

DRAFT-June 2007

UNIVERSITY  
SYSTEM OF  
GEORGIA

TASK FORCE ON ENHANCED ADVISING  
PROCESSES

*A Report to the University System of Georgia Chancellor and Board of Regents*

# Enhanced Advising Processes Team

---

Ronald M. Zaccari, President, Valdosta State University (Chair)  
Greg Anderson, Director of Advising Center, Armstrong Atlantic State University  
Lisa Baldwin, Information Technology, Valdosta State University  
Thressea Boyd, Assistant to the President, Valdosta State University  
Randy Braswell, Vice President for Academic Affairs, South Georgia College  
Tina Butcher, Director of Advising Center, Columbus State University  
Carolyn Codamo, Acting Director Student Advisement Center, Georgia State University  
Virginia Carson, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Georgia Highlands College  
Sharon Gravett, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Valdosta State University  
Julia Grubbs, Office of Information and Instructional Technology, USG  
Dana Hartley, Director Academic Advising, Georgia Institute of Technology  
Kerri Johnson, Director PTA Program, Darton College  
Ron Koger, Vice President for Student and Enrollment Services, Southern Polytechnic State University  
Marsha Krotseng, Associate Vice President for Strategic Research & Analysis, Valdosta State University  
Scot Lingrell, Associate Vice President for Student Services, University of West Georgia  
Bob Mattox, Director of Counseling and Advising, Kennesaw State University  
Shaina McGill, Senior Director Advising and Retention, Georgia College and State University  
Mike Miller, Vice President for Enrollment & Student Services, Medical College of Georgia  
Donald Moore, Director of Admissions and Recruitment, Fort Valley State University  
Joe Newton, Director of Information Technology, Valdosta State University  
Brenda Perry, Interim Director of Academic Advising, Gainesville State College  
Charles Schroeder, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs, North Georgia College and State University  
Carol Treible, Retention Coordinator, Macon State College  
Jody Trost, Coordinator of FYE and Academic Advisor, Dalton State College  
Ray Whiting, Special Assistant to Vice President for Academic Affairs, Augusta State University  
Felita Williams, Special Assistant to Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Programs, USG

# Table of Contents

---

I. Preamble.....	Page 4
II. Overview .....	Page 6
III. Recommendations .....	Page 12
IV. Appendices .....	Page 18

# I. Preamble

---

Public universities have always played a vital role in American society. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities' report, *Renewing the Promise: the Public's Universities in a Transforming World*, states "The public universities occupy a unique—and treasured—place on the American landscape. They represent a combination of individual opportunity and commitment to the common good and core values."

In 1862 when President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, establishing the nation's first land grant institutions, he defined the purpose of higher education as "built on behalf of the people, who have invested in these institutions their hopes, their support, and their confidence." More than a century later, the mission of higher education remains the same but its focus has shifted in order to prepare students for an internationally competitive workforce. Despite these changes, public college and universities still have the innate responsibility to protect the people's investment in higher education.

This innate responsibility prompted the University System of Georgia to identify 10 system-level projects designed to ensure a consistent, effective, and efficient response to a variety of key issues that currently face Georgia's higher education system.

The 10 system-level projects include developing programs for students at risk to prepare for college; increasing middle school focus for the African-American Male Initiative; developing more interest in students in K-12 to study math, science, and engineering and recruiting more teachers in these fields; improving retention, progression, and graduation rates; encouraging more enrollment projects and management; enhancing health professions; improving emergency management and planning; enhancing professional development programs for faculty and staff; improving capabilities related to energy management and lost efficiencies; and enhancing the academic advising processes at all USG institutions.

