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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Introduction

Advising programs serve as a conduit between the university, and the students’ educational, personal and career goals. Along with the academic content and personal development, academic advising is part of a well-oiled machine that serves a fundamental role in post-secondary education.

An essential component in long-term retention is the ongoing and personal contact of faculty and staff with students (Kadar, 2001; Tinto, 1993). Kadar (2001) stated, “The advising process provides an opportunity to guide students in setting and achieving their goals by working together on exploring where they are in the process, what they want, and what are the options available to them” (p. 174). But as academic majors vary in content, so do advising programs and their delivery systems.

Campus Review

In the Spring of 2014, an examination of advising practices was conducted by the Campus Coordinator of Academic Advising at Fresno State. A total of 25 meetings, with 148 participants, revealed information regarding the advising models employed on campus. The intended purpose was to get a broad cross section of information from the campus community, which included administrators, faculty, staff and students. The following chart displays the meeting and participant breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Meetings</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans/Assoc Deans</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs/Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Number of Individuals Participated | 148
---|---
Deans/Assoc Deans | 14
Chairs/Faculty | 73
Staff | 50
Students | 11

Advising Models

The participants disclosed the various advising practices utilized on campus. Schools/Colleges, departments, and student support programs use a variety of methods for advising to include the following (Appendix A):

- Split (Centralized & Faculty) – some advising (e.g. General Education) is in an administrative unit such as an advising or counseling center with a director and staff generally housed in one location. Major advising is done by the department/college.

- Split (Decentralized & Faculty) - advising services are provided by faculty and staff in their academic departments/colleges (e.g. CHHS).

- Decentralized Only – advising services are provided independently in the department/college (e.g. CSB, KSOEHD)

- Faculty Only - faculty serve as advisors for all students in the degree program (e.g. LCOE).

Common Themes

The interviews conducted were centered around four main questions. Participants were asked to provide feedback regarding the following (Specific comments can be found in Appendices B – E):

1. Can you give examples where advising is working well?
2. Where might it not be working so well?

3. How organized is advising on our campus?

4. What would be an ideal advising model?

Once the data was collected, the comments from the participants revealed four main categories, each containing common themes regarding advising practices on our campus. (Specific comments can be found in Appendices F – I).

*Where/When Advising Is Working Well*

**Theme #1: Understanding Policies & Resources** - Many individuals felt advising was working well for those who understood the policies and procedures on campus. Various programs were applauded, e.g. nursing, Kinesiology, Craig School of Business, for doing a good job with advising.

**Theme #2: Relationships** – Having a good rapport with students was seen as a positive contributor to advising.

**Theme #3: Desire/Interest in Advising** – For those interested, the task of advising was working well. Those faculty appear to be more engaged and willing to work with students.

**Theme #4: Time/Support** – Some departments have a course in the major that integrates advising, or even assigned time for faculty. Those with decentralized units also like the structure of permanent advisors.

*Concerns*

**Theme #1: Training & Consistency of Advising** – A majority of individuals felt there is a lack of resources related to advising. Policies are complex, and with limited training available, there is little consistency with advising across campus.
There was a fair amount of concern for inaccurate information given to students. Also, concern was expressed for the difficulty in understanding the DARS reports by both faculty and students.

**Theme #2: Inefficient Processes** – The multitude of memos and letters that need to be drafted were considered daunting and inefficient. There was a strong desire to streamline the process for financial aid letters. In addition, the mandatory advising milestones were viewed as cumbersome by some faculty.

**Theme #3: Student Advisor Ratio & Lack of Time** – The load for many advisors was considered too big, particularly for those departments/colleges that do not have a decentralized advising unit and rely on faculty advising. Also, there was concern for the need for summer advising. Faculty are here on a limited basis, which makes serving the students challenging.

**Theme #4: Information & Lack of Communication** – Many individuals felt they were not well informed of advising policies, procedures or initiatives. They expressed a concern for the lack of communication between departments and offices.

**Theme #5: Need for Assigned Advisors** – Some shared their desire for having advisors assigned to students. Currently, most students on campus do not have an assigned advisor, which creates confusion and uncertainty of where to go for advising.

*Ideal Advising Model*

**Theme #1: Split (Decentralized & Faculty)** – A majority of those interviewed liked the idea of having a Split Model in their department/college. A decentralized
unit, with professional staff advisors, was desirable, with faculty participating in academic advising, and/or career advising and mentoring.

Theme #2: Split (Centralized & Faculty) – Some feel that a Centralized unit can do a better job at coordinating and communicating information to students, but still want faculty to be involved in the advising process.

Theme #3: Faculty Only – Five out of 38 responses felt a Faculty Only model was best. It was expressed that it would be ideal to have specific faculty in the department assigned to advising.

Theme #4: Split (Model not specified) – Some expressed the desire to use a Split Model, but did not differentiate between utilizing a Centralized or Decentralized unit along with the faculty.

Suggestions For Improving Advising

Theme #1: Campus Communication - Most feel we need better communication and collaboration amongst departments and offices across campus, with suggestions to make information more readily available, implement a university advising website, and to make better use of degree flowcharts and roadmaps.

Theme #2: More Support (Time, Training, Resources) – Some feel the university needs to provide better resources in order to support advising. This could be in the form of release time, stipends and additional training.

Theme #3: Assigned Advisors – Some stated that assigned advisors would be helpful. It would decrease the confusion and uncertainty for students in knowing where to seek advising.
Theme #4: Mandatory Advising - Some shared the recommendation to continue the practice of Mandatory Advising Holds. They believe it helps keep students on track, and provides intervention for at-risk students. One particular suggestion was to mandate a hold based on the number of times a student has come in for advising (e.g. generate hold if they have not seen an advisor in the past year), rather than at specific points, such as the 75th unit.

In summary, the interviewed participants were very clear about their opinions related to advising. It was simple to identify the common themes, and interesting they were shared by the administrators, faculty, staff and students alike. It is also important to mention some of the groups were asked about their thoughts on using an Advising ePortfolio system. For the purposes of this study, those comments are only found in the appendices, but not included in the Summary of Findings.
DATA

Collected from meetings for the Fresno State Advising Report
Spring 2014
Where/When Advising Is Working Well

- Understanding Policies & Resources = 37%
- Relationships = 26%
- Desire/Interest in Advising = 16%
- Time/Support = 16%
- Misc. = 5%
Concerns

- Training & Consistency of Advising = 31%
- Inefficient Processes = 22%
- Student/Advisor Ratio & Lack of Time = 21%
- Information & Lack of Communication = 13%
- Need for Assigned Advisors = 7%
- Misc. = 7%
Ideal Advising Model

- Split (Decentralized & Faculty) = 45%
- Split (Centralized & Faculty) = 16%
- Faculty = 13%
- Split (Model not specified) = 11%
- Misc. = 16%
Suggestions for Improving Advising

- Campus Communication = 34%
- More Support (Time, Training, Resources) = 24%
- Assigned Advisors = 18%
- Mandatory Advising = 16%
- Misc. = 7%
RECOMMENDATIONS

The campus interviews revealed information regarding the perceptions, concerns and suggestions related to advising. Administrators, faculty, staff and students were candid about the practices currently employed, and shared various ideas about possible ways for our campus to improve advising. While some things are working well, there are definitely areas our institution could improve to help contribute to student success. After careful analysis and consideration, the following recommendations are being proposed:

Advising Models

It is important for a large university to have a comprehensive advising structure that meets the needs of all students. Currently, this is a multi-model campus and the advising practices vary between Colleges and Schools. The advising structure should be carefully examined, taking in to consideration variables such as student/advisor ratio (enrollment); administrative structure; to what extent is the faculty interested in advising; curriculum and career advising (Pardee, 2004). According to Gordon, et al. (2008), “The more students are underprepared, undecided, diverse, first-generation, and commuter, the more important it is to have a highly organized system for advising”. Furthermore, colleges/schools must recognize that students needs vary throughout their college experience. Pleasants McDonnell, et al. (2014) stated, “A coordinated approach to providing comprehensive supports takes into account the students’ needs from entry to exit”. A single model that compliments academic advising, mentoring and career coaching would enhance the advising experience, and provide consistent and comprehensive services for students, staff and faculty.
Improving Campus Policies Related to Advising

Campus policies and procedures can help provide structure and expectations for advising. They should be clear, concise and accessible to all constituents (administrators, faculty, staff and students). The following should be examined:

a. Advising Vision and Mission Statement – Representatives from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs should develop a well-defined Vision and Mission Statement for advising. The statement ought to establish goals and expectations for the advising process across campus. According to Habley (2013), “A mission statement guides the decisions we make about what we do and how we accomplish what we do”.

b. Revision of APM 205 – The university Policy on Undergraduate Academic Advising (Appendix J) has not been updated since March 1984. The Student Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate should re-examine the policy, and make appropriate updates to include a report by colleges/schools of the structure of advising services provided in their unit.

c. Campus Definition of Advising – A campus definition of the different types of advising (e.g. academic, career) will help the colleges/schools create an appropriate structure and expectations for those providing advising services.

