

**John Tyler Community College
Quality Enhancement Plan: Improving Academic Advising**



John Tyler Community College

**Submitted to the Commission on Colleges of the
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
January 10, 2002.**

CONTENTS

Introduction: Focus of Quality Enhancement Plan	1
Review of the Literature	4
Steps Taken in Developing the Plan	7
Part I: Creating an Effective Advising System	10
Review of the Literature	10
Overview Committee Discussions	12
Overview Committee Recommendations	14
Actions taken thus far	17
Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee ..	17
Part II: Focusing on First Year Advising	21
Review of the Literature	21
Student Development 100 Committee Discussions	23
Student Development 100 Committee Recommendations	25
Actions taken thus far	27
Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee ..	29
Part III: Training for Effective Advising	30
Review of the Literature	30
Faculty/Staff Committee Discussions	34
Faculty/Staff Committee Recommendations	38
Actions taken thus far	38
Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee ..	39
Part IV: Evaluating and Rewarding Faculty Advisors	40
Review of the Literature	40
Faculty Evaluation Committee Discussions	43
Faculty Evaluation Committee Recommendations	43
Actions taken thus far	44
Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee ..	44
Part V: Assessing the Advising Process	45
Review of the Literature	45
Institutional Effectiveness Committee Discussions	48
Institutional Effectiveness Committee Recommendations (supplemented by one Faculty Committee recommendation)	51
Actions taken thus far	52
Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee ..	52
References	53

Appendixes	55
Appendix A: CAS Standards and Guidelines	56
Appendix B: Information E-mailed to Faculty	58
Appendix C: Overview of Faculty Advisor Training Session	63
Appendix D: Faculty Evaluation Guidelines from <i>VCCS Policy Manual</i>	65
Appendix E: JTCC Enrollment Services Student Feedback Survey	66
Appendix F: JTCC Student Survey	69
Appendix G: JTCC Student Survey Results and Analysis	72

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN

Introduction: Focus of Quality Enhancement Plan

John Tyler Community College (JTCC), as one of the eight pilot institutions undergoing the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' new accreditation criteria and process, began its Self-Study process in the fall of 2000. The college completed a thorough review of its policies and practices throughout the Institutional Review of Compliance (IRC). Because the college determined it was in conditional compliance with Comprehensive Standard #9 under "Programs," the Steering Committee proposed to the college president that the college focus on academic advising for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The president was in agreement, so plans for the QEP began.

In the process of completing the Institutional Review of Compliance report, the college determined that it was in conditional compliance with Comprehensive Standard # 9 under "Programs" for several reasons. While the college has a well-defined formal procedure for academic advising that includes faculty and members of Student Services, the report noted that several areas of practice could be improved. In Fall 2000, new faculty members were provided with only limited training in the use of the registration system, and the college recognizes that more training is needed. While all faculty members are encouraged to read and use the college's *Faculty Advisor's Handbook*, which outlines the college's processes and procedures, there have been minor delays when updating this handbook. Furthermore, because parts of the handbook were outdated at the time, it was not distributed to new faculty hired for the 2000-2001 year. This meant that the handbook was

revised in the summer of 2001 and was distributed to all faculty at the beginning of the Fall 2001 semester.

A further weakness is that problems exist in the way students are assigned a faculty advisor. There are imbalances in the number of advisees assigned to faculty advisors that can make it difficult for faculty to effectively advise. No system exists to track students as they change from one campus to another for the bulk of their classes in order to ensure that an appropriate advisor continues to be assigned to these students. Furthermore, there is no systematic attempt to contact students at key points in their experience at JTCC (12 and 30 credit hours) to assess changes in their educational goals that would prompt changes in their advising status.

The college also needs to improve the way that it assesses the effectiveness of its advising system. Currently, only graduating students are surveyed to determine their satisfaction; however, it is clear that these students have “successfully” navigated the advising system. Their input, while important, does not shed light on how well or poorly the advising system is functioning for the vast majority of JTCC students. There is no structured, programmatic evaluation that invites feedback from the entire student body, faculty, and counselors regarding how well the system is actually functioning.

In addition to the above reasons, there was evidence in recent graduate surveys that academic advising needed improvement. While the graduate surveys usually rated advising as Superior or Excellent (67.4% of 1998-99 graduates, 73.5% of 1999-00 graduates), their verbatim comments indicated otherwise. For example, comments in the 1999 graduate survey related to advising included: “JTCC advisors should have known what would transfer and won’t.” “I spent quite a few semesters taking classes that I did not need. This was due to

the inadequate course advisors who by the way, were only available when they wanted to be.” “My one complaint involves student advisors. My advisor never seemed to have time to talk to me, so I met with several different advisors. All of them gave me the impression that I was wasting their time.” “One downfall was faculty advising prior to admission to the PTA program—never received consistent answers re: transferring credits, classes needed, etc. Seemed to lack knowledge re: what was needed and what wasn’t.”

The Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning conducted Focus Group sessions in Spring 2000. These were sessions in which students, faculty, and staff were invited to open sessions to give feedback to interview questions. There were similar findings concerning advising between the graduate surveys and the Focus Groups. Comments recorded at the Faculty/Staff Focus groups include: “Too much separation between student services and the faculty -- advising and counseling is poor because of it – summer advising is a particular problem.” “Develop retention strategies for students—include more systematic, regular communication with students about program, college activities.” “Improve academic advising and counseling- eliminate isolation of counselors and faculty.” Comments recorded at the Student Focus Groups include: “Advising/counseling need to be improved.” “Provide a better orientation to JTCC earlier in a student’s time here – include information on course and program offerings, services provided to students, alliances between JTCC and other colleges, businesses, etc.”

An indirect indicator that JTCC may have weaknesses within its advising system can also be found in its retention rates. As will be described later, a good advising program will increase retention. Retention has been a persistent problem at JTCC as evidenced by a significant drop in enrollment from one fall semester to the next.

Table 1 shows the number of students from 1994-1998 in each Fall term's cohort, followed by the number and percent retained the following spring term, the number and percent retained for the following fall term, etc. This data does count graduates as retained for the academic year in which they graduated. While these numbers reflect a student transience common to many community colleges, JTCC wishes to improve these numbers and feels that improving its advising is one way to do this.

Table 1.

JTCC Retention rates - Fall 94 - Fall 98 cohorts										
First-time, full- and part-time freshmen enrolling Fall term (counting graduates as returning)										
	Fall		Spring		Fall		Spring		Fall	
Cohort	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fall 94	394	100	314	80	199	51	175	44	126	32
Fall 95	395	100	308	78	202	51	172	44	142	36
Fall 96	377	100	284	75	193	51	167	44	126	33
Fall 97	336	100	252	75	175	52	151	45	118	35
Fall 98	287	100	211	74	142	49	118	41	79	28

Review of the Literature

An effective advising program system is important for a variety of reasons. According to Janet Greenwood (1984), establishing an effective academic advising system that responsibly meets the needs of students offers multiple benefits. She states:

Quality academic advising promotes the creation of a caring environment, builds a positive public image, enhances students' development, fosters a better understanding of academic and administrative processes, rewards advisors for their work, and produces primary and secondary benefits to society... Academic advising has the capacity, latent if not evident, to become the primary integrating factor that

brings students, faculty, student affairs staff, academic disciplines, and curriculum together into a truly meaningful educational whole... Academic advising is probably the single most important educational activity that all students experience as they move through college. (Winston, Miller, Ender, & Grites, 1984, p. 64)

According to Greenwood (Winston et. al, 1984, pp. 75 – 76), there are two overall choices when establishing an advising system. If the institution recognizes the educational process (and advising) as developmental in nature and students are aided in transitioning from present levels of knowledge and skill to increasingly advanced, more complex levels, the advising process will reflect this ideal. If, on the other hand, the institution views education (and advising) as compensatory in nature, the advising process will take on a remedial bent and focus on what the student might have “missed” in the program or past programs. Effective developmental and preventive approaches to providing student support through advising reduce the need for remediation.

Greenwood states that not only is developmental academic advising likely to increase retention, which is a positive that cannot be ignored, but it is “...probably the wave of the future” (Winston et. al, 1984, p. 86). Research increasingly shows that when students are challenged by new, previously not encountered questions and life situations and must react by making personal accommodations in their thinking or mastering new knowledge, developmental change occurs. So it can be with advising. Resting on the assumption that human development is a direct result of experiencing differentiation and reintegration and that there are critical periods when college students exhibit readiness to achieve new developmental tasks, Greenwood notes that students can benefit from advisors who can identify the predictable points at which students are not only ready for, but also in need of

new information, new challenges, and new opportunities. Whether or not the institution seeks to systematically respond to students' needs, students will progress through these critical points. However, "without the organized support of developmental academic advising, many students will drop out [of college] because they lack the ability to handle such matters without help" (Winston et. al, 1984, p. 76).

According to Greenwood, these critical points are: "pre enrollment period, initial data entry period, subsequent registration periods, and final enrollment period" (Winston et. al, 1984, p. 76). Students may experience these critical points differently, but they all must face the challenges presented at each critical point. A developmental academic advising program can make a significant difference as to how effectively these critical points are transcended.

Walsh (1979, pp. 446-449) suggests that developmental academic advising, while requiring a redefinition of the traditional role for advisors, can aid an institution in achieving its academic goals. Greenwood says academic advising has a "major influence on the image of the institution in the student's mind's eye, both during the college years and long afterward" (Winston et. al, 1984, p. 69). When students experience academic advising as being effective, personalized, accurate, and efficient, the institution's public image is enhanced.

These ideas pattern themselves after National Academic Advising Association's (NACADA) beliefs about the power of academic advising. NACADA professes that through regular contact with students, whether face-to-face, over e-mail, on the phone, or through regular mail, advisors gain meaningful insights into students' academic, social, and personal experiences and needs. Advisors can use these insights to draw students comfortably into

the academic community, to help them develop sound academic and career goals, and ultimately to be happy and successful in their college careers.

Steps Taken in Developing the Plan

John Tyler Community College got underway with its QEP in September 2001. After an initial plan that included seven committees was modified, five committees were established to address problem areas found in the IRC report. At the beginning of the process, requests for participation were sent to all faculty, staff, and administrators via electronic mail. The requests asked them for general feedback and to volunteer for specific committees.

