recommend that there be a clear and consistent message to students about the benefits and resources available through regular advising and the responsibilities of the student and the advisor should also be clearly stated. A single statement of these expectations that applies to all of CLAS would set the standard for all units. Such a statement already exists through the CLAS Advising Center (Appendix II). This information should be readily available through the individual units and accessible to both individual faculty advisors and their respective advisees.
4. There should be a mechanism in place for students to request a change of advisor through Banner. Often students will informally seek advice from a faculty member other than the assigned advisor. This means that one faculty member is receiving “credit” for advising the student while another is doing the work. Some units allow requests to change advisors, but this is not universally available across all units in CLAS.
5. Units in CLAS should have a plan in place for the equitable reassignment of advisees when a faculty member takes a sabbatical or retires. The plan should include appropriate notification of the students about their reassignment.
6. Digital Measures should include advising as part of the workload plan. There should be a place for the faculty member to describe plans for professional development, mentoring or leadership in advising for the coming year. When advising duties go beyond the norm for members of that unit, the unit head should accommodate the extra workload by adjusting expectations in other areas or seeking appropriate compensation for the faculty member.

*B. Possible strategies for managing the advising load within the Units*:

* To work towards the overall goal of equity, a baseline number of advisees should be established as the expectation for the faculty in CLAS. Based on the current data for the College from Institutional Analysis (see Figure 1) as well as reported norms from 1500 schools across the country (12), we recommend an ideal range of 20-30 advisees per faculty member. *Anything above that number would be compensated or otherwise recognized as an added burden to the faculty workload*. Recognition for faculty advising above this ideal range might consist of supplemental professional development funds, overload pay, or a stipend. Alternatively, the advising overload could be reported as a line item on the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) and factored into any merit increase.

*Figure 1.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Unadjusted Numbers | Adjusted for sabbaticals, reassigned time, phased retirement etc. |
| Number of students in CLAS | 10, 090 | 10,090 |
| Number of tenure track faculty  |  479 |  400 |
| Average advising load/tenure track faculty member |  21 |  25 |

* For majors with a low student to regular faculty ratio, one faculty member could be assigned as the academic advisor for all students in the major and the responsibility rotated on a regular basis. This will require special attention to maintaining continuity of communication with the advisees upon rotation of advising responsibilities. The use of the Student Success Collaborative will be particularly useful in this regard.
* For majors with a high student to regular faculty ratio, affiliate faculty could be drawn upon to assist with academic advising as part of their teaching workload. Examples of units already employing this strategy include Movement Science, Advertising and Public Relations, and History CSAT. In History, advising 70 students is considered the equivalent of one course.
* To maximize strengths and balance workloads, a Unit might choose to assign some faculty members to larger advising loads while releasing others to assume additional responsibilities in other areas of need within the unit.

We concede that these strategies do not provide equitable workload distribution in the sense that everyone across the College would have the same advising load. However, we believe that the adoption of any one of these strategies would be equitable and effective within the given unit because the members of the unit would choose and agree upon the strategy that is best suited to their needs. The public articulation and approval of the strategies by the College would also lend a sense of equity to the process.

*C. Advising for minors:*

* There are currently no advisors being assigned for minors and yet some faculty members willingly serve these students as an unofficial and unrecognized part of their advising load. They do this because they are not willing to turn away students in need. In essence, this becomes punitive when the faculty member is not recognized for the voluntary increase in workload that emerges from a strong commitment to student success. Advisors should be assigned for minors just as they are for majors, and considered equally in the distribution of workload.
* Another option might be to have faculty liaisons in departments that heavily use certain minors. The liaisons would receive training and would work closely with a colleague in the unit housing the minor to be able to handle the most common concerns for their specific population. For example, Spanish is a common minor for Biomedical Science students. A BMS faculty member could specialize in advising BMS majors who have declared a Spanish minor, assisting the students with information about both the major and the minor.