Collaboration/Communication Between Offices

Better lines of campus communication regarding advising should be established. Information needs to be readily accessible and shared between offices so all are aware of campus policies and procedures. Furthermore, the communication among offices will increase the awareness of services available to
students, therefore contributing to their ultimate success. Marquart (2014) stated, “When we bring a holistic view to our students’ experiences, we create an environment where students are getting the best of all facets of higher education and well-rounded interactions with multiple staff”.

**Council of Advisors**

To ensure the continued success and effectiveness of our university advising system, a Council of Advisors should be established. The Campus Coordinator of Academic Advising could lead the group, to be made up of representatives from each of the colleges/schools and Student Affairs units. While meeting on a regular basis, the group would be responsible for reviewing and making recommendations for university advising policies and procedures. These members would serve as liaisons to their respective areas, which would help with communication and collaboration among campus offices.

**Assessment of Advising**

It is critical to evaluate the effectiveness of the advising services provided on our campus, and therefore the university should have an assessment plan developed for advising. The Council of Advisors could be charged with designing and implementing an assessment process for the campus, taking in to consideration the various advising structures. An evaluation will help ensure the quality of the advising services provided, as well as provide meaningful data.

**Advising Website**

A website dedicated to advising would be useful for administrators, faculty, staff, and most of all, students. A site that pertains to “all things advising” could include
information such as a directory of advisors, policies and procedures, information on exams, student involvement, and support programs to name a few. Various links would allow users to get information quickly and easily.

**Training Program**

A formalized training program should be established in order to appropriately train new staff and faculty. An explanation of campus policies, procedures and expectations for advising is necessary in order to provide the best services possible for our students. The training program would serve as a resource for staff and faculty who deliver information related to academic and/or career advising. Regarding advising services, O’Banion (2012) stated, “Academic advising is the second most important function. If it is not conducted with the utmost efficiency and effectiveness, the most important function – instruction – will fail to ensure that students navigate the curriculum to completion”.

In summary, it is important for our university to create an advising structure that is useful and effective for everyone. We must provide support and training for advisors and ensure there is access to pertinent information. Clear and consistent advising will aid in the success of our students reaching their educational goals. Pascarella & Terenzini (2005) stated, “Research consistently indicates that academic advising can play a role in students’ decisions to persist and in their chances of graduating”. An article titled *Could Fixing Academic Advising Fix Higher Education* suggested,

“While advising by itself certainly can’t change the curriculum and co-curriculum, it can create a vital connection between students and their education – helping them to become more reflective and strategic about the choices they are making and the learning they are engaged in” (Hunter & White, 2004).
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### Colleges/Schools & Department Advising Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Advising Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAH</td>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mass Communication &amp; Journalism</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Classical Languages &amp; Literature</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenian Studies</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>Communicative Disorders &amp; Deaf Studies</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Administration</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth &amp; Environmental Science</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano &amp; Latin American Studies</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCAST</td>
<td>Agricultural Business</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animal Science &amp; Ag. Education</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child, Family &amp; Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Science &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Technology</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant Science</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viticulture</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enology</td>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSOEHID</td>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>De decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOE</td>
<td>Civil &amp; Geomatics Engineering</td>
<td>Faculty (Supplemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering</td>
<td>Faculty (Supplemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>Faculty (Supplemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>Faculty (Supplemented)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smittcamp</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split (Centralized/Faculty)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split (Decentralized/Faculty)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings with Deans/Associate Deans
Notes re. Advising Practices:

• Regarding advising structure ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College:</th>
<th>Advising Model:</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCAST</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>Split Model (De-centralized unit &amp; Faculty)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Split Model (De-centralized unit &amp; Faculty)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAH</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>De-centralized unit (some faculty)</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOE</td>
<td>Split Model (De-centralized unit &amp; Faculty)</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSOEHD</td>
<td>De-centralized unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Included 1 staff member

Total = 16

• Where is advising working well in your school/college?
  - Food Science has a 1 unit Service course where students get advising and prepare a roadmap (JCAST).
  - Ag. Business and Viticulture do group advising well (JCAST).
  - Faculty pride themselves on having those relationships with students (JCAST).
  - De-centralized advising unit, w/faculty involvement (CHHS).
  - Psychology has de-centralized unit (CSM).
  - Faculty do well with Graduate students (CSM).
  - There are some faculty that have a real interest in advising (CSS).
  - Large majors (e.g. Crim) faculty have assigned time (CSS).
  - Music department (CAH).
  - Distribution by option ... it has engaged faculty (CAH).
  - Requirements in RTP so it serves as an incentive (CAH).
  - Students getting what they need from the Undergraduate Student Services Center (CSB).
  - Center is very pro-active and has a positive atmosphere (CSB).
  - For those faculty that are interested, works well (LCOE).
  - Career advice from faculty. Students need mentoring and coaching (LCOE).
  - College is pro-active with at-risk students (LCOE).

• Where might it be “broken”?
  - Faculty load does not adequately support advising (JCAST).
  - Works well with some faculty, but not others (CHHS).
  - Difficult to keep up with changes (CHHS).
  - Volume vs. faculty load (CHHS).
  - Increased frequency of contacts [milestones] (CHHS).
  - No metrics on quality of advising (CSM).
- Chairs do not receive list of DQ students (CSM).
- Faculty are not informed of how to manage at-risk students (CSM).
- Career advising (CSM).
- Diversity of faculty and students needs to be addressed (CSM).
- Some faculty refuse “to be present” (CSS).
- Inequity in the number of majors - e.g., ratio for Geography is 5/1, whereas ratio from Criminology is 115/1 (CSS).
- Do not have enough resources to “beef up” advising services (CSS).
- Faculty great with advising “mentoring”, but not necessarily with academic advising (CAH).
- Lack of ability to give release time and lack of resources in the college (CAH).
- Would like more faculty involvement with all options (CSB).
- More SSP’s to work in Center (CSB).
- Better communication to get students to come in (CSB).
- Lack of use of electronic files (CSB).
- Some faculty spend a lot of time on advising, and others do not (LCOE).
- Not enough resources and time — volume and time is what faculty complain about the most re. advising (LCOE).

- How do you feel about a Centralized or Decentralized Model? Split Model?
  - Have had these conversations with faculty and there doesn’t seem to be a lot of interest in our college (JCAST).
  - Need to maximize and leverage resources better [referring to interns] (CHHS).
  - Long term goal to enhance Student Services Center (de-centralized unit in the college) … but who is going to pay for it? Should be Level A allocation (CHHS).
  - De-centralized preferred. Implementing the Advising and Resource Center (CSM).
  - Students need an opportunity to sit down with a professor … and faculty need to be versed in academia (CSS).
  - “Always been an advocate for an assigned advisor” (CAH).
  - Split model is an optimal situation (CAH).
  - Split model … SSP handles curricular/academic and Faculty provide mentoring/career advice/elective suggestions (CSB).
  - Ideal would be an enhanced staff advising center with faculty handling career coaching & mentoring, but resources are a big issue — with 1500 majors, would need 2 – 3 advisors (LCOE).
  - Mandatory advising would need to include faculty so they stay engaged (LCOE).