These committees and their charges were the:

- Overview Committee, to take an objective look at JTCC's current method of advising and to develop the logistics of an improved academic advising program at JTCC;
- Survey Committee, to compare JTCC's academic advising with other institutions in the VCCS of similar size;
- Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning Committee, to survey faculty and students to see how they view advising at JTCC;
- Student Development (STD) 100 Committee, to take a look at the existing orientation course and determine its effectiveness as it relates to the advising of first year students and to determine if this would be an appropriate course to complete general education testing of students to provide advisors with more baseline information;

- Faculty/Staff Development Committee, to develop an advising training program for faculty to be implemented on November 2, 2001 (Founder's Day/Convocation) and to make plans for future workshops;
- Faculty Evaluation Committee, to make recommendations regarding revision of the current faculty evaluation process to incorporate excellence in performance, including academic advising; and
- Institutional Effectiveness Committee, to determine factors that assure effective advising and to determine how these could be assessed.

As time progressed, some of the committees realized they had overlapping tasks. For example, the Faculty Evaluation Committee decided the effectiveness of faculty as advisors was a necessary item to include in the faculty evaluation document, as did the Institutional Effectiveness Committee in determining the overall effectiveness of the academic advising program. There were similar discussions about evaluation among other committees.

While the Chair encouraged committees to include students in their meetings, the committees opted to rely on information from student surveys and focus groups for student input. However, there were some graduates of JTCC on most committees who were able to provide a student perspective as well as an employee perspective.

In the initial stages of planning, it was determined the tasks for the Survey Committee and Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning (ARP) Committee would be completed by the Office of ARP.

Chairs or co-chairs were requested to serve by the Self-Study Chair for the other five committees. There were approximately eight members on each committee with one member from the Steering Committee acting as a liaison with the exception of the Chair, the SACS liaison and the Self-Study editor. Although general deadlines were given for the months of September and October, it was left up to the committee chairs/co-chairs as to how they would meet (in person or e-mail) and how often they would meet. Minutes were taken at each meeting and provided to the Self-Study Chair. She also attended most meetings to hear the discussions and to offer any guidance needed.

The QEP has been divided into five sections corresponding to the five Self-Study committees. Each section includes a review of the literature, an overview of committee discussions, a list of committee recommendations, a list of college actions taken, and recommendations by the Steering Committee modifying the committee recommendations and suggesting future actions.

Part I: Creating an Effective Advising System

Review of the Literature

There has been much research on what is needed to establish an effective advising system. How advising services are organized and delivered varies from institution to institution. In the monograph, “Reaffirming the Role of Faculty in Academic Advising,” King (1995, p. 21) reviews four key factors that will influence the way this occurs. First, the institutional mission has to be examined in areas of control (public or private), selectivity (open door vs. highly selective), and the nature of the program offerings (liberal arts vs. technical). The second factor is the student population. Traditional students tend to need a more centralized and intrusive advising system, unlike non-traditional students. The third key factor is the faculty: their interest, their awareness and knowledge as it relates to advising, the importance administration places on advising, and the extent to which advising is evaluated, recognized, and rewarded. The fourth and final key factor is the complexity of institutional programs, policies, and procedures--the greater the complexity, the greater the need for skilled advisors working within a highly structured advising system.

Research by Habley (1983) and Habley and McCauley (1987) identified the following seven organizational models of academic advising:

1. **Faculty Only:** Students are assigned to a specific faculty member for advising, usually one in their program of study. This is common in two and four-year private institutions.
2. **Supplementary Advising:** Faculty serve as advisors, but there is an advising office with a coordinator. The advising office serves as an information clearinghouse and referral resource but has no original jurisdiction for approving advising transactions.

3. **Split:** In this model, the advising office advises special groups of students (e.g. undecided or under-prepared, athletes, etc.), but once specific conditions are met, such as declaring a major, students are then assigned to advisors in their respective academic sub-units. The advising office has a coordinator with campus-wide responsibilities. This is the predominant model used in four-year public institutions.
4. **Dual:** Students have two advisors: one faculty member in the student's program of study and one in an advising office who provides information about academic policies and registration procedures. This model typically utilizes a coordinator with campus-wide coordinating responsibilities.
5. **Total intake:** With the total intake model, all initial advising of students is done by trained advisors who want to advise (preferably a combination of faculty, professional advisors, and peers/paraprofessionals) and who are prepared to work with all students (under-prepared, undecided, etc.). Once a set of predetermined conditions are met, students may be assigned to faculty in their academic sub-units. A coordinator of the advising office may have responsibility for campus-wide coordination of advising.
6. **Satellite:** In this model, advising offices are maintained and controlled in the academic sub-units and provide advising for all students whose majors are within a particular college or school. Faculty may or may not have responsibility for advising in the academic sub-units.
7. **Self-contained:** All advising takes place in a centralized unit, which is administered by a dean or director who has responsibility for all advising functions on campus. It is the predominant model in public two-year colleges. The main advantages of this

model are a trained group of advisors who have advising as a priority, a central location, and easy accessibility for students. The major drawback is that it doesn't promote faculty-student interaction because faculty are not utilized.

King in the monograph, "Reaffirming the Role of Faculty in Academic Advising," (1995, p. 23) feels the ideal advising model would be a total intake model where there is a centralized advising office with a full-time director reporting to the chief academic officer. It would be staffed by a combination of full-time advisors or counselors, faculty working part-time in the office, and paraprofessionals or peers. All advisors would be carefully selected, receive systematic skills training, and would be evaluated and receive appropriate recognition and reward for exemplary advising. The centralized advising office would be responsible for developing advisor and advisee handbooks; development, maintenance, and distribution of advising files; and for coordination of a freshman seminar program. One disadvantage of this model would be the cost of the people specifically hired for advising purposes, but it would provide a way of easing heavy faculty advising loads. It would also guarantee that advising services are coordinated and supervised.

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) established "General Standards" in 1986 to serve as program development and evaluation systems as well as self-study and self-assessment tools. A brief summary of these is located in Appendix A.

Overview Committee Discussions

At John Tyler Community College, the advising model most closely resembles the "split model" as noted above. Students are initially seen by counselors or trained advisors

(non-faculty) in the Counseling Center. Once a major has been declared and they have been program-placed, the students are then assigned a faculty advisor. There are problems in the implementation of this system. In the Arts and Sciences Division, students are assigned by the first letter of their last name. The advising loads for faculty can dramatically differ in size because of this. In addition, those in Arts and Sciences may be advising someone who eventually wants to pursue an occupational/technical degree despite the fact that faculty in this division are not trained to advise in these specializations. Although all information regarding student responsibility, assistance available, and college policies and procedures is available to students through an orientation booklet developed for Student Development (STD) 100 students, printed in the “Schedule of Classes” each semester, and available on JTCC’s website, many students are not taking advantage of this.

The “Overview Committee” addressed these concerns, as well as others. Faculty feel they are not updated on changes in policies and procedures occurring in Student Services. There are sometimes delays in the *Faculty Advising Handbook* being updated. Training is not provided on a regular basis. Advising during the summer semester is a problem because many faculty advisors are not on campus. The pay scale is also different in the summer, with no extra compensation for advising.

Students’ expectations were also discussed by the committee. Some want to self-advise or register online, leading to problems of them taking the wrong class. Finally, the whole process of academic advising is very fragmented because there is no one person in charge.

Overview Committee Recommendations

In addition to taking a look at problem areas, the Overview Committee utilized the CAS Standards and Guidelines (Appendix A) to address how an ideal advising program at JTCC might be developed. After several meetings and in-depth discussion, the Overview Committee made the following recommendations:

Recommendation #1, Assigning of academic advisors:

- A. Assign academic advisors by discipline rather than by alphabet (refers to Arts & Sciences students).
- B. Assign no more than 20 advisees per faculty member.

Recommendation #2, Training and resources:

- A. Provide up-to-date resources for advisors, such as the *Faculty Advising Handbook*, transfer guides, *STD 100 Handbook*, etc.
- B. Provide annual training on college policies/procedures to returning, new, and adjunct staff.

Recommendation #3, Summer advising:

- A. Compensate faculty for summer advising.
- B. Train Arts & Sciences faculty to advise in the technical programs.
- C. Have informational “Brown Bag” lunches to better prepare summer advisors for advising in all disciplines.
- D. Keep summer advising to a “general” type of advising versus program-specific. Use peer advisors for some of the initial work.

Recommendation #4, Improving services/communication for students:

- A. Do not place students in a curriculum until all developmental courses and 12 college credits have been completed.
- B. Assume control over self-advised students by removing telephone ID numbers from all developmental courses and first level courses in math and English; allow no self-advising with developmental courses.
- C. Provide better communication as to what services are available to bring student expectations into line with reality. Communicate to students they need to be made aware that:
 - 1. some advisors are not available during the summer semester,
 - 2. they need to schedule appointments, and
 - 3. they need to plan ahead by seeing their advisor in April for fall enrollment.
- D. Offer open admissions advising sessions on a regular schedule--once a semester, once a month, etc.
- E. Publish an advisor newsletter as mind-jogging reminder of advising goals, skills, information, etc.
- F. Explore the following new ways of getting information to students:
 - 1. JTCC Information spots through video – possible through an outside vendor;
 - 2. videotapes continuously running in selected areas, Counseling, foyer, student lounge; and
 - 3. use of peer advisors.

Recommendation #5, Staffing for and Coordination of Academic Advising:

- A. Establish Academic Advising Center (AAC) for Summer 2001 as a pilot program. It should be open at least three nights a week on each campus until 7:00 PM and could be located in the Academic Support Center on each campus.
- B. Hire a full-time coordinator for both campuses to be in charge of academic advising and the Academic Support Centers. The duties of that position would be as follows: reporting to the Dean of Academic and Student Service; coordinating all academic advising within the College; supervising activities in the Academic Advising Centers; training peer advisors, tutors, and other advising staff; providing faculty development as it relates to advising; acting as a resource for faculty; providing resources, such as advising handbooks, transfer guides, etc.; initiating, providing and keeping all necessary paperwork; maintaining the schedule for both the ASC and AAC; and maintaining appropriate relations both within and outside of the college.
- C. Provide additional staffing in the following manner:
 - 1. Hire part-time advisors for summer terms.
 - 2. Grant release time to faculty for staffing the AAC or pay faculty extra for staffing the center.
- D. Explore Perkins funds and other sources of grant monies.