**CLAS Advising Task Force Assessment Recommendations**

The Charge:

*Make broadly useable recommendations for how to assess faculty advising*

**I. Background and Context for the Recommendations**

In order to address this charge, the assessment subcommittee considered a variety of materials both from Grand Valley State University (GVSU) documents and from experts in the field. This included the GVSU website, the CLAS standards for personnel review, and the new [Advising Repository](http://www.gvsu.edu/facultyadvisor/) in order to determine what pre-existing definitions and criteria might be relevant to this charge. In addition, external resources were surveyed such as the NACADA website, sample assessment measures gathered by members of the Task Force, sample assessment instruments available from a variety of other universities, and the Education Research Complete Database using “advising” and “outcomes” or “assessment” as key search terms.

*A. Key definitions from existing University documents*

[GVSU Advising Defined](http://www.gvsu.edu/advising/what-is-advising--6.htm) (Possible Mission Statement). *Grand Valley State University recognizes that advising is an integral part of a college education. The advising process establishes a collaborative relationship between student and advisor in which the student feels a sense of connection, support, and guidance. Effective advising is developmental. It responds to, and creates, growth and change within the student. Advising encourages students to think critically, seek out resources, and develop action plans. It provides students with the information and encouragement they need to take personal responsibility for exploring options and making decisions. Ultimately, advising allows each student to achieve a meaningful and successful educational experience.*

[CLAS Standards for Personnel Evaluation.](file:///%5C%5Coffice%5Cdfs%5CBiomed-Health-Science-Private%5Cburgd%5CMyData%5CMy%20Documents%5CATF%20materials%5CCLAS%20standards%20and%20criteria%20for%20personnel%20evaluation%202010.pdf)*Effective advisors and teachers leave something of themselves with their students, demonstrate to students the importance of life-long learning and serve as important role models. Effective advisors make the time and have the flexibility to make each student feel that their individual learning experience is the top priority for the advisor. The effective advisor continually learns about university resources and references and has the ability to recognize when and where students need to be directed for the guidance they need. The excellent advisor not only connects to good students but is also effective in reaching out to students who have more challenges. The excellent advisor also helps junior faculty develop their advising through leadership and mentorship.*

*How achievement may be demonstrated:*

* *Demonstrating professional availability to students within a reasonable time frame through posted office hours, anything that demonstrates basic day-to-day availability to students.*
* *Developing and using advising syllabi or advisee guidelines*
* *Actively working to expand academic and professional contacts for students*
* *Documented pattern of motivating Grand Valley undergraduates to seek advanced degrees within an individual faculty’s sub discipline or with external colleagues outside of one’s sub discipline through mentorship*
* *Formal letters of support from alumni*

*B. Information from NACADA*

Assessment and Evaluation.Evaluation is centered on the performance of the individual advisor and is often assessed via student satisfaction surveys, while assessment is concerned with the quality of the broader academic advising program at the department or programmatic level. Assessment focuses on improving services and meeting programmatic goals and is holistic and continuous, whereas evaluation of individual academic advisors is only a small part of the larger assessment process (2,13,16).

Outcomes**.** Assessment must be linked to specific Student Learning Outcomes and Process Delivery Outcomes (focus on how and what should be delivered). In order to measure these outcomes, one must consider what information is exchanged and what students would ideally know, do, and value as a result of their advising experiences (1,5,16). Assessment must also consider broader institutional outcomes such as gpa, graduation rates, persistence or retention rates and with regard to how advising and changes in quality of advising might impact these measures (see references 2, 8, and 15 for examples of outcomes).

**II. Recommendations**

*A. Institutional support*

NACADA clearly indicates that best practices in assessment require that assessment (and evaluation) be driven by a clear mission statement and a focus on student learning outcomes (2, 13, 16). There is already existing institutional language that could serve as a mission statement (see GVSU Advising Defined, p.6), but this statement should be revisited in order to determine whether any changes might be beneficial to reflect our current philosophy of advising. Many examples of mission statements are also available at the NACADA website.