- In your opinion, how organized is advising on our campus?
  - Not sure it is working “well” anywhere (JCAST).
  - Need more faculty [if going to continue with faculty advising model] (JCAST).
  - Simplify options [cut back on majors] (JCAST).
- Does not appear to be very organized (CSM).
- Minimal training (CSM).
- Like a "Centralized" model for G.E. (CSS).
- Ideal to have 2 – 3 appointed faculty doing advising (CSS).
- Should offer faculty stipends for advising (CSS).
- University needs to make a decision whether we reward faculty (CSS).
- Can be improved, currently very unsystematic (CAH).
- "We do not know enough about it (campus advising), but we like how we are doing it here" (CSB).
- "If there are good things going on elsewhere, we have not tapped in to it.” (LCOE).
- Mandates have put burden back on departments. There are too many holds, and the holds are redundant to the Engineering holds (LCOE).
- Confusion with academic policies – not enough training for advisors (LCOE).
- Communication between Advising Services and colleges not good (LCOE).
Meeting w/Chairs & Faculty
Notes re. Advising Practices:

In the interest of time ....

- Briefly explain the advising practices in your depts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Advising Model</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCAST</td>
<td>Faculty do a majority of the advising. Some group advising (mandatory in CFS). Some required courses incorporate advising component (e.g. ASCI 1, Ag Ed 50, Nutr 61). Students assigned by faculty.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHS</td>
<td>Split Model – Decentralized unit and Faculty for major</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>Split Model – Centralized and Faculty for majors. Some programs in the college are supplemented by a decentralized unit. Moving towards a decentralized unit for the entire college.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS</td>
<td>Chairs handle academic advising. Faculty advise to specific majors. G.E. advising is done by Advising Services. Criminology has Coordinators advise for options and uses a Blackboard shell. Also, CRIM 1 course has advising component.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAH</td>
<td>English faculty handle advising (DAA has list); Music divided by discipline; MCL divided by credential and Spanish majors; COMM shared by faculty &amp; chair handles course substitutions; MCJ shared by faculty (4 options) according to alphabet.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSB</td>
<td>Decentralized unit handles all majors. There are a few faculty that help with options and career counseling.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOE</td>
<td>Faculty are primary advisors w/Pathways Center supplementing and working w/at-risk students. Some departments use group advising. Initial evaluation of transfer units is done by chair. College has additional mandatory advising.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSOEHD</td>
<td>Decentralized Advising Unit (Professional Staff)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Bernadette Muscat, Criminology - Coordinators advise for options and uses a Blackboard shell. Also, CRIM 1 course has advising component.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Mathew Buehler, Aerospace Studies – Split Model, AF Faculty and Departments (Intrusive Advising)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Honora Chapman, Smittcamp Family Honors College – Split Model, SFHC provides GE Advising and departments handle major.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Lorenzo Rios, Military Science &amp; Leadership – 4 Professors dedicated to advising different student level (freshmen, sophomore, etc..)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Council of Chairs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 73
• What are some of your concerns about advising?

- Student ratio/advisor varies drastically (CSS).
- No summer pay to advise (CSS).
- Endless request of letters (e.g. Financial Aid) – not an efficient process. Should have template letters and software that populates course options (CSS).
- Unit caps make it difficult for students to pursue dual major (CSS).
- All of the different academic plans for military students (CSS).
- Roadmaps not helpful (too many options) (CSS).
- Lack of resources; don’t know, not trained, as to what is available (CSS).
- Faculty not informed of policies (e.g. Change of major policy) (CSS).
- Don’t like having to know all the rules and policies (e.g. substitution, unit limits) (CSS).
- Policies have become more and more complex (CSS).
- Emails from university advisors (across campus) asking advising questions about engineering majors (LCOE).
- “We want to have a say in course evaluation” (LCOE).
- Time consuming … especially to advise immediately (LCOE).
- Financial Aid letters, memos and substitutions (LCOE).
- More information needed on-line (LCOE).
- @ graduation, sometimes appears they have been told by outside advisors they can waive a class or requirement (LCOE).
- Chair picks up most of the slack b/c they are around and available (CAH).
- Thought it worked better when 1 person was assigned. They were better trained and developed the expertise (CAH).
- Uniformity of advice (or lack thereof) (CAH).
- Not optimal to plan a lot of advising activities in summer (CAH).
- A lot of differences in motivation amongst faculty to advise (CAH).
- Don’t know who my advisees are – not updated in PS (CAH).
- Advising Services office – lots of incorrect information given to students (JCAST).
- Peer advising – “pulling their ignorance” (JCAST).
- Lack of student ownership and their responsibility of the degree (JCAST).
- Need easy access to list of “W” courses (JCAST).
- Financial Aid letters (Faculty)
- Sheer volume (Faculty)
- Students do not understand DARS report (Faculty)
- Course substitution letters are not put in DARS until graduation (Faculty)
- Summer load (lack of available time) (Faculty)
- Faculty load (CHHS).
- Keeping up with policy changes (CHHS).
- Some people do it well, and some don’t (CHHS).
- Financial Aid letters (CHHS).
- Inefficiency of sending multiple letters to Financial Aid (CHHS).
- Figuring out DARS (CHHS).
- Do not feel well informed (CHHS).
- Would like to see more mandatory advising & earlier (AS).
- Limit # of times to change major (AS).
- Need to better utilize roadmaps (AS).
- Countless mistakes from Advising Services (CSM).
- Need better support from Advising Services (CSM).
- Advisors across campus can lift holds which prevents students from seeing appropriate advisor (CSM).
- Financial Aid letters (CSM).
- “Advising, teaching, mentoring is different. If the administration values this, they need to be accountable and support it” (Cof C).
- University needs to devote resources at the college level. It has to be set aside for release time or professional staff (SFHC).
- Recommended to create decentralized units (SFHC).
- Course substitutions and petitions should be done by chairs (SFHC).
- Better “cross talk” between academic departments and special programs. Need more collaborative adventure (MSL).
- Need Best Practices literature (MSL).

- Preference of “ideal” advising model ...
  - Split model would be ideal … wouldn’t mind talking with students about courses, careers, but don’t want to handle the minutiae of advising (CSS).
  - “Perfect world .. wouldn’t do minutiae. If we are going to, we need to be trained” (CSS).
  - Split model (Faculty/Hernan/Rick). Like the idea of ‘decentralized” (LCOE).
  - We should be able to influence student career choices (CAH – MCL).
  - Keep in department (CAH – Music).
  - Split Model – Centralized and Faculty (CAH – COMM).
  - Split Model – Centralized and Faculty (CAH – ENGL).
  - Split Model – Centralized and Faculty “the faculty should be mentors” (CAH – Phil).
  - Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty (JCAST).
  - Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty advising for career, mentoring, course options (Faculty).
  - Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty to relieve some of the burden of advising (CHHS).
  - Split Model – Aerospace Studies Faculty and Departments
  - Decentralized Model w/faculty mentoring, career coaching, etc. (CSM).
  - Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty (“CSB is a great example”) (SFHC).
Thoughts on eAdvising ....

- "Even if you train faculty, you will never get them all on board" (CSS).
- No substitute for face-to-face interaction (CSS).
- This would "front load" the advising session (CSS).
- Concerned about time (LCOE).
- Wish students could have access to PS notes (LCOE).
- Sounds like a lot of work to set up (CAH).
- Those faculty that don't do a lot of talking aren't likely to view the prompts. Just one more thing to look in to (CAH).
- Interested in serving on committee to examine further (Faculty).
- Good use for examining major and psychosocial issues.