Recommendation #6, Improving communication/relations between faculty and Student

Services: Provide social activities between faculty and student services to keep lines of communication open.

Actions taken thus far:

1. The Director of Student Services sent two detailed e-mails to all faculty regarding Counseling Services November 12, 2001-January 22, 2002. Also sent to faculty was the Enrollment Checklist used by Counseling when advising students. Both of these should help with communication between Counseling Services and students and Counseling Services and faculty (Appendix B).
2. Similar e-mails have been sent by the English and Art faculty describing specifics regarding advising for their programs.
3. The Engineering Technologies program has developed a matrix showing what traits of students might indicate an appropriate engineering technology program placement. This is available on the public network drive.

Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee:

1. Concerning the Overview Committee's Recommendation #1, the Steering Committee suggests that the two parts of this recommendation be combined to state: "Strive for an acceptable ratio of students to advisor, effective Fall 2002 semester." Because some occupational technical programs may have only one faculty member, recommending no more than 20 advisees per faculty member is unrealistic. Assigning by discipline may also cause a disparity in advising loads. Therefore, the Steering Committee recommended that counselors have a list of advisors' advising loads, and when students are curriculum placed, they be assigned to an advisor with a lighter load. This would, of course, require cross-training of advisors, which is addressed later.
2. Concerning the Overview Committee's Recommendation #2, the Steering Committee was in agreement.

3. Concerning the Overview Committee's Recommendation #3, the Steering Committee recommended that if peer advisors were used, there would need to be a very selective process and they would need to be extensively trained.
4. Concerning the Overview Committee's Recommendation #4, the Steering Committee noted the following:
 - a. The first recommendation would be unrealistic because to receive financial aid, students must be curriculum placed.
 - b. The Steering Committee agreed upon a recommendation that would address both "Summer Advising" and "Improved Services/Communications for Students." In this proposal, when the student was placed in a curriculum by counseling personnel, the curriculum change form would be sent to the appropriate academic division office. There, a letter would be prepared and mailed to the student welcoming the student to the curriculum; noting the name, office, telephone number, and email address of the student's advisor; briefly informing the student of the purpose and importance of advising; and pointing out the responsibilities of the student in the advising process. No student, upon initial placement in a curriculum, would be approved to self-advise. A student would have to meet with his/her advisor prior to the subsequent registration. At that time, the advisor would make a decision regarding the self-advise status of the student based upon criteria established and adopted by the division and/or program. The suggested criteria are that a student should not be permitted to self-advise until he/she has completed all developmental courses and has a GPA of 2.0.

In addition, each spring semester, the Division of Student Services would send letters and/or postcards to all currently enrolled curriculum students noting the dates of registration for upcoming fall semester classes. This mailing would address the problem of conducting fall semester registration during the summer months when most advisors are not present. Students would be informed of this reality and advised to seek the assistance of their advisors during a special Advance Fall Semester Registration and Advising period held prior to the end of the spring semester.

- c. The Steering Committee strongly agreed with the suggestion made by the Overview Committee regarding exploring new ways of getting information to students.
5. Concerning the Overview Committee's Recommendation #5, the Steering Committee noted the following: In addition to this recommendation, the Steering Committee proposed that the AAC be called the Academic Success Center (ASC) and include advising, tutoring, placement testing, assessment testing, distance education testing, academic makeup testing, and selected special needs services. By addressing advising as part of a broader concept of student development support, the needs of the students would be better met. Grant funds may be a way to begin the development of the center, but over time it would require a commitment by the institution in terms of financial and human resources.
6. Concerning the Overview Committee's Recommendation #6, the Steering Committee noted the following:
 - a. The Steering Committee felt many college employees would not want to attend social activities. Therefore, the Steering Committee thought a better solution to improve communications would be an "Academic Advising Committee," whose

members would be solely comprised of counselors and faculty advisors, to discuss issues common to both areas and to improve advising for students.

- b. The Steering Committee felt that a one page insert on programs be put in the *Faculty Advising Handbook* to give faculty advisors more information of areas in which they might not be as familiar.
- c. The Steering Committee suggested that all changes in the schedule (addition of classes/drop of classes) come from one central area and continue to be communicated via e-mail.

Part II: Focusing on First Year Advising

Review of the Literature

Orientation and academic advising are staples in the first-year college experience and serve important roles in enhancing student success (Noel, Levitz, & Saluri, 1985).

Unfortunately, however, they have historically tended to exist apart from each other, being designed, administered, and implemented by different departments with little collaboration. Much of this is due to the standard method of decentralized advising. However, research finds that best practices exist in which advising processes are linked to pre-enrollment and extended orientation. By successfully linking these two, entering students are provided a clear view of academic expectations and the realities of campus life (White, Goetz, Hunter, & Barefoot, 1995).

For many students, their first personal contact with the college will be through some type of pre-enrollment orientation program. During these orientation sessions, students should become familiar with the language of higher education and be given a general overview of the structure of the college. These sessions should also include assessment in the form of placement testing so that students will know if they are ready for particular courses. Another important aspect of the orientation program is providing students with information about academic programs and policies and procedures. This is critical since the complexity of this information can be overwhelming to students. After this general information is provided to students, they also need to be informed of the requirements and specific structure of their chosen area of enrollment (White, Goetz, Hunter, & Barefoot, 1995).

A powerful way for first semester students to enhance academic advising and their transition to college is to participate in what is commonly known as freshman seminars. Their popularity has grown since the 1980's because of a number of internal and external circumstances. First are the increasing complexities of contemporary life that affect the great society, such as diversity, health issues, drug use, and violence. Second is the influx of first-generation, socio-economically disadvantaged, and ethnic minority students into higher education. Third is the need for colleges to offer preparation in basic study skills and time management. And fourth is the alarming college dropout rate, especially in the first year of college (Barefoot & Fidler, 1992).

Freshman seminars can address these issues. "There is evidence that freshman seminars increase rates of student persistence and academic success, because they are highly interactive, personal, and small groups (approximately 20 students) in which students find support from each other and from the instructor" (Fidler, 1991).

There are ways to link freshman seminars to academic advising. For example, in a growing number of these programs, the seminar instructor is the official academic advisor for seminar students. In others, the freshman seminar is the primary structure for academic advising for first-year students.

By linking orientation and advising, colleges can benefit in many ways. The institution's retention efforts are supported by an academic orientation program. Students receive messages early on about academic advising. Databases can be established that can provide perspectives on the student population and any trends that may be developing. Professional development for the faculty and staff advisors can be enhanced by their involvement in these programs (White, Goetz, Hunter, & Barefoot, 1995).

Student Development 100 Committee Discussions

All degree-seeking students at JTCC are required to take Student Development (STD) 100-Orientation, a one-credit course designed to provide entering students with important information about the institution. STD 100 is organized into three parts: enrollment services and placement testing, a general orientation session, and topical seminars. These seminars address such topics as study skills, career exploration and development, leadership development, computer literacy, student finance, health science program preparation, and transfers to senior institutions.

One of the questions addressed by one of the sub-committees was “What role does STD 100 have in the advising process?” It was decided that STD 100 sessions, whether they are on-line, in-person, or through use of the course text, should clearly, simply, and succinctly state to the student how advising is done. The sub-committee recommended that, because it contains such important information for the new JTCC student, this course should be taken by all students in their first or second semester (excluding only those for whom it is not required, such as career study certificate students). A further recommendation of this sub-committee was to encourage Program Heads to develop topical seminars as an introduction to their disciplines, thereby enhancing the advising process.

Another sub-committee looked at the possibility of doing general education testing as a part of STD 100. One difficulty the college has had in the past is in determining the most effective place and time to complete general education testing to gain the most comprehensive and useful data. The college has opted to use WorkKeys as its general education test. WorkKeys is an ACT product, developed for career and workforce development by matching a person with specific skills for a specific job. It assesses the

following skills: applied mathematics, applied technology, listening, locating of information, observation, reading for information, teamwork, and writing. However, the college has not been able to administer this test in a uniform manner to a wide spectrum of its student body.

The final recommendation of the sub-committee regarding this assessment tool was as follows: “The WorkKeys assessment instrument should be offered as an optional STD 100 topical assignment to be administered by the Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning.”

The final task for the Student Development 100 Committee as a whole was to determine the effectiveness of the STD 100 course itself. The committee reviewed the content of both the four-hour orientation session and the new textbook and agreed that the information is important and necessary for students. Statistics from Enrollment Services Student Surveys support this position. 64% of students surveyed in 2000 rated the relevant statement “Orientation classes [STD 100] provide useful information and benefit most new students” either “Strongly Agree” or “Mildly Agree.” The complete statistical breakdown for this question for the previous three years shows these figures:

	1998 Results N=217 %		1999 Results N=154 %		2000 Results N=107 %	
A. Strongly Agree	79	36.49%	69	44.8%	33	30.8%
B. Mildly Agree	59	27.2%	31	20.1%	36	33.61%
C. Agree/Disagree Equally	38	17.5%	32	20.8%	23	21.56%
D. Mildly Disagree	26	12.6%	9	5.8%	8	7.5%
E. Strongly Disagree	15	6.9%	13	8.4%	7	6.5%

However, the committee felt the information in this course should be delivered to students as early as possible in their career at JTTC and that this is not uniformly occurring due to a failure to communicate with students and a need for a clearly enforced and explained requirement. The threshold at which students must take STD 100 is difficult to quantify because many students become curriculum-placers after taking multiple courses. After much discussion, the committee recommended that students take STD 100 when they have accumulated between six and fifteen credits and when they have registered in a curriculum. Students in this group could be targeted with a letter encouraging them to take STD 100 and listing the benefits to them.

Student Development 100 Committee Recommendations.

The following are the final recommendations of the STD 100 Committee.

Recommendation #1: Students should take STD 100 by the time they have completed between six and fifteen credit hours.