A strong faculty advising program also requires clear and visible support from the administration to promote faculty participation in training and active engagement in advising activities. This support could take the form of:

* Well-defined expectations for advising as a part of faculty workload
* Use of a single, standard measure for advising assessment across all units in CLAS
* Accountability and reward for faculty advising embedded in the merit and tenure/promotion process
* Inclusion of advising strategies and goals in the College and Unit strategic plans and assessment

*B. Assessment of the advising program offered to students*

It is essential that faculty and professional advisors share the workload in advising students but also share in building/shaping an advising program that offers students the resources and support to meet their goals. The assessment of such an advising program must be driven by clearly defined student learning outcomes that describe the broader developmental and behavioral milestones to be accomplished during the undergraduate experience. Some examples might be:

* A transition from responding to external expectations to developing personal responsibility for academic success.
* Development of personal identity through discovery of personal strengths and exploration of academic and career goals.
* A transition from external guidance and support to increasing self-reliance with regard to identifying necessary resources for success.

Assessment of student learning outcomes and institutional outcomes (persistence and retention, graduation rates, or grade point average) will provide important information for improving the advising program. Consequent improvements might include adjustments to the methods of advising, the balance of responsibilities between faculty and professional advisors, and the way in which advising tools are used (MapWorks, MyPath, Student Success Collaborative, etc.) and additions or changes to programmatic offerings (workshops, orientations, group advising, etc.)

*C. Assessment of the faculty advisor development program*

The faculty workload recommendations include the development of a more comprehensive faculty advisor training program that would continue beyond the first year of advising. The success of this ongoing faculty advisor training and development will be measured by the evaluation of individual faculty advising through the selected assessment tool as well by review of faculty self-reporting and reflections provided in Digital Measures. The assessment information should be used to guide future advising related program development and training.

*D. Assessment of Unit performance*

Like the assessment of advising at the individual and College level, it is also important to have an ongoing focus on advising at the Unit level by specifically addressing advising in the Unit strategic plans and coincident assessment. While some units may do this already, it is important to set this as a standard for best practice. We anticipate that this faithful scrutiny will help all departments develop strong advising programs and buy-in to good advising practices and, over time, ameliorate the pockets of resistance to participation in advising best practices. Because advising complements and informs teaching in the classroom, we would expect that improved advising practices will inevitably lead to better teaching as well.

*E. Assessment of individual faculty member performance*

An evaluation of faculty advising should be collected annually for inclusion in the Faculty Activity Report (FAR), much like we currently do for teaching evaluation. The evaluation instrument chosen must be short enough to be completed regularly. In addition to collecting feedback from advisees, Cuseo (7) suggests that advisors be actively engaged in the evaluation process through self-assessment. Currently many faculty members simply list the number of advisees assigned to them, but self-assessment of advising should parallel (in briefer form) the format for the FAR teaching reflection, and it might include consideration of philosophy, progress with advising, and advising goals. In addition, the faculty should provide evidence of professional development in advising during the review period, such as specific training, workshops, webinars, participation in advising-related conferences, orientations, or other opportunities to acquire, develop, or maintain their skills. This annual reporting would necessitate some modification of Digital Measures to accommodate the documentation of these activities and to provide space for reflection on advising.

**III. Selection of an Appropriate Assessment Tool**

Given the assessment needs described above, it would be ideal to select an instrument that is robust enough to be used for faculty evaluation and broad-based assessment simultaneously, as this would result in a single data collection process serving the purpose of assessment on a variety of levels (faculty, department or program/CLAS). These data could then be used to inform both faculty evaluations and programmatic changes, such as foci for advising development, trainings, etc (e.g., 8).While it is possible to create such a measure for assessment of advising (7, 10, 18), we believe that it would be a better use of time and resources to adopt an existing instrument with established psychometrics, if an appropriate option can be identified. Using a single instrument throughout CLAS would relieve the units from spending time identifying and creating credible instruments of their own. It will also provide uniformity across units and allow for data to be pooled for broader-based (CLAS level) assessment. This is particularly important when the assessment data is used to develop or improve the programming for advisor training. For some assessment instruments, national norms are available and these would allow evaluation of CLAS data within that context. The instrument chosen should be flexible enough to allow for departments (and/or CLAS) to add individual items to reflect any unique outcomes of interest, and it should provide some opportunity for student open-ended comments, as these often contribute valuable insights to the evaluation process (e.g., 7).