Misc.:

- Inequity in advising load (CSS).
- If Administration values advising, they need to support/provide resources (CSS).
- How about formula .... E.g. per every x# of advisees, x# of release time (CSS).
- Need to publicize liaisons (CAH).
- Roadmaps – need a way to link them more easily for students (CAH).
- DARS reports could be more use friendly (CAH).
- Financial Aid memos are a huge waste of time (CAH).
- In favor of academic holds for "at risk" students (CSM).
- Need release time for faculty interested in talented in advising (CofC).
- Working well .... Being able to read the "magical language" of DARS (SFHC).
- SFHC doesn't just advise, but also provides mentoring, coaching, career counseling (SFHC).
- One of the most comprehensive programs is nursing. They are very clear on expectations and the faculty advisor communicates well (MSL).
Meeting w/Staff
Notes re. Advising Practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Individuals</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group #1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group #2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group #3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Leadership Team</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Advising Unit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What are some of your concerns about advising?
  - All new freshmen should be assigned an advisor. There is a disconnect between caring for the students.
  - One of the first questions students ask is “who is my advisor?”
  - Need to assign advisor early for outreach purposes.
  - Perhaps dedicated advisors for freshman class (like H.S.), then passed to major advisor.
  - Consistency of information.
  - Communication to students needs to be better.
  - Student Support Services reviews grades after Fall semester. How do we become co-curricular with Academic Affairs.
  - There is a disconnect between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.
  - We are so fragmented with advising across campus.
  - Evaluations stopped sending DARS to graduating students.
  - Making sure students get advising at the senior year.
  - Colleges that do not have a de-centralized unit. “Those that have a de-centralized unit, we see a lot less deficiencies.”
  - Departments are re-active rather than pro-active.
  - We need a new process for the large volume of memos needed for exceptions.

- Preference of “ideal” advising model …
  - Decentralized preferred
  - Mandatory advising at the senior year.
  - Departments could send out senior reports.
• Thoughts on eAdvising . . .
  - Would depend on how receptive the departments are.
  - Students love anything with technology.

• Misc.:
  - Suggested to have SAFARI for faculty
  - Kinesiology is doing an excellent job at advising!
What influences students to take 12-14 units per semester?
- Time conflicts in a schedule when the student is restricted to one of the meeting patterns (i.e. MWF or TTh).
  Restrictions are due to work schedule or ridesharing. Students are concerned with having too many final exams on the same days due to meeting patterns.
- Students cannot get into classes due to impaction. Wait listing has become a more difficult method to getting into a class than it once was.
- Policy changes such as an Add/Drop policy that is more restrictive than in the past. A policy timeline would be useful.
- Messaging:
  - Financial aid requires >= 12 units. Students take the minimum for FA.
  - Freshman students who work or have family obligations are encouraged to start slow and take 12-13 units their first semester “to get their feet wet” with the idea that they can make up the difference in the summer. However, many classes have been cut from the summer schedule.
  - STEM students are sent the message to take their time due to the difficulty of the classes.
- Confidence influences units taken per semester. When the student performs well, they attempt more the following semester. If they perform poorly, they take fewer units the following semester.
- Some students feel too challenged to take 15 or more units. Transfer students who took 15+ at City College, feel CSU is more difficult and choose to take less units.

What patterns have been noticed in students taking 12-14 units?
- FTF & FT transfers take 12-14 units.
- STEM students take 12-14 units.
- Students attempt to follow the road map but cannot get classes due to lack of availability. This is especially true for prerequisite courses that are in high demand.
- Ag/Animal Sci works at keeping freshmen at 15 units.
- Students perceive they are behind if they need remediation.
- Students realize that their unit load is too high after the drop date.
- Students have been taking classes that they do not necessarily need.

What are the bottleneck courses?
- Chem 1a, Crim2, Calc, PH 92, Bio 1a & 1b. Too many and too quick to list. Follow-up?
- Students have been known to change majors to get into the high impacted classes that they need. [Implying that if the student is in the major, they have priority/preference in enrollment to certain classes?]

What documents include messaging about unit load?
- Barkbook – new student handbook. Message is that students have the choice on unit load and time to degree. The handbook states time to degree is 4-5 years if unit load is 12-15 units per semester. [not verified].
- Advisors encourage >=15 units only to the students who state they want time to degree in 4 years. If they work or have a family and 4 years T2D is not a priority, they do not encourage >=15.
- Most advising during Dog Days is done in groups therefore presentation is generic.
- Dog Days is tailored to the less confident and lower achieving student. The confident/high achieving student may be hearing the wrong message. Possibly explore having 2 presentations, targeting the message to the particular group.
Do advisors have profile information on students?
No, not for Dog Days. Yes, later in the semester. They have access to transcripts, holds, ELM scores, etc.

Part II – Janell Morillo

What works well in advising?
- Assigning a faculty/[major?] advisor in the portal.
- Departments refer students to advising services for general advising and the bigger picture.
- Departments are good at providing specific major advising.
- Advising Services’ implementation of case load assignments for first semester undeclared students.
- Access to colleagues for support in assisting students. [However, mention later: It is not always easy to identify the appropriate colleague for the necessary resources. No list of all campus advisors].
- Good collaboration between service providers.
- Campus Advisors Network
- Walk-in period held 2 weeks prior to ________.
- Advising campaigns coordinated and timed with admission/records announcements.
- Technology advising: Skype-like technology and chatting. Only one site and advisors take turns manning the chat. Not as popular the 2nd year. Waiting on additional technology for a complete roll-out.

What does not work well in advising?
- Not enough training. When training occurs, the majority of attendees are student assistant advisors. Low attendance by staff and faculty advisors. Faculty may have scheduling conflicts with training.
- Students get passed around while trying to get information. Could be a service issue.
- No advisors on campus for evening students.
- Students are confused with the role of major advising and general advising. Messages sent are not always clear on the type of advising they are addressing.
- Wrong information is provided (such as wrong road maps). Old documents/information are still in circulation and distributed to students. Explore centralizing road maps and when classes are offered (spring/fall).
- Colleges do not have consistent web pages on advising. It is difficult and sometimes impossible to identify who the advisors are in a college. Phone calls are often required to figure out whom to refer the student to for additional services.
- Make use of flowcharts to remain consistent with the services
- Ensure that accurate information is used in the catalogs
- MA1 and MA2 warnings need clarification between major advising vs. general advising. [Sounds like students get the warning and are confused about which advisor to see to get it cleared.]

What are the preferred models for advising?
- Health and Human Services’ model works well but they are understaffed.
- General advising is required regardless of model.
- Centralized could allow for fast and accurate dissemination of information to all advisors/students/need-to-knows.
- Centralized could do a better job at coordinating, communicating and sharing information. Some group members felt AS could be the hub, if centralized...others were unsure on the matter of the “who and where” of the hub.

What are your thoughts on E-Advising and E-Portfolio? FTF answer specific questions online prior to first advising meeting.
- Good starting discussion.
- How do you make students answer the questions online? Ans: possibly tie it to holds.
  - Not all first advising meetings are individual. Many are group advising. Individual meeting may not be occurring to release the hold.
March 10, 2014

Focus Group #2 of Academic Advisors
Discussion Notes

Attendees:
EOP - Lupe Maldonado, Mui Vuong, Victor Olivares | Advising Services - Kathleen Molina, Carmen Avila
OIE – Angel Sanchez, Joann Venturi, Marie Fernandez | Ugrad Studies – Janell Morillo

Part I – Angel Sanchez

What influences students to take 12-14 units per semester? Are there any messages related to the number of units a student should take?

Messaging:
First-time freshmen are encouraged to enroll in 12-15 units. Second year and greater, students are encouraged to take at least 15 units. It is believed that the college road maps are messaging 4 years.*

Influences:

Student who require remediation have difficulty getting 15 units the first year due to pre-reqs and this delays graduating in 4 years.

The belief is that students are limited to the number of units they enroll because they cannot always get into the courses.

Priority enrollment has a maximum enrollment limit of 16 units. Students are encouraged to enroll in max because they cannot add any more until open enrollment. By the point of open enrollment, classes are full and not available.
Enrollments in many courses that fulfill prerequisites are often limited to majors. This limitation creates bottlenecks and delays the new students. Some of these courses are first-year, basic entry courses. Ex: chem 3a.

Number of units taken is impacted by students who work, especially those who work full time. Personal lives impact number of units taken. One person believes that financial aid is not awarding as much as it did previously and therefore, students must work more.

FCC [transfer] students may not have an easy time starting at CSU, Fresno. Sometimes, transfer student transcripts are not evaluated or posted in time for students to register for classes that require pre-reqs. Transfer students are then recommended to take the 4 GE classes, which is only 12 units. This is more likely to happen to the spring admits but occasionally the fall admits experience this, as well.