Recommendation #2: The most basic information in STD 100 should be made available in a variety of ways including the following:

- A. Create a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) link on the college's website that gives information in an easily accessible format about such important topics as deadlines for withdrawal and refunds, last dates to apply for curriculum admission, last dates to withdraw without academic penalty, and last dates to apply for graduation. This information is also on the college calendar, which is on the college website. The FAQ page could also link to the calendar, student handbook, and the list of advisors.

- B. Program the Student Information System's REG 040 (Student Inquiry Screen) screen to show a message when the student completes 15 credits. The message could state:
"Student has now completed 15 credits. If the student wishes to select a curriculum, please refer them to the Counseling Center to complete this step."
- C. Include another message for the student who is in a curriculum and has completed 15 credits but who has not completed STD 100: "Student has now completed 15 credits and must enroll in STD 100 in the next semester."
- D. If possible, direct the above messages to students when the college converts to the People Soft registration system and students have more direct access to the registration screens. At the present, only the counselors or advisors have access to the REG 040 screen.
- E. Inform advisors of this basic information and strongly encourage them to share it with their advisees.
- F. A particular focus of all of these efforts should be to stress the advantages of enrolling in a curriculum as soon as possible. The benefits of such a decision can be advanced through the FAQ link on the web page, and advisors can be encouraged to promote this decision.

Recommendation #3: Students should complete an evaluation form for all Orientation classes. To promote this, the following is recommended:

- A. Distribute evaluation forms at both the STD 100 four-hour sessions and the individual workshops and classes. Some evaluations are done now for the Cultural Awareness Programs, the Explore Series, and other programs with guest speakers and presenters.

- B. Encourage comments about the usefulness of the instruction and suggestions for improvement.

Actions taken thus far:

1. Two questions addressing STD 100 were included in the current JTCC Student Survey completed in fall 2001. Using these two questions and other information collected from the survey, the college is beginning to develop a sense of who is most likely to take STD 100 early and whether or not this exposure helps students understand the advising process. There were 538 surveys mailed to students. Of these, 94 were returned for a return rate of 16%. The findings were as follows and are presented as responses to two research queries:

Research query: Who is taking STD 100 (Orientation) and does it affect students' perceptions of the advising process?

When asked about their exposure to STD 100 ("Have you already taken or are you currently taking STD100 (Orientation) at JTCC?"), almost 60% of the respondents indicated that they had not yet been exposed to STD 100.

- The age group most likely to be exposed to STD 100 is in the age range 22 – 24; the groups least likely to have previous or current involvement in STD 100 are in the ranges 25 – 34 and 45 +.
- Students who answered that they did not have an assigned advisor were far less likely to have been exposed to STD 100.
- Transfer and new students reported the smallest levels of exposure to STD 100; less than half of reapplying students had had exposure to STD 100.
- 60% of full-time respondents reported exposure to STD 100; an equal proportion of part-time respondents reported no exposure.
- Non-developmental student respondents reported a very low rate of exposure to STD 100; over 60% of developmental student respondents had been or are being exposed to STD 100 presently. The more hours of developmental courses taken, the higher the likelihood of exposure to STD 100.

- With respect to time of attendance, the only group with more than half of respondents reporting exposure to STD 100 was the group attending both day and evening classes; evening students were the least likely to be exposed, though day students followed closely behind.
- As expected, degree/certificate students reported the highest levels of exposure to STD 100 (70%), and CSC and unclassified students reported low levels of exposure; however, 13% of unclassified student respondents reported having taken STD 100.
- Almost 70% of Midlothian student respondents reported no exposure to STD 100, compared to 50% of Chester student respondents; high rates of non-exposure were reported by off-campus and Ft. Lee respondents, though the sample sizes are so small as to make conclusions risky to draw.

Research query: For those exposed to STD 100, is it helpful in their understanding of the advising process?

A majority of respondents did not answer the question regarding how helpful STD 100 was to them since they had not yet been exposed to it. The question was as follows: “If you have already taken or are taking it now, how helpful was it in helping you understand the JTCC advising process.” However, 55% of respondents who did express an opinion about STD 100 indicated that it was somewhat helpful or not helpful at all to them. The choices of response were “very helpful,” “somewhat helpful,” and “not helpful.”

- Students who have attended during at least 1 previous semester were evenly split about the helpfulness of STD 100 to them.
- No matter how respondents rated the advising system, majorities responded that STD 100 was either somewhat helpful or not helpful at all in their understanding of the advising system.
- Majorities of Chester and Midlothian students who have been exposed to STD 100 found it either somewhat or not helpful. The splits on both campuses were essentially the same – 55% to 45%.
- Respondents were about evenly split on the question of STD 100 helpfulness when examined by curriculum level.
- 58% of evening students who were exposed to STD 100 indicated that it was very helpful; day only respondents tended to see STD 100 as not so helpful.

- Non-developmental students were evenly split in their rating of STD 100 helpfulness; developmental students tended to have a less positive view of the helpfulness of STD 100 to them.
 - Full-time students had a less favorable view of STD 100 than did part-time students, though majorities of both expressed relatively negative views of the helpfulness of STD 100.
2. So that all faculty advisors have access to the information provided in STD 100, a grant was written and approved to purchase the handbook for all faculty advisors and student services personnel. These will be purchased and distributed prior to May 2002.
 3. Course evaluation forms will be completed on all STD 100 classes beginning in Spring 2002.

Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee:

1. The committee agreed with all of the above recommendations. The committee also felt that, in addition to the methods to alert faculty, that measures should be taken to alert students as to when they should take STD 100. Two ideas that will be investigated include having the message added to the student's grade report and sending letters to all students who have taken between six and fifteen credit hours.
2. The issue of general education testing could be addressed by the aforementioned Academic Success Center.

Part III: Training for Effective Advising

Review of the Literature

Advising has evolved into a complex tool for student development that requires comprehensive knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors that can be learned and enhanced. This complexity has been caused by an increasingly diverse student population, curricular complexity, concern about student retention, and consumer awareness (Gordon, Habley & Associates, 2000, p.289).

Shipton and Steltenpohl suggest that colleges can enhance student development and enrich students with coping skills for successive stages of development only if their faculty and staff advisors and counselors are “prepared to assist students of all ages in clarifying their life, career, and academic purposes” (Winston et. al, 1984, p. 90). Greenwood, likewise, makes the suggestion that in order to become successful advisors faculty members must alter their behaviors, attitudes, and approaches, perhaps by increasing the time they spend socializing with students and participating in faculty development seminars/workshops designed to teach helping skills, attitudes, and behaviors. These systematic staff development programs are essential. The impact of faculty-student interaction on students’ academic achievement, general intellectual growth and competence, and college satisfaction is well documented (Winston et. al, 1984, p. 66).

The primary goal of an advisor training program is to increase the effectiveness of the advising services provided to students. This in turn will increase student satisfaction and persistence. Weston (1993) noted other benefits as well: enhanced communication among faculty and staff; better integration of the academic advisors into the culture of the college; reduced barriers between the academic, student affairs, and administrative divisions of the

college; creation of a better understanding of the contribution the individual advisor makes to the process of educating students; and creation of a more student-oriented institution.

Current Status of Advisor Training on College Campuses

Questions about the status of advisor training on college campuses have been asked in the ACT national surveys of academic advising. The fifth survey was summarized by Habley and Morales in the monograph, “Current Practices in Academic Advising: Final Report on ACT’s Fifth National Survey of Academic Advising” (1998).

Observations on the existing mandatory activities for faculty advisors include:

- Training was provided by 34.8 percent of academic departments; 23 percent of those departments required formal training. Mandatory training programs are more prevalent in two-year private (67 percent) and two-year public (46 percent) colleges.
- The most common format for training (35 percent) was a single workshop of one day or less per year. Two-year institutions are more likely to have a workshop series throughout the year.
- Factual information continues to be the dominant focus of the training with a limited focus on advising concepts and relationship skills.

Reviewing the Institutional Mission

An advisor training program should evolve from the institutional mission statement. Then the advising mission statement should articulate the relationship between advisor training and the institutional mission. Common phrases like “development of the whole student,” “lifelong learning,” “preparing an informed citizenry,” and “develop broad

intellectual skills” can become the focus of goals, objectives, and expected outcomes in an advisor development program (Kerr, 1996, p. 9).

Identifying Needs

Training programs need to address needs as identified by data collected from both individual advisor evaluations and program evaluations. Another source for ideas for training topics can be gathered from input from experienced advisors as well as in the form of a needs assessment from those to be trained. Input from faculty, staff, and students is critical in this process (Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000).

Establishing Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives for the program need to be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and tangible. This will assist in the assessment of the training program.

Selecting Appropriate Content, Strategies, and Methods

There are three factors to consider in planning advisor training. The first is content. Topics for training programs are typically organized into three content areas: conceptual skills (the ideas advisors must understand), informational skills (the things an advisor must know such as academic regulations, policies and registration procedures, and the use of information sources), and relational skills (those behaviors an advisor must exhibit in the advising interaction such as counseling skills, interviewing skills, and decision-making skills) (Kramer, 1995, p.15).

The second factor is the audience. Training for teaching faculty new to the campus will be very different than a program for experienced advisors. There may be resistance from faculty towards training as well as advising. Among teaching, committee work, and research, advising may have low priority, especially if there is no reward. As stated in

NACADA's publication, "Designing an Effective Advisor Training Program, (p.21) institutions implementing advisor training often will find their faculty saying, "The advisors who need this most are not here." Therefore, training programs need to focus attention and energy on offering incentives to encourage training and on those who are present and willing to learn.

The third factor to be considered is the strategies and methods to be used in conducting the training. These might include external presenters, panel sessions, case studies, brainstorming activities, videos, discussion groups and so on. Advisors are adult learners so a variety of strategies and methods should be used, rather than delivering the training in a lecture-presentation format (Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000).

Implementing the Program

In planning for implementation, it is imperative to have administrative support. That support can come from the dean or president in the form of a letter or by addressing the faculty and staff at the training session. This is critical because it reinforces the importance of the program.

It's important to publicize the training program and, if possible, to offer incentives to attend (food, free materials, etc.) Times and durations need to be chosen that are appropriate for the purposes of the particular session and that are convenient for faculty and staff. The location of the training may be limited by resources, but where it is held can have significant effects on its outcomes. The location can be either on or off campus, but if held at a comfortable, attractive, and prestigious location, this location can become one of the few rewards that the institution is able to provide (Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000).