The measure chosen should be an established instrument with evidence of psychometrics. Because of our focus on both broad assessment of advising and individual faculty evaluation, we considered both existing (published) satisfaction-style surveys with a focus exclusively on faculty evaluation, and existing broader assessment instruments that also provide measures for program evaluation. Appendix I contains two examples of satisfaction-style surveys (for faculty evaluation) and two samples of broader assessment instruments. One notable difference between these two approaches is the length, with satisfaction instruments taking only a few minutes to complete while the broader instruments take 10-20 minutes to complete. However, given the comprehensive data the longer instruments provide with regard to both program outcomes and areas for improvement, we believe that the broader assessment approach should be used.

In addition to the sample instruments available in Appendix I, we have included a table summarizing the pros and cons of each instrument, including psychometric data. The two satisfaction surveys (18, Sanders & Wiseman, 2000) each contain 20-30 items. Each of these surveys shows evidence of validity based on content analysis, inter-item consistency, and factor analysis. The Teasley instrument has a bit more detail in terms of providing possible information regarding areas for advisor improvement, but it does not enable broader assessment.

Samples of broader assessment instruments include **The Academic Advising Inventory** (AAI, 19) and the **ACT Survey of Academic Advising** (ACT SAA). These instruments are both widely recognized and are included in the section on assessment of advising at the NACADA website. (Note that some ACT items on the copy currently available are incomplete, and some items are repeated so data can be presented in several ways.)

The Academic Advising Inventory consists of five parts covering basic advising approach (prescriptive versus developmental), content of advising, satisfaction, demographics, and ratings of the “ideal advisor” (4). The survey takes about 20 minutes to administer, it is available free from the NACADA website, and it is widely cited in the literature. Scores on this instrument have been associated with satisfaction with advising, and with persistence in the case of international students (14).

The ACT Survey of Academic Advisingassesses 18 areas, including 38 items that rate the advisor. Thisinstrument takes about 20 minutes to administer and has been used for three decades in six national surveys conducted by NACADA regarding changes in advising (e.g., see ref. 12). This instrument was developed and made available by ACT as part of a packet of instruments called ACT Evaluation Services, and it has also been used by a number of large universities as an assessment tool (e.g., DePaul; Purdue). Several published studies have used this instrument, although it is less commonly cited than the AAI, perhaps because it is likely an instrument that must be purchased. This instrument provides the opportunity to conduct individual faculty evaluation as well as a broader assessment simultaneously. Information is requested concerning both satisfaction and perceived needs in a variety of areas, so this instrument can be used as both a needs assessment and a satisfaction survey. Disparity between satisfaction and needs (having a high need and low satisfaction) helps identify areas to be targeted for improvement. Research by Sun and Valiga (17) has resulted in specific estimates of target student responses to enable reliable findings with this instrument, and the instrument shows solid psychometrics (11).

While the ACT SAA was not designed as an advisor evaluation tool and the length of the ACT SAA may make it hard to administer annually, work by Goodson (11) using large scale national data suggests that it would be possible to shorten the instrument to a 5 minute scale while retaining the psychometric integrity of the instrument. Importantly, the original version of this instrument also allows the addition of a number of university or department-specific items to tailor the instrument for assessing specific needs or outcomes.