In regard to academic advising, Chancellor Erroll Davis, Jr., observed the following after completing visits to several institutions: "The presidents I have met have been generally upbeat, as were their direct reports. The students are generally happy, but the one theme that has come up a number of times is the quality of advising they are getting. That has also engendered debate about the responsibilities of students to chart their own future versus being dependent upon others to do it for them." (USG Board of Regents meeting April 19, 2006)

The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), an association of more than 9,300 professional advisors, identifies the primary purpose of an academic advising program as assisting students with educational plans that are compatible with their life goals. The function of the academic advisor goes beyond course selection and includes assistance with study skills, time management, career choices, leadership development, social responsibility, appreciation of diversity, spiritual awareness, and the achievement of a host of other personal and educational goals and decisions.

According to the NACADA's Academic Advising Standards and Guidelines, "The formal education of students is purposeful, holistic, and consists of the curriculum and the co-curriculum. The Academic Advising Program must identify relevant and desirable student learning and development outcomes and provide programs and services that encourage the achievement of those outcomes."

Academic advising can significantly influence, either positively or negatively, a student's educational, social, and personal development. According to Light, "Good advising may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college experience"<sup>1</sup> (81). Higher education professionals widely agree that academic advising plays an essential role in an undergraduate student's overall success; however, the roles of the advisor and student and the actual advising process may vary, depending upon the size and mission of an institution.

Once students arrive at post-secondary institutions, they begin a journey that will change their lives in profound and positive ways. They are immediately confronted with a set of decisions that will determine their educational path. "What major should I select?" "In what activities should I participate?" "How do I study properly?"

In an effort to provide students with a positive college experience, the Enhanced Advising Processes (EAP) team was established to examine current academic advising processes and formulate appropriate recommendations to improve the quality and effectiveness of advising at all USG institutions. These recommendations serve as a guide to set standards and provide successful models to enhance advising and subsequently improve retention, progression, and graduation rates at all USG system institutions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Light, Richard. *Making the Most of College: Students Speak Their Minds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

This report will outline the methodology used by the EAP team, including an overview of the current advising models at all USG institutions; an examination of advising best practices; a review of National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) findings in comparison to those of students from across the nation; key points of discussion from two EAP team meetings and a meeting with members of the USG Student Advisory Council; and web-based discussions via Basecamp at <https://borusg.seework.com>.

## II. Overview

---

The Enhanced Advising Processes team was charged with seeking innovative approaches to enhancing advising at all USG institutions. The EAP team is comprised of 26 higher education professionals from all sectors of the USG. Their expertise represents a cross-section of professional fields, including academic affairs, admissions, advising, enrollment services, freshmen year experience programs, information technology, and student affairs. Each team member exhibited a passion for and dedication to advising, as well as an enthusiasm for cultivating positive change.

## *EAP Team First Meeting (November 28, 2007)*

The first EAP team meeting was held November 28, 2006, at Valdosta State University and included an overview of the team's charge; review of the USG Student Advisory Council's position on academic advising; group discussions regarding perceived advising strengths and weaknesses; presentation of data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE); and initial discussions involving development of a system-wide electronic advising model.

### *Review of USG Student Advisory Council's position on Academic Advising*

The Student Advisory Council (SAC) is comprised of Student Government presidents from each of the 35 USG institutions. In 2006, the SAC formed a committee to make recommendations to the system office to create more effective and consistent advising at USG institutions. The SAC September 13-14, 2006, minutes (<http://www.usg.edu/sac/minutes>) outline SAC's observation on academic advising:

Issue: Academic Advisement is not effective and/or consistent which causes students a lot of frustration.

Objective: Create an academic advisement center or department that deals with advisement regardless of major. This center/department will know all Board of Regents information and changes, know graduation requirements, academic scheduling, etc. This center/department should work to complement the university advisement mission. This center/department will train all faculty in how to advise students about multiple issues such as balance, etc., as well as logistical changes in graduation requirements, course catalog changes, etc., every year. Students will be required to see their academic advisors every semester and will have a hold on their ability to register for classes each semester if they do not fulfill this requirement. Once a student visits their advisor, the hold will be lifted. This requirement would not apply to students in a cohort or program that allows for no flexibility in scheduling.