Evaluating the Program

As mentioned earlier, the evaluation process needs to relate directly to the goals and objectives for the program established in the planning stages. This evaluation can be formative (after individual sessions) or summative (after a series of sessions). It can focus on participant satisfaction or on what the participants have learned. The program evaluation data used that indicated a need for specific training can be used to determine if there is improvement in that aspect of the program (Gordon, Habley, & Associates, 2000).

Faculty/Staff Development Committee Discussions

At JTCC, a formal workshop was held for new faculty in the fall of 2000 to assist them in the advising and registration of students. Prior to that time, information on advising was provided to the faculty solely by providing them with the *Faculty Advisor's Handbook*. The committee felt that, while this workshop was an improvement over past practices, it was inadequate training because all faculty should be required to attend a workshop on advising and registration in which they would be updated on new policies and be able to gain new ideas to improve their advising skills.

In addition to this inadequate training, another problem noted by this committee was that all faculty were not able to access the necessary Student Information System (SIS) screens on their computers. It was determined that the following screens were needed by all faculty: TTR 030 (Update Self-Advising Indicator Screen), TRK040 (Curriculum Progress Inquiry Screen), REG021 (Student Registration Screen), REG040 (Student Inquiry Screen), REG050 (Class Sections), REG060 (Selected Class Rolls Screen), and REG075 (Online Student Locator Screen).

There were also discussions about a lack of communication between Student Services and faculty advisors regarding procedural changes (i.e. that only counselors are allowed to do curriculum changes) and policies (i.e. that curriculum changes can only be done by appointment and not on Friday afternoon). No concrete recommendation arose from these discussions.

Another issue addressed by the committee was how the registration process could be more made efficient for students wanting to take non-traditional courses as well as traditional courses. Currently, only the Division of Extended Learning and Distance Education is allowed to register students for Weekend College courses, Internet courses, and Extended Learning Institute courses (a variety of credit courses for students who find it is either necessary or convenient to study independently). The committee suggested that all faculty should be able to register students in these non-traditional courses. This would enable students combining traditional and non-traditional courses to register for them in one place at one time.

They noted that this registration would only be effective if it were accompanied by training that emphasized the differences in traditional and non-traditional courses and by impressing upon faculty advisors that they would need to screen students to be sure that they met the pre-requisites for these courses. The committee noted that in the past the faculty had failed to properly screen students for courses.

There were beginning discussions on future topics for training sessions. The topics that they felt could be addressed in training sessions included “what and when student forms needed to be submitted,” “what courses transfer to what institutions,” and “what pre-requisites were required for specialized programs.” The committee suggested that these

sessions could take the form of workshops and brown bag lunches. However, the committee's discussions concerning the topics for training and the form that such training might take were hampered by the fact that the college is about to adopt a new Student Information System that has been purchased by the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) from PeopleSoft.

This new Student Information System (SIS) is a major leap forward from the legacy system that has served the college since the 1980's. Once deployed, the new system will provide many new services for students, faculty, and staff. For the first time ever, JTCC's website will be linked "real time" to our SIS database. Students will have web access, enabling them to: perform address changes, schedule classes, monitor their degree progress, check financial aid, and view their student account. Faculty will be able to use the web to view their class schedule and submit grades. Advisors will have web access to schedule appointments, view real time degree progress, and schedule classes for their advisees.

Value added features for JTCC's other support staff areas are numerous and far reaching. Admissions staff will be able to track multiple applications and support several student addresses. The Records Office will benefit from a more flexible course catalog and class scheduling that supports the needs of our Academic Divisions. Grades submitted via the web will be able to be validated and posted on-line. The Financial Aid Office will benefit from not having to maintain four separate systems for application, awarding, disbursing and packaging students. The Business Office will benefit from the addition of a true student account and third party billing. Our Workforce and Community Education divisions will be fully integrated with the rest of the college. For the first time JTCC will

reap the benefits of a single system and these divisions will see the same improvements in the areas of admissions, records, and student finance.

The new SIS is being deployed as a single system with all 23 VCCS colleges sharing one database. This will enable students to easily transfer within the VCCS or take courses at more than one VCCS college simultaneously. From the single database, VCCS will be able to monitor their centralized reports allowing college Information Technology staff to support local programming and reporting needs. The VCCS, and thus JTCC, is planning to go live with this new system during Summer or Fall 2002 registration.

Given the impact on advising and the new services that this system will provide advisors and students, it was difficult to formulate formats for training without having current access to this system. The committee, however, noted that this system will heighten the importance of providing effective advising training to faculty and that the committee's job in the future will be to see that the college offers this support.

Currently, the college is using the SIS deployment as an opportunity to re-engineer the way it does business. Many of the procedures are different in the new system, and the college will be discovering many better ways to accomplish necessary tasks with the new SIS. It is also evident that the new SIS is set up in such a way to provide value added processes to be able to better serve the college's constituents. Like other services within the college, advising and advising training will need to be adjusted to best utilize this system. The committee noted that this adjustment will need to be pursued in greater depth after the college goes live with the new SIS.

Faculty/Staff Development Committee Recommendations

The following are the final recommendations of the Faculty/Staff Development Committee.

Recommendation #1: Provide all faculty with all SIS screens needed for advising and registering students for classes.

Recommendation #2: Allow the faculty to register students for non-traditional courses (Weekend College, ELI, Internet).

Recommendation #3: Provide training to improve advising on a regular basis to all new and seasoned faculty.

Actions taken thus far:

1. An advisor's workshop was held October 2, 2001 (Convocation/Founder's Day) to provide basic faculty advisor training (Appendix C). Dr. Ray Drinkwater, Director of Student Services, discussed basic procedures including admissions, registration, transfers, add/drop, curriculum entry and graduation. Mr. Jim Cosby, Associate Professor of Accounting, discussed the various SIS screens and how to use these screens in on-line advising. Time was given for questions by the faculty. As a follow-up to this workshop, it was determined that faculty would benefit from having access to the information provided in the *STD 100 Handbook*. As mentioned earlier, a grant was written and approved to purchase enough handbooks for all personnel responsible for advising students.
2. All SIS screens needed by faculty for advising and registration are now accessible.
3. The Dean's staff agreed to allow all academic advisors to register students for Weekend college courses. Dr. Melody Moore, Division Chair for Extended Learning and Distance Education, will develop a new registration form that beginning in the fall semester of

2002 will be used for registering students for Weekend College, Internet, and ELI courses. The form will list the student enrollment requirements, as a reminder to both the student and advisor, and must be signed by the advisor. Once the advisor registers the student in SIS, the form is to be returned to the Division of Extended Learning and Distance Education. This will allow the Division to track several informational items useful to the college. Prior to the beginning of Fall 2002 registration, Dr. Moore will distribute the registration forms and an information sheet to all faculty at the college.

Further actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee:

1. Included in the survey of faculty to determine how they view academic advising at JTCC will be a section on what faculty perceive as their needs with regard to training. This survey will be conducted by the Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning in January.
2. The Faculty/Staff Development Committee will design training programs to address these needs, determine a time frame for implementation, and then design an evaluation form to be completed by participants after implementation.

Part IV: Evaluating and Rewarding Faculty Advisors

Review of the Literature

One of the reasons faculty avoid academic advising is because they believe they are not properly rewarded for their efforts. Academic advising is usually either not an important part of promotion and tenure criteria or it is missing from this criteria altogether.

Institutions need to effectively incorporate advising into their promotional/tenure structure in order to send a clear message to faculty that academic advising is important and rewarded. Unfortunately, any change in an established promotion/tenure system can be slow, frustrating, and is often rejected. However, given the importance of advising, the difficult task of incorporating advising into this system is one that needs to be done.

Even when an institution commits itself to incorporating advising into its promotion/tenure system, it still faces another difficult task--how to describe and evaluate effective advising. Criteria may include process criteria (accessibility and satisfaction) as well as outcome criteria (retention and student knowledge). The source of information to assess these criteria is from the advisees themselves and through surveys, individual interviews, or focus groups. Other sources might include supervisor evaluations. Peer evaluations and self-evaluations are relatively rare in evaluating effective advising. However, advising portfolios are beginning to be discussed as possibilities for evaluation of faculty advisors. Faculty can collect materials for a generic portfolio in the area of advising, and incorporate this into their teaching portfolios for promotion, tenure, and merit increases. These portfolios might include self-assessments, advisee evaluations, and logs of student contact (Glennen & Vowell, 1995).

Teacher's College, as part of Emporia State University, incorporates advising into the performance evaluation for its faculty. Its performance evaluation focuses on three areas: (a) Instruction and Student Related Activities, including advising and differential assignments; (b) Scholarly Activity; and (c) Service. For Instruction and Student Related Activities, four areas are evaluated: Student Evaluations of Instruction; Related Activities (development of new courses, number of advisees, student load, etc.); Goal Achievement; and Other (interpersonal relations and management skills) (Vowell, 1995).

There are several ways advising can be evaluated. Emporia State University, which has a central advising center, uses a Performance Evaluation for Advisors that lists eight expectations of advisors. While not necessarily applicable to the community college setting, these expectations could be adapted. They are as follows:

1. Attend advisor training session prior to the beginning of the academic year and regular inservice training meetings.
2. Advise 10 hours/week for 9 weeks and 6 hours/week for the remaining 8 weeks of the semester. Infrequent Saturdays and other times will be requested to meet student needs.
3. Practice intrusive, developmental advising which helps students learn to set appropriate goals and develop strategies for reaching them and utilize available opportunities to improve familiarity with advising theory and practice.
4. Be familiar with campus support services.
5. Be familiar with university regulations and procedures needed for advising.
6. Remain current with degree requirements for your discipline. Acquire a working knowledge of other degree requirements to advise undeclared students.

7. Remain current with various general education programs.
8. Participate in on-going personnel evaluation procedures. (Vowell, 1995).

As part of the “on-going personnel evaluation procedures” that are mentioned in the Emporia State University’s list of advising expectations, a faculty advisor completes an evaluation form in which he/she responds to open-ended essay questions. This is returned to the director of the advising center one week prior to the evaluation conference. The director completes the evaluation, has a conference with the faculty advisor, and then writes a letter to the chair of the advisor’s division to serve as part of the overall evaluation of a faculty member for the purposes of promotion, tenure, or merit increases.