**IV. Final Comments**

While there is already a framework in CLAS for much of what we recommend, some remaining work needs to be done to make the assessment and evaluation process well integrated in accordance with best practices. We strongly recommend a broad assessment approach that uses a universal instrument that can provide information on both quality of current advising and areas for programming improvement. In addition to collecting data to evaluate individual faculty advising, a broad assessment would allow for connection of changes in advising with large scale CLAS outcomes such as major changes, gpa, retention, etc. This information could further inform advising-related program training and development. Requiring faculty to reflect upon their advising (considering both quality and quantity) in their FAR as a component of teaching will emphasize the value of this activity, as well as the fact that growth is expected as part of a faculty member’s development. If these recommendations are followed, we feel that faculty would be better supported in acquiring the information and skills needed for advising, as well as be better recognized for the work that they do in advising.

**APPENDIX 1: Sample Instruments**

[ATF Instruments Table.pdf](file:///%5C%5Coffice%5Cdfs%5CBiomed-Health-Science-Private%5Cburgd%5CMyData%5CMy%20Documents%5CATF%20materials%5CATF%20Instruments%20Table.pdf)

[AAI document (2).pdf](file:///%5C%5Coffice%5Cdfs%5CBiomed-Health-Science-Private%5Cburgd%5CMyData%5CMy%20Documents%5CATF%20materials%5CAAI%20document%20%282%29.pdf)

[ACT SAA.pdf](file:///%5C%5Coffice%5Cdfs%5CBiomed-Health-Science-Private%5Cburgd%5CMyData%5CMy%20Documents%5CATF%20materials%5CACT%20SAA.pdf)

**APPENDIX II: CLAS Advising on Roles and Responsibilities**

***College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Advising Roles and Responsibilities:***

Faculty advisors and professional advisors have overlapping roles and responsibilities. Each strives to facilitate and support student’s intellectual and personal growth while helping them to learn how to navigate the university setting. The advising activities of both types of advisors are integrated into a coherent, cohesive, coordinated, informed and on-going dialogue with students that enrich and enlighten a students’ progress toward their goals.

1. **Faculty Advisors:**
* Know your department’s requirements for fulfilling the major and/or minor.
* Know the General Education requirements and how they fit into a Liberal Arts education.
* Allow an appropriate amount of time for students to discuss plans, programs, courses, academic progress, and other subjects related to their educational program.
* Serve as mentors for students in making decisions about career directions.
* Assist students in choosing courses and experiences to prepare them for their specific career or graduate work.
* Assist/mentor students interested in undergraduate research.
* Provide guidance to students when choosing appropriate elective courses within their majors.
* Assist students in determining appropriate graduate programs as well as effective strategies for graduate school admissions and/or employment.
* Evaluate student’s progress toward established goals.
* Keep records when appropriate of each meeting with an advisee regarding date/time of meeting and content of discussion.
* Participate in advising development programs to enhance knowledge and skills.
* Make appropriate referrals to other university resources and services, e.g. Advising Resource Center, Counseling/Career Development, Women’s Resource Center, Student Life, etc.
1. **Professional Advisors:**

We recognize that roles may differ depending on the advisor’s targeted student population.