The EAP team discussed the SAC committee's recommendations and agreed that further discussion and input from this group would be essential before drafting final recommendations. A meeting with members of the SAC advising committee and EAP team was held on February 23, 2007, in conjunction with the SAC spring meeting at Atlanta Metropolitan College.

### *Advising strengths, weaknesses, and general recommendations*

In an effort to determine the types of advising models that currently exist at all 35 USG institutions, members of the EAP team, along with presidents and academic affairs vice presidents of those institutions not represented on the EAP team, were asked to submit a brief

summary of their institution's current advising model. This exercise was used to elicit the areas of commonality as well as areas of uniqueness within their institution's advising system.

Information was provided by all USG institutions, and the current advising processes at USG institutions are represented within three primary models:

1. Decentralized—professional or faculty advisors are housed within their academic departments;
2. Centralized—professional and faculty advisors are housed in an advising center;  
or
3. Combination—students are advised within their academic unit and later transferred to an advising center, or vice versa.

Members of the EAP team were provided a complete report of the USG institutions' current advising models and asked to review them in preparation for the first meeting on November 28, 2006. (Appendix A, full copy of USG Institutions' Current Advising Systems)

The EAP team discussed a plethora of ideas, including responsibilities of both advisors and students in the advising system; the pros and cons of mandatory advising; benefits of advising centers versus one-on-one faculty interaction; viewing advising as an opportunity for mentoring instead of a five-minute process; evaluation systems for advising; and ways to change the culture of advising on USG campuses.

Based on the EAP team initial review of the USG institutions' current advising models the following strengths and weaknesses were identified:

- Strengths
  - Advising centers help to monitor overall academic success
  - Mechanisms are in place (electronic holds) at most campuses to prevent students from moving forward in the registration process without seeking an advisor's guidance
  - Mandatory advising seems to benefit students

- Weaknesses
  - Faculty advising training and related quality outcomes are insufficient
  - Level of advising at USG campuses varies significantly
  - The knowledge base for advising often does not include financial aid, counseling services, etc.
  - Advising declines after the sophomore year—difficult for faculty to get students involved in the advising process as juniors and seniors

#### Presentation of NSSE and CCSSE Surveys

EAP team member Dr. Marsha Krotseng presented results from the 2005 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) for four-year institutions and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) for two-year institutions. University System of Georgia institutions participated in the 2005 survey that included specific questions related to advising. The NSSE and CCSSE data are particularly valuable because of the ability to compare Georgia's responses with those of first-year students and seniors across the nation.

When students were asked on the NSSE survey how they rate the quality of academic advising they received at their respective institutions, the percentage of "Excellent" responses by USG students was lower in comparison with the national sample. This response was true for first-year students as well as seniors in Georgia's four-year colleges and universities, underscoring the importance of the EAP team's work.

Examining results from individual institutions within the USG indicated that the percentage of "Excellent" responses did exceed the national benchmark for both first-year students and seniors at seven campuses. At one of these institutions, both student groups rated the quality of advising they had received as higher than the national percentages. Not surprisingly, two items that were most strongly related to the students' overall advising experience were "My academic advisor was available when needed" and "My academic advisor provided me with accurate information about courses, programs, and requirements."

For Georgia students attending two-year institutions, the percentage of those who were very satisfied with academic advising/planning was one point higher than the national benchmark. However, for Georgia as well as the nation, this experience differed greatly between part-time and full-time students, with full-time students clearly expressing higher levels of satisfaction with advising. This observation was reinforced by the national 2006 CCSSE report that found 41% of students taking college-level courses at two-year institutions rarely or never participated in academic advising.