Even if faculty cannot be rewarded through the formal reward system of promotion, tenure, and merit increases, colleges can be creative in developing other ways to recognize and reward academic advisors. Faculty who are interested in advising could be paid additional overload salaries or given release time for their efforts. Financial remuneration could also be provided for doing academic advising in the summer, rather than, or in addition to, teaching classes. Faculty could be nominated for campus advising awards or national recognition by the American College Testing Program and NACADA.

An “Advisors Week” or “Take your Advisor to Lunch Day” could be established to recognize those faculty who are willing to undertake the academic advising role (Glennen & Vowell, 1995).

Faculty Evaluation Committee Discussions

The *VCCS Policy Manual* provides, for all of the 23 community colleges in the system, minimum standards for the evaluation of all full-time faculty. Faculty evaluations are to address the development and improvement of professional performance. They should also relate to the promotion, retention, and salary of those being evaluated. One item of special importance as it relates to JTCC's QEP, is that the VCCS Policy 3.6 states "advisement of students" is one component of teaching effectiveness (Appendix D).

The following information is taken from the *JTCC Faculty Handbook* (on-line) and describes the current method of evaluation for teaching faculty:

The contractual responsibilities of persons holding faculty rank are defined in the *VCCS Policy Manual* and in this manual. These responsibilities include instruction, student activities (academic advising, club sponsorship, etc.), record keeping, division assistance, and College-wide activities. These responsibilities should be weighted in the evaluation process according to their relative importance with the notation that the primary responsibility of faculty members is instruction.

One problem with the current system, as noted by faculty and administrators, is that with the current weighting system, truly excellent teachers and faculty advisors receive basically the same rating as those who assume few responsibilities. Also, there is only a mention of advising as being a part of "Student Activities Responsibilities."

Faculty Evaluation Committee Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Under the current "Student Activities Responsibilities" section on the JTCC evaluation form, include the following categories: advising, maintaining office hours,

sponsoring a club, supervising students on/off campus activities (performances, lectures, field trips). Faculty would be responsible for documenting these activities in their evaluation portfolios; for example, each faculty member should keep a log of contacts with student advisees as well as a record of participation in club and other student activities (Casino Night, Awards Night, Scholarship Breakfast). A brief student evaluation of advising should be given to each student advisee, collected centrally, and returned to each division chairperson. This assessment would provide data that would allow faculty to study and improve the quality of advising at the college.

Actions taken thus far:

1. None

Future actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee:

1. The college will develop a brief student advisee evaluation form by March 2002 to be completed by the student and placed in the faculty's advising portfolio.
2. The Steering Committee recommended that the JTCC Faculty Evaluation be reviewed and revised by a faculty task force appointed by the president in Spring 2002, incorporating the above recommendation including the new evaluation being implemented in Fall 2002.

Part V: Assessing the Advising Process

Review of the Literature

Upcraft and Schuch (1996) suggest two reasons why assessment and evaluation should be a component of an advising program. First, administrators and faculty should want to know whether or not their efforts and resources are producing the desired effects. Second, advising needs to be assessed for economic and political reasons because of increasing demands for accountability (Gordon, Habley & Associates, 2000, p. 324-325).

Evaluation of academic advising can occur at any one of four levels of increasing complexity: (1) the individual advisor, (2) the advising program, (3) the advising unit, or (4) institution-wide advising. The evaluation of the individual advisor was addressed in the previous section. An advising program is one targeted to the advising needs of a special population of students, for example, at-risk first year students, disabled students, or minority students. Evaluation of an advising program requires focusing on the specific goals of that program and the needs of the student body it serves. These advising programs can be a part of the advising unit, which is defined as an identifiable administrative or organizational entity that has allocated resources and is charged with a mission or purpose that includes but may not be limited to providing academic advising. An evaluation of this unit requires focusing in on the specific advising tasks that this unit performs and assessing them in the context of their greater mission and other duties. Institution-wide advising encompasses the individual advisors, advising programs, and advising units. Assessing institution-wide advising, however, must go beyond these separate units to include their interfacing with each other and with other program units that support academic advising such as counseling services, admissions, etc. (Gordon, Habley & Associates, 2000, pp.327-328).

Advising should be viewed as a complex process designed to produce outcomes. Therefore, an assessment of academic advising should include both a process evaluation as well as an outcomes evaluation. To begin an assessment that includes “process” and “outcomes” evaluations, an institution must determine what indicators will be measured for each of these categories. After these indicators are determined, possible sources of data need to be identified.

Figure 1 lists possible advising process and outcome indicators. Figure 2 lists potential data sources (Gordon, Habley, & Associates, pp. 332-333).

Figure 1. *Advising Process and Outcomes Indicators*

Process Indicators	Outcome Indicators
Advisee follow-through on referrals	Academic Performance (GPA)
Advisor accessibility	Advisee satisfaction ratings
Advisor assignments/loads	Alumni satisfaction ratings
Advisor utilization of referral sources	Appropriate course selections
Advisor knowledge of career options	Appropriate referrals
Advisor knowledge of policies/procedures	Co-curricular involvements
Advisor understanding/use of profile data	Courses failed
Appropriate remedial assignments	Drop-Add transactions
Course selections consistent with advisee degree objectives	Graduate school admission rates
advisee profiles	Graduation rates
pre-requisite requirements	Persistence rates
Number of advisee initiated contacts	Post-graduate placement rates
Number of student initiated contacts	Time to graduate
Number of students not receiving advising	
Referral follow-up with advisor and advisee	
Referrals to co-curricular activities	
Referrals to experiential education	
Requests for change of advisor and reasons	

Figure 2. *Potential Data Sources*

People	Documents
Academic deans/department heads	Academic transcripts
Admissions staff	Admission profiles
Advisees	Advisee course/class schedules
Advising administrators	Advisor notes/records
Advisors	Degree-audit reports
Alumni	Developmental transcripts
Career planning staff	Grade reports
Counseling staff	Placement scores/profiles
Faculty	Registrar's student data file
Financial assistance staff	Students information files
Housing staff	Student tracking system
Graduating students	Transcripts/videos of advising
Learning assistance staff	
Registrar	
Students not advised	
Withdrawing students	

After these indicators and sources have been determined, the next step is to decide by what methods the data will be collected. These might include surveys (mail, telephone, or in person). The assessment surveys would determine whether advisors “are consistently available; keep regular office hours; get to know the students personally; make appropriate referrals; have a positive, constructive attitude; are on time for appointments; have the information the students need; discuss personal and academic goals; and keep the students up to date on their course of study” (Railsback & Colby, p. 5).

Other methods might include interviews (in-person or by telephone), focus groups, field observation, document analysis, and field experiments. Data analysis should utilize both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Since the final evaluation report may be very lengthy, an executive summary with recommendations may be the best solution.

Gordon, Habley, and their research associates (2000, p. 337) suggest this summary should be no longer than three pages and include a brief discussion of what has been done, the findings and recommendations. Sonnichsen (1994) suggests that recommendations possess five qualities: 1) that they be made in a timely fashion, 2) that they have a realistic chance for implementation, 3) that they should be directed to those who will have final responsibility for implementation, 4) they should be simple, specific, and understood by all affected, and 5) the connection between the recommendation and the findings should be obvious.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Discussions

Prior to Fall 2001, Student Services at JTCC surveyed all financial aid students using the “JTCC Enrollment Services Student Feedback Survey” (Appendix E). This usually resulted in a number of around 2200-2500 surveys mailed with a 10-20% return rate. The surveys were mailed to the students with return postage envelopes. In Fall 2001, special needs students and curriculum pending students were added, increasing the sample to over 3,000 students. Because data isn’t available yet from the fall 2001 students, the following are the results of this survey as they relate to assessment of advising by the Counseling Center for the years 1998-2000.

Question 5. My faculty advisor is knowledgeable about the transfer requirements of other Colleges and universities.

	1998 Results N=237 %	1999 Results N=158 %	2000 Results N=113 %
A Strongly Agree	116 48.9%	91 57.6%	56 49.6%

B. Mildly Agree	68	28.7%	32	20.3%	34	30.1%
C. Agree/Disagree Equally	39	16.5%	21	31.3%	12	10.6%
D. Mildly Disagree	5	2.1%	10	6.3%	6	5.3%
E. Strongly Disagree	9	3.9%	4	2.5%	5	4.4%

Question 19. My faculty academic advisor is accessible and approachable.

	1998 Results N=264 %		1999 Results N=183 %		2000 Results N=119 %	
A Strongly Agree	126	47.7%	102	55.7%	55	46.2%
B. Mildly Agree	61	23.1%	42	23.0%	36	30.3%
C. Agree/Disagree Equally	40	15.2%	20	10.9%	17	14.3%
D. Mildly Disagree	16	6.1%	12	6.6%	6	5.0%
E. Strongly Disagree	21	7.9%	7	3.8%	5	4.2%

Question 25. My faculty academic advisor is knowledgeable about my program requirements.

	1998 Results N=258 %		1999 Results N=179 %		2000 Results N=121 %	
A Strongly Agree	143	55.4%	114	63.7%	70	57.9%
B. Mildly Agree	69	26.7%	36	20.1%	25	20.7%
C. Agree/Disagree Equally	30	11.6%	19	10.6%	18	14.9%
D. Mildly Disagree	7	2.7%	9	5.0%	5	4.1%
E. Strongly Disagree	9	3.5%	1	.6%	3	2.5%

The surveys showed a general satisfaction with the faculty academic advisors but, as mentioned earlier in this report, this finding was contradicted by general comments included

by students at the end of the survey. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee discussed and took these mixed results into consideration and used the questions on the survey to help them begin determining what needed to be assessed in the college advising program and how this assessment would be done.

The members of the QEP Institutional Effectiveness Committee discussed several items they felt to be important to the advising process. These included issues related to the knowledge of advisors, accessibility of advisors, the number and distribution of advisees, and student satisfaction with the process. Perceived knowledge of the advisor was discussed from the perspective of the student as well as the advisor. The committee focused on the issue of academic advising as it related to course planning and progression through a program of study.