* Help coordinate students’ advising experiences.
* Engage students in exploratory discussions concerning major, minors, and careers available within particular areas of study.
* Provide information regarding university and departmental policies and procedures to both students and faculty.
* Clarify issues concerning graduation, teaching certification, and major/minor requirements.
* Help students focus on tasks and course sequences that need to be addressed at specific times.
* Keep records when appropriate of each meeting with an advisee regarding date/time of meeting and content of discussion. [See addenda for an example of such a record.]
* Provide appropriate referrals to the students’ faculty advisor.
* Make appropriate referrals to other university resources and services, e.g. Advising Resource Center, Counseling/Career Development, Women’s Resource Center, Student Life, etc.
* Provide information about preparation for the graduate school process and testing.
* Participate in advising development programs to enhance knowledge and skills.
1. **Students:**
* Take responsibility for their academic programs and give thoughtful consideration to academic and career goals.
* Initiate contact and meet at least once a year with a faculty or professional advisor.
* Prepare a meaningful academic plan yearly to discuss with your advisor.
* Actively participate in the advising session.
* Prepare a written list of questions before each meeting with the advisor.
* Know the Academic Calendar, e.g. when to register, drop/add courses, withdraw, etc.
* Develop an awareness of key advising resources available.
* Consider your advisor as a resource.
* Accept responsibility for making final decisions on academic choices.
1. **The University:**
* To be responsible for communicating consistent information to all students about the advising process.
* To provide a community of academic advisors for all students.
* To assist students in the development of suitable educational plans and goals.
* To monitor and provide accessible guidance on each student’s academic progress.
* To provide referrals to university services when appropriate.
* To be accountable for providing required, continuous and accurate training for all academic advisors.
* To provide sufficient and on-going resources and support for advising services across the university.
* To recognize the importance of excellent and accurate faculty academic advising through the tenure and evaluation process.
* To conduct continuous assessment and improvement in academic advising.

**So, what's the difference between a faculty and professional advisor?**
Both types of advisors can address questions about major/minor and graduation requirements. However, you can think of the difference between these advisors as a difference in perspective and scope.

Faculty advisors are experts in your major field and bring this in-depth understanding into play in addressing your questions and concerns. They know the wide variety of careers available to majors, what specific courses will be best for you, and and how to most effectively chose and prepare for specific graduate programs and careers. They can also help you evaluate how well your skills and abilities fit with the field and your goals. In addition, they have extensive contacts in the field and can foster your professional development in your academic area of interest.

Professional advisors, on the other hand, offer a broader perspective on your undergraduate experience. A professional advisor's expertise is in how to successfully fulfill major/minor and graduation requirements and navigate through the process of getting an undergraduate degree, and they can clarify for you the steps necessary to prepare for a career and/or graduate study. In the case of the professional advisor, the in-depth knowledge they bring to addressing your questions and concerns is about college and university policies and procedures, your myPath degree evaluation and transcripts, and the wide range of resources and extra- and co-curricular experiences available to students. ([www.gvsu.edu/clasadvising/who-is-my-advisor-60.htm](http://www.gvsu.edu/clasadvising/who-is-my-advisor-60.htm))

**APPENDIX III: Sample Target Assessment Outcomes**

In determining target outcomes, one must consider what students should know or be able to do as a consequence of advising (3). Ultimately these must be stated as specific measurable objectives (using word like: describe, explain, apply, differentiate, organize, evaluate). However, below we give a range of ideas from the literature with regard to both student and institutional outcomes.

**Samples of possible student learning outcomes (SLO)**

* Taking personal responsibility
* Exploring and defining academic and career goals
* Exploring and defining how to attain these goals
* Take growing personal responsibility (over time)
* Bring list of questions to the advising session
* Consider academic and career goals
* Initiate contact
* Play an active role in the session
* Ask questions
* Know the academic calendar (meet deadlines)
* Know when to register and drop/add courses
* Pick courses that fit with goals and requirements
* Take responsibility for final decisions on courses

**Program Assessment and Institutional outcomes (may overlap with SLOs):**

* Banta et al (3) suggests the following macro questions with regard to assessment of advising
	1. Is our advising program meeting the most important needs of students, such as how to access resources, what is required for major, etc.
	2. Does advising effectiveness vary for different groups? (first generation, minority, veterans, male versus female)
	3. How effective are we in meeting our own objectives?
	4. Is this program cost effective? Are we using resources wisely?

Can use pre and post test for all students freshman year and at graduation. If they have read certain materials or seen them, do they differ from those who haven’t? (3).

* Persistence, time to graduate, enrollment related outcomes are clearly some GVSU stated goals
* Metzner (3, p. 8) found advising had indirect impact on persistence via GPA and student satisfaction. Advising negatively influenced intentions to withdraw.
* *Summative and formative outcomes are important. Summative outcomes*: awareness of support resources, graduate rate, time to complete, number of major changes, enrollment in honors courses, early application for graduate, retention (see 3, 17, ; Oja, 2011; Molina & Abelman, 2000), GPA (see Oja, 2011 for more here), enrollment numbers. F*ormative outcomes*: access and use of resources, contact with at risk students (15). Faculty participation in professional development would fit here as formative, as well.