Students who are on probationary disqualification are restricted to enroll in 13 units or less during the following semester.* This impacts approximately 1800 to 2200 students. However, sometimes the PDQ hold status does not get applied until after the student has enrolled in the next semester. [If hold is late, what is the consequence or impact to units enrolled during the 3rd semester?]

Many advisors use college road maps; however the road maps are not consistent. Some are better than others. They are usually found online and sometimes difficult to find. They are typically a 4 year road map.* Lupe advises juniors and seniors. She does not use roadmap. She reviews DARS w/ students. Most students want to graduate as soon as possible.

Office of Institutional Effectiveness, (IV)
There is no standardized advisor training.

‘Follow up:
1. Communicate that the handout on units is “enrolled” units, not earned units.
2. Update the Enrolled units handout (Units by Category and Student Level) to include Earned units – (HY)
3. Q-Victor: What effect did the remediation policy in 1998 have on the number of units enrolled? Comparison of pre-policy and post policy data tables. [Hongtao says we have data prior to 1998, if it is decided that we investigate this further.]
4. Victor – Suggests talking to Tony Cantu, President of FCC regarding the challenges FCC students have with transferring to CSU, Fresno.
5. Q-Kathleen: How many FTF who took 12-15 units were on probationary disqualification (PDQ) as a result of their first semester performance? Between fall and spring, how many students rolled over with a 2.5 or higher GPA?
6. Q-Victor: What do the college roadmaps say regarding 12-14 unit messaging? Do they encourage 15+ units?

Part II – Janell Morillo

What works well in advising?

Early and heavy, intrusive [pro-active] advising works best, especially for new students. Students on contracts and advisers assigned case loads. EOP has contracts and case load assignment on approximately 1600 students. Their students get a lot of advising.

Starting the student/advisor relationship early is important. This relation begins at Dog Days for undeclared students. If connection is not made there, students typically do not come back for advising. Some students get waivers to not attend Dog Days.

Students benefit from offering a holistic approach to advising as oppose to exclusive academic advising.

Using DARS to advise students works well. DARS makes suggestions on what courses to take. DARS is changing to another product.

Flow charts are recommended for 1st and 2nd year students. School of Business has a good example of flow charts. Road maps do not work well for students who need remediation. Remediation is not included in road maps.

What does not work well in advising?

Advising needs to be better defined. Some students get waivers out of dog days, such as Summer Bridge, CAMP. Not all students get equal advising.

Group advising is not really advising; it is sharing information. [This relates to the need for defining “advising” and using the term appropriately.] Students get “checked off” for attending these so called group advising meetings as though they are individual advising sessions. Mandatory group advising that requires attendance before the student can receive individual advising is a problem. It creates holds which delay the students from getting early individual advising.

Only a small population of students receives intrusive advising. It should be offered to more students.
Road maps do not work well for students who need remediation. Remediation is not included in road maps. The road maps are not consistent across colleges and departments. For improved consistency, it might be beneficial that some guidelines be established for the development of road.

Communication between all the advising groups is not good. Information is often found out late or through a student.

There is a lack of baseline advising guidelines and training for advisors which contributes to lack of consistency in advising. Could a summer training program be offered for baseline advising? Look at CSU, Northridge for a model. [?]**

Policies related to advising may be rolled out too fast and not enough planning done prior to implementation.

**What are the preferred models for advising?**

Centralized is helpful because it is uniform. There needs to be connection to colleges as well. Some liked the approach of having advising liaisons at colleges. Some advisers have just recently been assigned to colleges.

Colleges should have their own centralized advising units.

Summer advising is an issue because faculty are not on campus to advise students. Triad advising works well because it helps cover when faculty are not available.

Does our advising model need to change due to our demographics changing, ie more first-generation students? [Angel] - Yes, first-generation students need more structure. [Janell] - The model is not as important as the training for our changing demographics.

**What are your thoughts on E-Advising and E-Portfolio? FTF answer specific questions online prior to first advising meeting.**

This sounds like something geared toward academic advising as oppose to holistic advising. Students may not want to share personal experiences in a pre-questionnaire. Personal issues do get in the way of their success.

**Follow up:**

1. Could a summer training program be offered for baseline advising? [compared to summer training offered for course redesign]. Possible model for advising training at CSU, Northridge.
Focus Group #3 of Academic Advisors

Discussion Notes

March 13, 2014

Attendees:
CSB - Catherine Kuchar
KOSEHD - Jessica Choy & Johnny Conley
HHS - Frank Castro & Crystal Bishop
OIE – Angel Sanchez, Joann Venturi
Undergrad Studies – Janell Morillo

Part I – Angel Sanchez

What influences students to take 12-14 units per semester?

Increase in number of students and lack of availability of courses. Students want to take more classes but they just are not available.

FTF and transfer student register later than continuing students and therefore have less courses and schedules to pick from. When FTF cannot register for foundation classes (due to being full), they immediately get behind. When students cannot get foundation classes, they try to take classes that meet their electives. In cases where electives have been met or the major has no electives, students take random classes just to meet their 12 unit minimum for financial aid.

How class offerings are scheduled can be a limitation. Some courses are not offered each semester. Sometimes they are not even offered once per year. Students have to compete to get into courses with few sections, such as math 10A, Biology ? . These are courses that multiple majors need and sometimes certain majors get priority.

Impacted majors require a higher GPA. So students will take less units with the expectation that they will perform better and earn a better GPA. This concept applies to undergrads who are planning on attending graduate school.

Commuter students might be impacted due to course availability for limited schedule.

Students work full time and take the minimum 12 units to qualify for FA. Students have families and are balancing work, family and minimum 12 units required for FA.

PDQ'd students are capped at 13 units.

Messaging:
  • The belief is that FGS and FTF are advised to take only 12 units [their first semester or first year] to improve their chances of success during this time period.
• Students may continue to believe that 12 units is better for success beyond the first year and throughout their academic career.
• Does this message continue after first year for FGS?
• Remediation students take 12 units to insure success. [not sure if this is messaging or policy]
• HHS students are encouraged to not work more than 20 hours per week.
• Message from financial aid is 12 units.
• Written messaging -- Roadmaps = 15 units.

Are you aware of any surveys conducted on hours students work?
• Group response was “no”.

Would a structured MW and TTh schedule help students take more units?
• All responded “yes” that it would be helpful. Especially for working students and commuting students.

What else would help students take more units?
• Some programs do not offer any night classes and/or few online offerings.
• Students want more night classes.
• Everyone agreed that students want more online classes offered.

Would students take classes if offered on Saturdays?
• Those that provided a response, answered “yes”.

Part II – Janell Morillo

Decentralized vs centralize model explained. It was stated that this group uses the decentralized model.

What works well in advising in your areas and across campus?

Advising workshops for pre-nursing students. A few nursing students were invited to answer pre-nursing student questions from a student’s perspective.

Handouts, roadmaps and advising sheets for liberal studies. Flowcharts for business students.

Advising holds that force students to see advisers. Holds on majors for GE works well, too. While holds can be good thing, advisors can’t always see all the students in a timely manner to release holds, especially if the students wait too long.

Evaluation list-serv used to communicate with students.

What does not work well in advising?

Students sometimes take wrong classes due to communication from dog days and other advising across campus. (CSB)

Students take advising information for one major and apply it incorrectly to another major.
Too much information is disseminated to the student at one time rather than what is needed at that time. When too much information is shared with the student all at once, the student gets confused.

Do you have a good case load?

Some responded that they could use more advisers. In the case of complicated advising and no full-time designated major advisor, there is not always enough time for the necessary one to one advising. As a result, a few advisors participate in group advising like dog days. Nursing uses workshops to reach a larger group and work around this problem.

How well does group advising work?

Some responded that it works “Ok” for them.

There is a lack of technology used for advising. We don’t use web advising. Would like to utilize peoplesoft more. Would benefit from a using an electronic method to track, store and retrieve advising session notes.

What is an ideal advising model?

Likes the year round model that KSOEHD has. One stop-shop is good for GE but not necessarily good for major.