Other issues that they discussed as possible aspects of advising that may need to be assessed were issues of data management and disability services that were raised in the program review submitted in 1999-2000 by the Counseling Department. While these issues were identified as important to the effective process of advising, the committee felt that focusing on them in a general assessment would not help the college determine specific outcomes of the advising process.

The committee identified outcomes, methods of measurement, and benchmark figures indicating attainment of outcomes. When developing these outcomes, committee members discussed the need to evaluate advisor knowledge and preparation and also the need to separate individual job performance (i.e. confidential faculty evaluation) from trended, overall data. Therefore, the use of a survey from students and from advisors was selected as a tool of measurement.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee Recommendations (supplemented by one Faculty Evaluation Committee recommendation)

The following are the final recommendations of the QEP Institutional Effectiveness Committee.

Recommendation #1: That the following outcomes, methods of measurement, and benchmark figures be accepted and implemented by the College:

- A. Students will indicate satisfaction with the advising program. Benchmark: 75% of students will indicate satisfaction with advising by giving a rating of 3 or better on a 5-point scale. Method: Evaluate and revise, as needed, the surveys that are currently in use (graduate follow-up survey and Enrollment Services Survey). Include items specifically related to advisor accessibility, helpfulness, knowledge of course requirements, and overall satisfaction.
- B. Advisors will indicate competence with the advising process. Benchmark: 80% of advisors will attend professional development activities provided by the college to improve advising. 80% of the advisors will rate their level of preparation and confidence in their ability to advise as 3 or higher on a 5-point scale. Method: Monitor attendance at professional development activities. At the completion of the school year (or last planned professional development activity), survey the advisors to determine their perception of their level of confidence in their ability to advise.

Recommendation #2 (from the Faculty Evaluation Committee): A survey incorporating faculty's perception of their advising load, training, information, and support provided the advisors should also be completed at the end of each advising period, collected centrally,

evaluated by student services, and returned to each division chairperson. This assessment would provide data that would allow faculty as well as Student Services to study and improve the quality of advising at the college.

Actions taken thus far:

1. The Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning surveyed a random sample of currently enrolled JTCC students in the fall of 2001 to determine their perceptions of the quality of services provided. The first section of the survey (Appendix F) deals with Advising Services. Ninety-four surveys were returned out of 538 sent for an overall return rate of 16%. The results can be found in Appendix G.

Future actions to be taken as recommended by the Steering Committee:

1. The current student survey should be revised to incorporate the scale of 1-5 as recommended by the QEP Institutional Effectiveness committee.
2. The current student survey should continue to be administered yearly to a random sample of students.
3. The Office of Assessment, Research, and Planning should extract needed information from these surveys for faculty to provide feedback to them about their advising, which could, in turn, be added to their advising portfolios as recommended by the Faculty Evaluation committee.

References

- Barefoot, B., & Fidler, P. (1992). 1991 national survey of freshman seminar programming: Helping first year college students climb the academic ladder (Monograph No. 10). Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the Freshman Experience.
- Fidler, P. (1991). Relationship of freshman orientation seminars to sophomore return rates. Journal of the Freshman Year Experience, 3(1), 7-38.
- Glennen, R.E. & Vowell, F.N. (1995). Selecting, training, rewarding, and recognizing faculty advisors. In M.L. Upcraft & G.L. Kramer (Eds.), First year academic advising: Patterns to the future: Pathways to the future. Monograph Series, no. 18. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, National Resource Center for the Freshman Experience.
- Gordon, V.N., Habley, G & Associates (2000). Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- John Tyler Community College. John Tyler Community College faculty manual. Retrieved December 31, 2001 from <http://www.jt.cc.va.us/manualsonlinejtcc>
- Habley, W.R. (1983). Organizational structures for academic advising: Model and implications. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(6), 535-540.
- Habley, W.R., & McCauley, M.E. (1987). The relationship between institutional characteristics and the organization of advising services. NACADA Journal, 14(2).
- Kerr, T.J. (ed.). (1996). NACADA faculty advising training facilitator's manual. Manhattan, Kansas: National Academic Advising Associations.
- King, M. (1995). Organizational models and delivery systems for faculty advising. In G.L. Kramer (ed.), Reaffirming the Role of faculty in academic advising. Monograph Series, no. 1. Manhattan, KS: NACADA Publications.
- Noel, L., Leavitz, R. & Saluri, D. (1985). Increasing student retention. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Railsback, Gary, & Colby, A. (1988). Improving academic advising at the community college. ERIC Digest. In http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed320647.html
- Sonnichsen, R.C. (1994). Evaluation of change agents. In J.S. Whorley. H.P. Hatry, and K.E. Newcomer (Eds), Handbook of practical program evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Upcraft, M.L., and Schuh, J.H. (1996). Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Virginia Community College System. Virginia Community College System faculty manual. Retrieved December 31, 2001, from <http://www.so.cc.va.us/polypdf/contents.pdf>

Vowell, F. (1995). In G.L. Kramer (ed.), Developing faculty potential as excellent advisors. Reaffirming the role of faculty in academic advising. Monograph Series, no. 1. Manhattan, Kansas: NACADA Publications.

Vowell, F., Grites, T., Wachtel, E. & Rozzelle, B. (Eds.). (1996). Designing an effective advisory training program. Monograph. Manhattan, Kansas: NACADA Publications.

Walsh, E. M. (1979). Revitalizing academic achievement. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56 (8), 446-449.

Weston, P. (1993). Adviser training in the community college." In M.C. King (ed.) Academic advising: Organizing and delivering services for student success. New directions for community colleges, no. 82. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

White, E.R, Goetz, J.J., Hunter, M.S., & Barefoot, B.O. (1995). Creating successful transitions through academic advising." In M.L Upcraft and G.L. Kramer (eds). First year academic advising. Columbia, S.C., University of South Carolina: National Resource Center for The Freshman Year Experience & Students in Transition.

Winston, R.B., Jr., Miller, T.K., Ender, S.C, and Grites, T. J. (Eds). (1984). Developmental academic advising: Addressing students' educational, personal, and social needs. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

CAS Standards and Guidelines

Part 1. Mission

Mission statement must be consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

The institution must have a clearly written statement of philosophy pertaining to academic advising, which must include program goals and expectations of advisors and advisees.

Part 2. Program

Advisors must review and use available data about students' academic and educational needs, performance, aspirations, and problems.

Individual academic advising conferences must be available to students each academic term.

Academic advising caseloads must be consistent with the time required for the effective performance of this activity.

The academic advising program must provide current and accurate advising information to academic advisors.

Part 3. Leadership

Leaders must be selected on the basis of formal training, relevant work experience, personal attributes, and other professional credentials.

Part 4. Organization and Management

The programs must show evidence of appropriate structure including current and accessible policies and procedures, written expectations for performance of all employees, and organizational charts.

Part 5. Human Resources

The program must establish procedures for selection, training, and evaluation of advisors; set expectations for supervision; and provide professional development opportunities.

Part 6. Financial Resources

The academic advising program must have adequate funding to accomplish its mission and goals, including funding for training and development of advisors, print and non-print information, and resources to promote the program.

Part 7. Facilities, Technology, and Equipment

The academic advising program must have adequate and suitably location facilities, technology, and equipment to support its mission and goals.

Part 8. Legal Responsibilities

Academic advisors must be knowledgeable about and responsive to law and regulations that relate to the academic advising program.

Part 9. Equal Opportunity, Access, and Affirmative Action

Services must be provided on a fair and equitable basis and are accessible to all students. Hours of operation must be responsive to the needs of all students.

Part 10. Campus and Community Relations

The academic advising program must establish, maintain, and promote effective relations with relevant campus offices and external agencies. For referral purposes, the academic advising program should provide academic advisors with a comprehensive list of relevant external agencies, campus offices, and opportunities.

Part 11. Ethics

The academic advising program must implement and publish statements of ethical practice. Confidentiality must be maintained for all records and communications (paper and electronic), unless exempted by law.

Part 12. Assessment and Evaluation

The academic advising program must regularly conduct systematic qualitative and quantitative evaluations of program quality to determine the extent to which the stated mission and goals are being met. Results of these evaluations must be used in revising and improving the performance of personnel.

Appendix G

Current Student Survey, Fall 2001

Race	Survey Respondents	Student Body
Caucasian	61.7%	67.1%
African-American	27.7%	24.1%
Asian	4.3%	2.1%
Hispanic	2.0%	2.3%
Other	4.3%	3.5%
American Indian	0%	0.3%

There were 538 surveys mailed to students and 94 were returned for an overall 16% return rate.

Student Understanding of the Advisor Assignment Process:

Do most students know whether or not they are in a curriculum? Do they understand which curriculum they are in?

- Respondents were asked if they are currently assigned to a curriculum program at the college (Ex. Police Science program, Arts and Sciences for Transfer, Nursing program, etc.). A large majority, 71% indicated that they were assigned to a curriculum, with 22% indicating that they were not assigned to a curriculum. When these responses were compared to the students' actual currently assigned curriculum codes, the following results were found:
 - There is confusion about curriculum assignment among unclassified students; 45.9% of them indicated that they are currently assigned to a curriculum program at the college.
 - A high degree of curriculum identification was found among both Career Studies Certificate (CSC) and other degree/certificate program-placed students (approximately 90% of students in these classifications responded with a "yes" to the curriculum assignment question on the survey).
- Looking further at whether or not respondents correctly identified the curriculum in which they are officially placed at the college, the following results were found:
 - Among unclassified students, 16% said they were assigned to the Arts & Sciences for Transfer program, another 8.1% indicated assignment to a CSC, and another 13.5% indicated assignment to another degree or certificate program; approximately 38% of unclassified students indicated assignment to a curricular program to which they were not currently assigned.
 - For CSC students, 44% of students' responses agreed with the official assignment of curriculum. The main reason for the high rate of disagreement is due to the number of CSC Allied Health Preparation students who

- identified the curriculum to which they intend to change – Nursing, Physical Therapist Assistant, or Funeral Services.
- 80% of degree/certificate students correctly identified their official curriculum.

Do most students know whether or not they have been assigned an advisor? If they have been assigned an advisor, do they distinguish between that person being a faculty member or a counselor?