**References**

1. Aiken-Wisniewski, S. et al. (2010). *Guide to assessment in academic advising* (2nd ed.) Monograph No. 23. Manhattan, KS: The National Academic Advising Association.
2. Aiken-Wisniewski, S., (2013). *Implications for assessment 2011 national survey*. Retrieved August 23, 2014 from the NACADA website. <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Implications-for-assessment-2011-National-Survey.aspx>
3. Banta, T. W., Hansen, M. J., Black, K. E., Jackson, J. E. (2002). *Assessing advising outcomes*. NACADA Journal, 22, 5-14.
4. Brown, R. (1989). *Academic Advising Inventory*. In J. C. Conoley, & J. J. Kramer (Eds.), Tenth Mental Measurements Yearbook *,* Student Development Associates, Inc.
5. Campbell, S. Nutt, C., Robbins, R., Kirk-Kuwaye, M., & Higa, L., (2005). *NACADA guide to assessment in academic advising.* Manhattan, KD: National Academic Advising Association.
6. *Components of a Successful Faculty Advising Program* (2007). Webinar Pocket Guide Series (PG05), National Academic Advising Association.
7. Cuseo, J. (n.d.; a) *Assessment of academic advisors and academic advising programs*. Retrieved October 22, 2014 from <http://www.advising.hawaii.edu/nacada/assessmentIG/pdf/Cuseo_Marymount1.pdf>
8. Cuseo, J. (n.d.; b) *Academic advisement and student retention: Empirical connections and systematic interventions.* Retrieved October 22, 2014 from
9. <http://cpe.ky.gov/NR/rdonlyres/6781576F-67A6-4DF0-B2D3-2E71AE0D5D97/0/CuseoAcademicAdvisementandStudentRetentionEmpiraclConnectionsandSystemicInterventions.pdf>
10. Gabbert, S. and Lynch, M. J. *Development a new evaluation tool for advisors: From conception to implementation*. Retrieved from the NACADA Website September 12, 2014. <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Evaluation-of-Academic-Advisors.aspx>
11. Goodson, L. (2000). *ACT Survey of Academic Advising: Assessment of the psychometric properties and development of a short form*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University.
12. Habley, W.R. (2004). *The Status of Academic Advising: Findings from the ACT Sixth National Survey*. NACADA Monograph Series, No. 10. Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association.
13. Macaruso, V. (2007). From the Co-Editors: *Brief report on the NACADA commission on the assessment of advising 2004 survey results*. NACADA Journal*, 27*, 3-8.
14. Mataczynski, L. (2013). *Advising and acculturation variables as predictors of satisfaction, sense of belonging, and persistence among international undergraduates*. Unpublished dissertation, UCS Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California.
15. McClellan, J. L. (2011). *Beyond student learning outcomes: Developing comprehensive strategic assessment plans for advising programs*. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management *22*, 641-652.
16. Robbins, R. and Zarges, K. M. *Assessment of Academic Advising: A summary of the process*. Retrieved July 20, 2014, from the NACADA Web site. <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Assessment-of-academic-advising.aspx>
17. Sun, A. & Valiga, M. J. (1997). *Using generalizability theory to assess the reliability of student ratings of academic advising*. Journal of Experimental Education*. 65*, 367-380.
18. Teasley, M.L, & Buchanan, E. M. (2013). *Capturing the student perspective: A new instrument for measuring advising satisfaction.* NACADA Journal*,* 33, 4-15.
19. Winston & Sandor (1985). *Academic Advising Inventory*. Retrieved October 5, 2014 from the NACADA website. <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Academic-Advising-Inventory-.aspx>