“No” to a centralized unit.

Centralized by college would be good if there were more advisers. Some faculty do not understand degree needs or they are just not available to the students.

What do you think about having a liaison from advising services at each of the colleges?

This would be helpful for those colleges who do not currently have a decentralized model. Having at least a part-time liaison would be beneficial.

It would be good for other majors, but not CSB unless they were well trained. Though, CSB would like the support. They do GE advising as well as major advising.

What are your thoughts on E-Advising and E-Portfolio? For instance, students answer specific questions online prior to first advising meeting.

Answering questions online could be helpful, especially for freshman who are often very shy or timid.

It could beneficial for students have the ability to type their questions to advisors in advance. They could take their time in putting together a list of questions and not feel so much pressure to remember everything they wanted to ask once they get their appointment. Advisors could also review the questions in advance and be more prepared for the students appointment.

Other comments or suggestions?

Office of Institutional Effectiveness, (JV)
All agree that there is the need to improve communication amongst all advising groups.

DARS is very difficult to read. As a result of this comment, Janell gave an update on the UAcheive rollout coming to replace DARS.

It was recommended that training occurs for both staff and students on the new UAcheive reports. There is currently a helpful DARS YouTube video for students. It was suggested another YouTube be created for the new reports.

Janell shared that a centralized webpage for advising information is under development and will be added to the Fresno State website.
Meeting w/Students
Notes re. Advising Practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Individuals</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Focus Group</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Briefly explain who you have received advising from at this institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advising Services</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAA’s</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Unit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What are some of your concerns about advising?

  - Many different advisors
  - Memos and exceptions – other advisors don’t know about it (because the information isn’t shared).
  - Some programs are growing – are there enough advisors?
  - Faculty not well versed in degree requirements
  - Faculty not well versed in new/latest career opportunities
  - Very difficult to get in touch with advisor through email, no advising hours posted
  - Had no idea who my advisor was (PeopleSoft says “No Advisor Assigned”)
  - Would like to know who advisor is early on
  - Split advising (Advising Services & faculty) is cumbersome
  - Students do not like having a separate GE advisor from major advisor
  - Do not know who advisor is if a faculty member goes on sabbatical
  - Mandatory advising milestones pointless (the way they are handled). Some departments do group advising to “check off the box” or have an on-line option and it is not personally helpful
  - Group advising not helpful
  - Staggering advising (rather than specific milestones) would be helpful
  - Advising website would be helpful – nice to have things in 1 spot.
  - Faculty advising can develop good relationships.
  - “I use my advisor less for class information. I use the roadmap for classes, and consult with the faculty advisor more for career and club information.”
  - Regarding holds – instead of specific points, look at the number of times a student has been in for advising. If less than a certain number, then put a hold on them. In other words, whatever number the university deems as a reasonable amount, that would identify those that need to come in for advising. This will free up time for advisors (not having to see a student or pull a file again).
• Positives –
  - Enjoy career counseling from faculty
  - Physics and Pol Sci assign and update advisors
  - Criminology – the faculty are aware of who best to refer students to based on options.
  - Craig School of Business is doing a really good job. Very career oriented. I like the one-stop-shop (Student Services Center).
  - Facebook, Twitter – good ways to get in touch with students.

• Preference of “ideal” advising model …
  - Decentralized preferred (3 students)
  - Faculty only (4 students)
  - Split Model (1 student)

• Thoughts on eAdvising ….
  - “If it is an option, I would ignore it.”
  - “If on-line, I would only do it because I had to, not because I want to.”
  - Takes away the personal connection.
  - Students need a professional relationship.
  - “Forcing people to answer personal questions would be intrusive. I would start a petition to remove it.”
## Where/When Advising Is Working Well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Understanding Policies &amp; Resources</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Desire/Interest in Advising</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Time/Support</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Being able to read the “magical language” of DARS (SFHC).
2. One of the most comprehensive programs is nursing. They are very clear on expectations and the faculty advisor communicates well (MSL).
3. Ag. Business and Viticulture do group advising well (JCAST).
4. Students getting what they need from the Undergraduate Student Services Center (CSB).
5. College is pro-active with at-risk students (LCOE).
6. Kinesiology is doing an excellent job at advising!
7. Criminology – the faculty are aware of who best to refer students to based on options.
8. Craig School of Business is doing a really good job. Very career oriented. I like the one-stop-shop (Student Services Center).
9. Departments refer students to advising services for general advising and the bigger picture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments are good at providing specific major advising.</th>
<th>Advising Services' implementation of case load assignments for first semester undeclared students.</th>
<th>Technology advising: Skype-like technology and chat. Only one site and advisors take turns manning the chat. Not as popular as other advising types. Waiting for additional technology for a complete roll-out.</th>
<th>Using DARS to advise students works well. DARS makes suggestions on what courses to take. DARS is changing to another product.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Advisors Network</td>
<td>Faculty pride themselves on having those relationships with students. Faculty is very pro-active and has a positive atmosphere.</td>
<td>Faculty do well with Graduate students (CSM). Students need mentoring and coaching (LCOE).</td>
<td>Faculty advising can develop good relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow charts are recommended for 1st and 2nd year students. School of Business has a good example of flow charts. Road maps do not work well for students who need remediation. Remediation is not included in road maps. Also, handouts, roadmaps and advising sheets for liberal studies.</td>
<td>SFHC doesn't advise but also provides mentoring, coaching, career counseling (SFHC).</td>
<td>Career advice from faculty. Students need mentoring and coaching (LCOE).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoy career counseling from faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assigning a faculty/[major?] advisor in the portal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Access to colleagues for support in assisting students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good collaboration between service providers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Starting the student/advisor relationship early is important. This relation begins at Dog Days for undeclared students. If connection is not made there, students typically do not come back for advising. Some students get waivers to not attend Dog Days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Music department (CAH).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>There are some faculty that have a real interest in advising (CSS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Distribution by option ... it has engaged faculty (CAH).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For those faculty that are interested, works well (LCOE).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physics and Pol Sci assign and update advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Early and heavy, intrusive [pro-active] advising works best, especially for new students. Students on contracts and advisers assigned case loads. EOP has contracts and case load assignment on approximately 1600 students. Their students get a lot of advising.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advising workshops for pre-nursing students. A few nursing students were invited to answer pre-nursing student questions from a student’s perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Food Science has a 1 unit Service course where students get advising and prepare a roadmap (JCAST).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>De-centralized advising unit, w/faculty involvement (CHHS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Psychology has de-centralized unit (CSM).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large majors (e.g. Crim) faculty have assigned time (CSS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Requirements in RTP so it serves as an incentive (CAH).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Walk-in period held 2 weeks prior to .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advising campaigns coordinated and timed with admission/records announcements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Facebook, Twitter – good ways to get in touch with students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advising holds that force students to see advisers. Holds on majors for GE works well, too. While holds can be good thing, advisors can’t always see all the students in a timely manner to release holds, especially if the students wait too long.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Training &amp; Consistency of Advising</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inefficient Processes</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student/Advisor Ratio &amp; Lack of Time</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Information &amp; Lack of Communication</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Need for Assigned Advisors</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Roadmaps not helpful (too many options) (CSS).
2. Lack of resources; don’t know, nor trained, as to what is available (CSS).
3. Faculty not informed of policies (e.g. Change of major policy) (CSS).
4. Don’t like having to know all the rules and policies (e.g. substitution, unit limits) (CSS).
5. Policies have become more and more complex (CSS).
6. Emails from university advisors (across campus) asking advising questions about engineering majors (LCOE).
7. “We want to have a say in course evaluation” (LCOE).
8. @ graduation, sometimes appears they have been told by outside advisors they can waive a class or requirement (LCOE).
9. Uniformity of advice (or lack thereof) (CAH).
10. Advising Services office – lots of incorrect information given to students (JCAST).
11. Peer advising – “pulling their ignorance” (JCAST).
| Students do not understand DARS report (Faculty) | Keeping up with policy changes (CHHS) | Countless mistakes from Advising Services (CSM) | DARS reports could be more use friendly (CAH) | Difficult to keep up with changes (CHHS) | No metrics on quality of advising (CSM) | Minimal training (CSM) | Confusion with academic policies - not enough training for advisors (LCOE) | Colleges that do not have a de-centralized unit. “Those that have a de-centralized unit, we see a lot less inconsistencies.” | Faculty not well versed in degree requirements deficiencies. | Faculty not well versed in new/latest career opportunities | Only a small population of students receives intrusive advising. It should be offered to more students. |
1 DARS is very difficult to read. As a result of this comment, Janell gave an update on the UAchieve rollout coming to replace DARS.