When asked if an advisor had been assigned to them, 66% responded “yes,” 21% responded “no,” and 13% were “unsure.” When these responses were compared to respondents’ indication of curriculum assignment, 29% of students who indicated that they were not in a curriculum program responded that they had been assigned an advisor. On further examination, among unclassified students (who are not in curricular programs and have not been assigned advisors), 37% of these students indicated that they had been assigned an advisor, and another 18% were unsure. This indicates a fair amount of confusion among non-curricular students about the nature of the advisor assignment process. CSC and degree/certificate students, on the other hand, exhibited a high degree of understanding of the advisor assignment process, with 73% of CSC students and 89% of degree/certificate students indicating that they had been assigned an advisor.

Comparing student responses about advisor assignment to various demographic characteristics, the following results became apparent:

- By age, the 35 – 44 age group showed the least certainty about advisor assignment (53% “yes”); the 22 – 24 age group showed the most certainty (78% “yes”).
- Transfer students demonstrated a large degree of confusion regarding advisor assignment: 29% “yes,” 43% “no,” and 28% “unsure.”
- Both full-time and part-time students indicated a high degree of advisor assignment (at least 64%).
- Developmental students (those who have attempted at least 1 developmental course in their academic career at JTCC) showed a higher degree of advisor assignment than non-developmental students; 63% of those indicating they had been assigned an advisor were developmental students; 75% of those indicating that they had not been assigned an advisor were non-developmental students.
- Students indicated a high degree of advisor assignment regardless of time of day of attendance; night students were the least likely to indicate advisor assignment.
- Though a very small sample, no off-campus students indicated that they had been assigned an advisor; students at Ft. Lee, Chester, and Midlothian indicated high degrees of advisor assignment, with Midlothian being the lowest of those three.

The final part of the examination of student understanding of the advisor assignment process is to determine if students distinguish properly between being assigned to a counselor as opposed to a faculty advisor. Respondents were asked, “If you have been assigned an advisor, is that person a counselor or a faculty member?” Of the 94 respondents,

- 30.5% indicated “counselor,”

- 33.7% indicated “faculty advisor,” and
 - 35.8% did not respond to the question.
- Of the 68 respondents who reported being in a curriculum, 23 (34%) indicated that they were assigned to a counselor; however, only 8 (12%) of the respondents were assigned to the Allied Health Preparation curriculum (069), in which a specific counselor is assigned. 44% of these students indicated that they were assigned to a faculty advisor.
 - Of the 21 respondents who reported not being assigned to a curriculum, 5 (24%) indicated that they had been assigned to a counselor.
 - Of those respondents who did not indicate a specific counselor-faculty advisor assignment, about half said they were assigned to a curriculum and about half said they weren’t assigned to a curriculum.

Do students confer with their assigned advisors often?

Respondents were very mixed in their answers to the question, “How often do you confer with your assigned advisor?” A total of 19% of students did not answer the question, which is roughly the same percentage of students who indicated that they had not been assigned an advisor; 31% indicated that they conferred with their assigned advisor each semester, 16% confer only when they have a program or transfer question, and 34% conferred very seldom or never.

- Of those who indicated that they only confer when they have a program or transfer question, 53% indicated that they were assigned to a faculty advisor, compared to 20% who said they were assigned to a counselor.

Respondents who were **least** likely to confer often with an advisor fell into these categories:

- over age 25
- attended at least 1 previous semester in the last 2 years
- attend part-time
- took 0 – 4 hours of developmental courses
- attend at night only
- are enrolled in unclassified curriculums or degree/certificate programs
- are off-campus or Chester campus students. Midlothian campus students tend to confer with their advisors more often than students on any other campus.

What is their rating of the level of help they receive from their assigned advisors?

Students’ ratings of the helpfulness of their assigned advisors were mixed, with 35% indicating “very helpful,” 23% answering “somewhat helpful,” 7% answering “not helpful at all,” and 35% giving no answer. In the “no answer” category, 21% of the respondents would be expected to give this answer, since they had indicated that they did not have an

assigned advisor, so approximately 14% of those with assigned advisors chose not to answer this question.

- When compared to the respondents' answers to whether or not they had been assigned an advisor, the more positive responses regarding advisor helpfulness came from those who answered that they were definitely assigned an advisor. Large numbers of no responses or less positive ratings of helpfulness of assigned advisors came from those who indicated that they had either not been assigned an advisor or were unsure.

How involved are students in the “informal advising system”? What reasons do they give for this involvement?

69% of respondents indicated that they did **not** have an “informal” academic advisor, for example, a favorite instructor or counselor that they turn to instead of their assigned advisor. About 19% of respondents indicated that they do use an informal advisor.

Of those who answered that they use an informal advisor,

- 67% of them reported that they had an assigned advisor,
- 44% reported that the assigned advisor was a faculty member, and
- 17% reported that the assigned advisor was a counselor.
- It made no significant difference at what time of day students took classes.
- About 1/3 are unclassified students; 61% are degree/certificate students.

How do students rate their overall experience with JTCC advising services?

The overall results of the respondents' ratings are summarized below:

- Very easy to use and informative – 32%
- Somewhat easy to use, could be more informative – 21%
- A little confusing, but the people involved are nice – 11%
- Very confusing – a lot of “run-around” is involved – 8%
- Not helpful at all – 1%
- Not applicable – 23%
- No response – 3%

A little more than half of respondents indicated that the current system is easy to use and reasonably informative; one-quarter did not give a rating of their experience at all.

Further analysis of these results shows the following:

- Students who rate the advising system positively (“very easy to use and informative,” “somewhat easy to use, could be more informative”) have the following characteristics:
 - 75% responded that they were in a curriculum at JTCC.
 - 76% indicated that they had an assigned advisor.

- Evenly split on the type of advisor – counselor or faculty advisor.
 - 60% have taken at least 1 developmental course at JTCC.
 - 74% attend during day hours (day only or both day and evening).
 - 56% are degree/certificate students.
 - 55% plan to turn to an assigned counselor or faculty advisor for help during the next registration period.
 - 23% report having an informal advisor that assists them with advising.
- Students who rate the advising system as confusing or unhelpful have the following characteristics:
 - 85% reported being in a curriculum at JTCC.
 - 80% answered that they had an assigned advisor.
 - Evenly split on the type of advisor – counselor or faculty advisor.
 - 50% were between the ages of 25 and 34.
 - 60% attend during evening hours (evening only or both day and evening).
 - Almost evenly split between degree/certificate and unclassified categories.
 - Plan to see either an assigned counselor for help or self-advise during the next registration period.
 - 15% have an informal advisor that assists them with advising.
- Students who gave a rating of “Not applicable” or did not rate their experience with the advising system at JTCC have these characteristics:
 - 54% report being in a curriculum.
 - 54% indicate that no advisor has been assigned to them.
 - 13% report having a counselor assigned as their advisor; 21% say they have a faculty advisor.
 - 54% have not taken a developmental course at JTCC.
 - 62% attend during evening hours (evening only or both day and evening).
 - 63% are unclassified students.
 - 58% plan to self-advise during the next registration period.
 - 13% have an informal advisor.

Comparing the results of the respondents’ rating of advising services by certain demographic characteristics yielded the following results:

- Between 53% - 60% of respondents in all age groups rated advising services as “easy” or “somewhat easy”; respondents ages 16 – 34 gave the highest ratings of “confusing/not helpful”; respondents 35 and older gave the highest ratings of “not applicable/no response.”
- New students gave the highest ratings of “confusing/not helpful”; reapplying students gave the highest ratings of “easy/somewhat easy”; transferring students (transferring into JTCC) gave the highest ratings of “not applicable/no response.”
- Part-time students gave the highest ratings of “confusing/not helpful” or “not applicable/no response”; most full-time students rated the system “easy/somewhat easy.”

- Students who have taken at least 2 developmental courses rate the advising system as “easy/somewhat easy” in much larger numbers than non-developmental students or developmental students who have taken only 1 course.
- 55% of respondents from either the Chester and Midlothian campuses rated the advising system as “easy/somewhat easy”; however, Midlothian students were twice as likely as Chester students to rate the system “confusing/not helpful”, while Chester students were twice as likely to rate the system “not applicable/no response.”

Who will they turn to most for help with the next semester’s registration process?

When asked, “Who will you turn to for advising help during the next registration period,” respondents answered as follows:

29% - counselor who is my assigned advisor (C-AA)

12% - assigned faculty advisor (FA)

36% - will self-advise (SA)

18% - informal advisor (favorite instructor or counselor, friend, or parent)

5% - no response

Further analysis of this data shows the following:

- 1/3 of degree/certificate students expect to turn for help with their next registration to a “counselor who is my assigned advisor”; this indicates that there may be some confusion among these students about which advisor they have actually been assigned. This may explain why so many curriculum-placed students are coming to the Counseling area expecting to be advised during registration periods.
- 55% of unclassified students expect to get help in deciding which classes to take next semester from “assigned” or “informal” advisors; 27% of them will turn to “assigned” advisors in counseling or on the faculty; 15% will turn to favorite counselors or faculty members for advice.
- Respondents who most frequently expected to turn to informal advisors for registration help are CSC students (27%).
- When considered by time of attendance (day only, evening only, or both day and evening), no more than ¼ of students expect to see a faculty advisor for registration help, regardless of time of attendance.
- 59% of evening only students expect to self-advise; only 3% of these students expect to see a faculty advisor for help.
- 28% of students attending both day and evening classes expect to self-advise.
- The students who most expect to consult an informal advisor are day only students.

- Students who intend to turn to assigned advisors tend to give very positive ratings of the advising system; those who intend to self-advise tended to give “not applicable” ratings of the advising system – only 39% of these students gave positive ratings of the system.
- When comparing the results of students who gave relatively positive and negative ratings of the advising system, the expectation of help in advising shifted from assigned advisors to self-advising, not toward the increased use of informal advisors.
- Nearly 60% of those who did not rate the advising system expect to self-advise during their next registration period; 25% of these students expect to see an informal advisor.
- Non-developmental students are twice as likely to self-advise as developmental students.
- The longer students remain in the developmental education program, the more likely they are to self-advise or see an informal advisor for registration help.