1 Road maps do not work well for students who need remediation. Remediation is not included in road maps. The road maps are not consistent across colleges and departments. For improved consistency, it might be beneficial that some guidelines be established for the development of road.

1 There is a lack of base-line advising guidelines and training for advisors which contributes to lack of consistency in advising. Could a summer training program be offered for baseline advising? Look at CSU, Northridge for a model. [?]**

1 Policies related to advising may be rolled out too fast and not enough planning done prior to implementation.

1 Some people do it well, and some don’t (CHHS).

1 Works well with some faculty, but not others (CHHS).

1 Career advising (CSM).

1 “If there are good things going on elsewhere, we have not tapped in to it.” (LCOE).

1 Students sometimes take wrong classes due to communication from dog days and other advising across campus. (CSB)

2 Endless request of letters (e.g. Financial Aid) – not an efficient process. Should have template letters and software that populates course options (CSS).

2 All of the different academic plans for military students (CSS)

2 Financial Aid letters, memos and substitutions (LCOE).
Financial Aid letters (Faculty)

Course substitution letters are not put in DARS until graduation (Faculty)

Financial Aid letters (CHHS).

Inefficiency of sending multiple letters to Financial Aid (CHHS).

Advisors across campus can lift holds which prevents students from seeing appropriate advisor (CSM).

Financial Aid letters (CSM).

Financial Aid memos are a huge waste of time (CAH).

Increased frequency of contacts [milestones] (CHHS).

Does not appear to be very organized (CSM).

Can be improved, currently very unsystematic (CAH).

Mandates have put burden back on departments. There are too many holds, and the holds are redundant to the Engineering holds (LCOE).

We are so fragmented with advising across campus.

Making sure students get advising at the senior year.

Departments are re-active rather than pro-active.

Mandatory advising milestones pointless (the way they are handled). Some departments do group advising to "check off the box" or have an on-line option and it is not personally helpful.

Group advising not helpful
MA1 and MA2 warnings need clarification between major advising vs. general advising. [Sounds like students get the warning and are confused about which advisor to see to get it cleared.]

No summer pay to advise (CSS).

Chairs do not receive list of DQ students (CSM).

Lack of use of electronic files (CSB).

There is a lack of technology used for advising. We don’t use web advising. Would like to utilize PeopleSoft more. Would benefit from a using an electronic method to track, store and retrieve advising session notes.

Group advising is not really advising; it is sharing information. [This relates to the need for defining “advising” and using the term appropriately.] Students get “checked off” for attending these so-called group advising meetings as though they are individual advising sessions. Mandatory group advising that requires attendance before the student can receive individual advising is a problem. It creates holds which delay the students from getting early individual advising.

Student ratio/advisor varies drastically (CSS).

Time consuming ... especially to advise immediately (LCOE).

Chair picks up most of the slack b/c they are around and available (CAH).

Thought it worked better when 1 person was assigned. They were better trained and developed the expertise (CAH).

Not optimal to plan a lot of advising activities in summer (CAH).

Sheer volume (Faculty).

Summer load (lack of available time) (Faculty).
Faculty load (CHHS).

University needs to devote resources at the college level. It has to be set aside for release time or professional staff (SFHC).

Faculty load does not adequately support advising (JCAST).

Volume vs. faculty load (CHHS).

Some faculty refuse "to be present" (CSS).

Inequity in the number of majors - e.g. ratio for Geography is 5/1, whereas ratio from Criminology is 115/1 (CSS).

Do not have enough resources to "beef up" advising services (CSS).

Lack of ability to give release time and lack of resources in the college (CAH).

Would like more faculty involvement with all options (CSB).

More SSP's to work in Advising Center (CSB).

Some faculty spend a lot of time on advising, and others do not (LCOE).

Not enough resources and time - volume and time is what faculty complain about the most re. advising (LCOE).

Some programs are growing - are there enough advisors?

Very difficult to get in touch with advisor through email, no advising hours posted

Split advising (Advising Services & faculty) is cumbersome

A lot of differences in motivation amongst faculty to advise (CAH).
No advisors on campus for evening students.

More information needed online (LCOE).

Do not feel well informed (CHHS).

Faculty are not informed of how to manage at-risk students (CSM).

Better communication to get students to come in (CSB).

Communication between Advising Services and colleges not good (LCOE).

Students get passed around while trying to get information. Could be a service issue.

Communication to students needs to be better.

There is a disconnect between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs.

Evaluations stopped sending DARS to graduating students.

Memos and exceptions – other advisors don't know about it (because the information isn't shared).

Wrong information is provided (such as wrong road maps). Old documents/information are still in circulation and distributed to students. Explore centralizing road maps and when classes are offered (spring/fall).

It is not always easy to identify the appropriate colleague for the necessary resources. No list of all campus advisors.

Advising needs to be better defined. Some students get waivers out of dog days, such as Summer Bridge, CAMP. Not all students get equal advising.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communication between all the advising groups is not good. Information is often found out late or through a student.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too much information is disseminated to the student at one time rather than what is needed at that time. When too much information is shared with the student all at once, the student gets confused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Don’t know who my advisees are – not updated in PS (CAH).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>One of the first questions students ask is “who is my advisor?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Many different advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Had no idea who my advisor was (PeopleSoft says “No Advisor Assigned”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students do not like having a separate GE advisor from major advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do not know who advisor is if a faculty member goes on sabbatical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students are confused with the role of major advising and general advising. Messages sent are not always clear on the type of advising they are advertising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Colleges do not have consistent web pages on advising. It is difficult and sometimes impossible to identify who the advisors are in a college. Phone calls are often required to figure out whom to refer the student to for additional services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit caps make it difficult for students to pursue dual major (CSS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of student ownership and their responsibility of the degree (JCAST).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Advising, teaching, mentoring is different. If the administration values this, they need to be accountable and support it” (CofC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Diversity of faculty and students needs to be addressed (CSM).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H
### Ideal Advising Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Split (Decentralized &amp; Faculty)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Split (Centralized &amp; Faculty)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Split (Model not specified)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Split model (Faculty/Hernan/Rick). Like the idea of “decentralized” (LCOE).
2. Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty (JCAST).
3. Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty advising for career, mentoring, course options (Faculty).
4. Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty to relieve some of the burden of advising (CHHS).
5. Split Model – Aerospace Studies Faculty and Departments
6. Decentralized Model w/faculty mentoring, career coaching, etc. (CSM).
7. Split Model – Decentralized (professional staff) and Faculty (“CSB is a great example”) (SFHC).
8. Long term goal to enhance Student Services Center (de-centralized unit in the college) ... but who is going to pay for it? Should be Level A allocation(CHHS).
10. Split model ... SSP handles curricular/academic and Faculty provide mentoring/career advice/elective
Ideal would be an enhanced staff advising center with faculty handling career coaching & mentoring, but resources are a big issue – with 1500 majors, would need 2 - 3 advisors (LCOE).

Decentralized preferred (3 students)

Health and Human Services’ model works well but they are understaffed.

Centralized is helpful because it is uniform. There needs to be connection to colleges as well. Some liked the approach of having advising liaisons at colleges. Some advisers have just recently been assigned to colleges.

Colleges should have their own centralized advising units.

Likes the year round model that KSOEHD has. One stop-shop is good for GE but not necessarily good for major.

(De)Centralized by college would be good if there were more advisers. Some faculty do not understand degree needs or they are just not available to the students.

Split Model – Centralized and Faculty (CAH - COMM).

Split Model – Centralized and Faculty (CAH - ENGL).

Split Model – Centralized and Faculty “the faculty should be mentors” (CAH - Phil).

Like a “Centralized” model for G.E. (CSS).

Centralized could allow for fast and accurate dissemination of information to all advisors/students/need-to-knows.

Centralized could do a better job at coordinating, communicating and sharing information. Some group members felt AS could be the hub, if centralized... others were unsure on the matter of the “who and where” of the hub.
We should be able to influence student career choices (CAH - MCJ).

Keep in department (CAH - Music).

Students need an opportunity to sit down with a professor ... and faculty need to be versed in academia (CSS).

Ideal to have 2 – 3 appointed faculty doing advising (CSS).

Faculty only (4 students)

Split model would be ideal ... wouldn't mind talking with students about courses, careers, but don't want to handle the minutiae of advising (CSS).

Split model is an optimal situation (CAH).

Split Model (1 student)

Summer advising is an issue because faculty are not on campus to advise students. Triad advising works well because it helps cover when faculty are not available.

"Perfect world ... wouldn't do minutiae. If we are going to, we need to be trained” (CSS).

Have had these conversations with faculty and there doesn't seem to be a lot of interest in our college (ICAST).

Need to maximize and leverage resources better [referring to interns] (CHHS).

General advising is required regardless of model.

Does our advising model need to change due to our demographics changing, ie more first-generation students? [Angel] - Yes, first-generation students need more structure. [Janell]- The model is not as important as the training for our changing demographics.

“No” to a centralized unit.
Suggestions for Improving Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Campus Communication</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More Support (Time, Training, Resources)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assigned Advisors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mandatory Advising</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Need easy access to list of “W” courses (JCAST).
2. Need to better utilize roadmaps (AS).
3. Better “cross talk” between academic departments and special programs. Need more collaborative adventure (MSL).
5. Need to publicize liaisons (CAH).
6. Roadmaps – need a way to link them more easily for students (CAH).
7. We need a new process for the large volume of memos needed for exceptions.
8. Departments could send out senior reports.
9. Advising website would be helpful – nice to have things in 1 spot.
10. Make use of flowcharts to remain consistent with the services.
11. Ensure that accurate information is used in the catalogs.
12. Explore centralizing road maps and when classes are offered (spring/fall).
13. All agree that there is the need to improve communication amongst all advising groups.
14. Need better support from Advising Services (CSM).
If Administration values advising, they need to support and provide resources (CSS).

How about formula ..., E.g. per every x# of advisees, x# of release time (CSS).

Need release time for faculty interested & talented in advising (CofC).

Need more faculty [if going to continue with faculty advising model] (JCAST).

Should offer faculty stipends for advising (CSS).

University needs to make a decision whether we reward faculty (CSS).

Could a summer training program be offered for baseline advising? [compared to summer training offered for course redesign]. Possible model for advising training at CSU, Northridge.

It was recommended that training occurs for both staff and students on the new UAchieve reports. There is currently a helpful DARS YouTube video for students. It was suggested another YouTube be created for the new reports.

Recommended to create decentralized units (SFHC).

Course substitutions and petitions should be done by chairs (SFHC).

All new freshmen should be assigned an advisor. There is a disconnect between caring for the students.

Need to assign advisor early for outreach purposes.

Perhaps dedicated advisors for freshmen class (like H.S.), then passed to major advisor.

Would like to know who advisor is early on.

"Always been an advocate for an assigned advisor” (CAH).

Would like to see more mandatory advising & earlier (AS).

In favor of academic holds for “at risk” students (CSM).

Mandatory advising at the senior year.

Staggering advising (rather than specific milestones) would be helpful.

Regarding holds – instead of specific points, look at the number of times a student has been in for advising. If less than...
certain number, then put a hold on them. In other words, whatever number the university deems as a reasonable amount that would identify those that need to come in for advising. This will free up time for advisors (not having to see a student or pull a file again).

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mandatory advising would need to include faculty so they stay engaged (LCOE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Limit # of times to change major (AS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Simplify options [cut back on majors] (JCAST).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Suggested to have SAFARI for faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ACADEMIC ADVISING

I. Policy Statement

Academic advising complements academic instruction and is thus a faculty responsibility. The California State University System recognizes this responsibility by allocating 3 WTU for indirect instructional activity, which includes student advising, as part of the total 15 WTU faculty instructional workload. Further, for an academic advising program to meet students' educational needs effectively, students and the administration must share joint responsibility with faculty although faculty are considered to be the key element. The above statements, however, are not intended to reduce students' basic responsibility for initiating academic advising contacts with faculty, and for knowing and completing all degree requirements.

The primary purposes of academic advising are to help students to select appropriate academic courses and programs, to establish effective mentor relationships, to use support services effectively, and to plan for the future. Therefore, an effective academic advising program will:

1) Assist students in designing an academic program for timely fulfillment of their degree goals, including selection of appropriate courses singly and in sequence;

2) Provide faculty advisers with adequate training and materials with which to advise students appropriately;

3) Assist students and faculty advisers in learning how to use the catalog and schedule of courses effectively in the advising process;

4) Provide students with timely and accurate information regarding University academic policies and procedures;

5) Assist students to select educational and professional career objectives commensurate with their interests and abilities;

6) Inform students of the wide variety of student support services and extracurricular educational opportunities that may help them reach their personal, academic, and career goals;

7) Assist students to explore and understand possible short- and long-range implications and consequences of their choices.

II. The Advisement Program

A. Each school, department or program will prepare and implement a written plan for advising students in their majors. The plan should include the following elements:

1) How faculty advisers will be selected, assigned and trained to provide academic advising;

2) How students will be notified of the advising policy and procedures;
3) What materials will be used in the advising process;
4) What students should do in case an adviser is not available;
5) How students will be introduced to the major;
6) What is expected of students to help make the plan work; and
7) How advising will be evaluated.

B. The Division of Student Affairs will continue to provide orientation programs to inform new students of registration procedures and degree requirements, and direct them to academic departments/programs for initial advising on major requirements.

C. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and school deans will provide the following services to ensure that faculty are appropriately equipped to advise students:

1) On-going, in-service workshops for faculty academic advisers;

2) Annual in-service workshops for department chairs on academic policies and procedures including recent changes and additions;

3) A comprehensive orientation for newly appointed faculty which would include an overview of University academic policies, practices and student support services.

III. Statements of Responsibility

A. Student Responsibilities

Students should:

1) Attend a summer new student orientation program* or Advising Day provided by the Office of Advising and Orientation prior to their first semester of attendance;

2) Purchase a catalog once upon entering the University and a schedule of courses every semester; **

3) Meet at least once each semester with their departmental academic advisers, beginning with the first semester. Undeclared majors should contact the Office of Advising and Orientation for academic advising assistance until they declare a major. ***

---

*International students and students in the Educational Opportunity Program have their own required orientation programs.

**Transfer students should be aware that the catalog governing their graduation degree requirements may not be the current catalog.

***International students and students in the Educational Opportunity Program are also required to maintain regular contact with their respective advisers.
4) Maintain their own personal academic advising folders and take them to every advising appointment. Documents placed in this folder should include prior college/university transcripts, semester grade reports, add/drop form receipts, official registration confirmation cards, transfer/90-unit evaluation sheet; and

5) Realize that, ultimately, knowing and completing all degree requirements are their responsibility.

B. Faculty Responsibilities

Faculty advisers are the key element in providing academic advising to students. Therefore, they are expected to participate in periodic in-service training sessions to improve their advising skills and to remain current on policies, procedures and degree requirements including general education. Further, they are expected to maintain regular and reasonable office hours during which they will be available to meet with individual advisees.

C. Departmental/Program Responsibilities

Academic departments/programs should routinely provide majors with description of their advising program. In addition, they are encouraged to conduct their own introduction/orientation to the major on a regular basis.

D. Administrative Responsibilities

The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and school deans should ensure that academic advising of students is fully recognized, duly supported and periodically evaluated. In addition, the Division of Student Affairs should provide the following services in support of the advising process: Office of Advising and Orientation, Student Counseling Center, Career Planning and Placement, International Student Services and Programs, and the Educational Opportunity Program.
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