The NSSE and CCSSE findings offered another perspective for the EAP team to consider and added to the solid foundation of evidence on the effectiveness of academic advising. In general, the quantitative results of these surveys paralleled the anecdotal reports of faculty, staff, and students related to the advising experience. Data from the NSSE, CCSSE and other instruments of this type will be critical as USG institutions move forward to implement the recommendations of the EAP. Aggregate student responses can be monitored over time as a means to measure future improvement. (Appendix B, 2005 NSSE results related to advising at USG four-year institutions and all NSSE participating institution; and Appendix C, 2005 CCSSE results related to advising at USG two-year institutions and all CCSSE participating institutions)

#### Group Discussion regarding system-wide electronic advising model

The lack of a centralized system for documenting the advising process was collectively regarded as an area the EAP team needed to explore and include in its list of recommendations. In advance of the November 28, 2006, EAP meeting, Valdosta State University's Information Technology Department began the process of developing a pilot electronic advising model that, if approved, could function system-wide and allow the following:

- The ability for advisors and students to schedule appointments online
- Online access for advisors to see pertinent information, including notes from actual advising session listing of courses completed, and recommended courses to complete selected curricula
- Notification of "holds" placed on the student's account
- Tracking the advice and scheduling recommendations given to students from their advisors
- Used as a data base for transfer among USG institutions

#### Enhanced Advising Processes team's methodology

Early in EAP deliberation, team members established four objectives: (1) assessing the relationship that exists between students' level of satisfaction with advising at USG institutions (based on NSSE and CCSSE) and institutional retention and graduation rates; (2) identifying the current advising structure at USG's 35 institutions and then listing common strengths and weaknesses; (3) recommending a set of essential advising practices, based on identified strengths and weaknesses, and components that clearly articulate the USG advising mission; and (4) proposing options for a system-wide electronic advising data system that supports the USG's advising mission and enhances the advising process through clear and continuous communication.

### *EAP Team Meeting with Student Advisory Council Meeting*

Members of the EAP team met with representatives of the USG Student Advisory Council's (SAC) Academic Advising Committee on February 23, 2007. General discussion focused on appropriate training for faculty and professional advisors; the student's responsibility in academic advising; benefits of an electronic advising system that would allow students and advisors to view academic progress; the purpose and use of CAPP (which was not properly identified at all USG institutions); the disconnection between students and their faculty advisors; and differences in advising at two-year and four-year institutions.

The student government leaders discussed their views and academic advising at USG institutions. The SAC's report stated, "The purpose of the academic advising committee is to articulate student interest for achieving excellent advising within the University System of Georgia. The foundation of advisement should stem from a collaborative effort between faculty and students with equal expectations placed on both parties. Academic advising should reflect the University System's vision to create a more educated Georgia. Proper advisement that is governed by a centralized body is a necessity in providing consistency throughout the system towards achieving a first-rate undergraduate and graduate education."

The SAC Academic Advising Committee suggested eight advising practices for implementation system-wide that include the following: identifying the responsibilities of faculty and professional advisors and providing proper training; developing a unified advising mission for all USG institutions; providing a system for evaluating faculty and professional academic advising that is related to tenure and promotion or annual evaluations; ensuring proper training for students regarding academic advising through freshmen seminar classes; and providing incentives programs that encourages outstanding advising and motivates faculty members and professional staff to educate students regarding the benefits of a well-rounded educational experience. (Appendix D, USG Student Advisory Council Academic Advising Committee's recommendations)

### *EAP Team Meeting—February 28, 2007*

In preparation for this meeting, EAP team members were requested to review the lists of advising strengths and weaknesses outlined in the November 28, 2006 EAP minutes. Based on this information and their professional advising expertise, EAP team members submitted what they deemed to be the top five strengths and corresponding recommendations and appropriate action steps. Equally important, EAP members were asked to identify the top five weaknesses in USG advising and develop recommendations to improve outcomes. (Appendix E, EAP team's list of USG institutions advising strengths, weaknesses, and related recommendations)

EAP members were divided into groups based on three main advising areas: procedures, mission and policies, and training and evaluation. Group discussions led to the following 10 recommendations to enhance advising at USG institutions:

1. Adopt a clear academic advising mission statement that corresponds to the institution's mission and includes appropriate goals and student outcomes.
2. Define and post an advising administrative structure to assure consistency and coherency in advising across all academic departments of the institution.
3. Develop a policy that mandates undergraduate students meet with their advisors before registration is completed. The frequency of these advising meetings will be determined by each institution.
4. Develop an online advising handbook at each institution that includes the following: mission statement; responsibilities of academic advisors and students; list of advising tools; proactive/intrusive advising information; and referral information and links.
5. Require academic departments to provide and post comprehensive advising plans, including such elements as degree requirements, program map, roles and responsibility of advisors and students, and training and assessment plans.
6. Ensure institutions post an advanced two-year course schedule to facilitate advising and academic planning.
7. Require academic training for all individuals responsible for undergraduate academic advising, including professional advisors, faculty, and academic department chairs and deans. The training program will include the following:
  - An overview of the institution's advising mission as it relates to the institution's strategic plan and consistent with the USG's advising mission
  - The institution's academic advising philosophy as it is expressed in National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education
  - Responsibilities of advisors and students
  - Advising tools (Banner, CAPP, DegreeWorks, other software systems, etc.)
  - Proactive/intrusive advising information
  - Referral information
  - Handbook access
8. Mandate that all USG institutions annually assess their advising effectiveness in each of the following categories:
  - Individual advisors and advising units
  - Proactive/intrusive advising information
  - Referrals
  - Intervention with academic difficulties
  - Proactive communication

- Student satisfaction
  - Course advising accuracy
9. Require USG institutions to evaluate annually the advising effectiveness of all faculty and professional advisors as part of their annual review, which will be included as part of the promotion and tenure process for faculty advisors.
  10. Purchase a system-wide technology process to improve advising communication, the advising process, and assessment of advising programs.

The specifics details of the EAP team’s recommendations are provided in the following pages of this report.

## III. Recommendations

---

### *Recommendation #1: Mission Statement*

Each USG institution will adopt a clear advising mission statement that corresponds to the institution’s mission and includes appropriate goals and student outcomes.

*Objective:* Clearly defined mission statements, goals, and objectives for academic advising are essential elements in providing effective advising services for students. According to White (2000, pp. 180-181), mission statements with corresponding goals and objectives their “provide the purpose” for the advising program serve as a “source for the professional development of advisors” and allow “for the assessment process to work more effectively.” The inclusion of academic advising in clearly articulated mission statements, goals, and objectives supports the

provision of effective advising services by (a) demonstrating evidence of institutional commitment; (b) relating academic advising to the fulfillment of the institution's mission; (c) providing a basis for assessment; and (d) justifying significant budgetary allocations for this endeavor.<sup>2</sup>

*Action:* Each USG institution will review its existing advising mission statement to determine if it complies with the institution's mission and includes appropriate goals and student outcomes. The EAP team recommends that the mission statement be drafted using a cross-campus constituency, including students, and upon its completion that it be distributed and promoted campus-wide and easily accessible on the institution's web site.

*Budget:* Estimated cost to USG institutions is minimal and implementation can be achieved with existing staff.

### [Recommendation #2: Defined Academic Advising Administrative Structure](#)

Each USG institution will define and post an advising administrative structure to promote consistency and coherency in advising across all academic departments of the institution.

*Objective:* Advising services are normally administered at both two-year and four-year institutions within three primary models: (1) decentralized—professional or faculty advisors are housed within their academic departments; (2) centralized—professional and faculty advisors are housed in an advising center; or (3) combination—students are advised within their academic unit and later transferred to an advising center, or vice versa. The EAP team recognizes the importance of each model and concludes that each institution should be allowed to structure its advising system based on a variety of variables, including campus academic culture, enrollment size of institution, mission of institution (two-year, four-year, or research), special needs of the institution, and academic composition of students (large number of undeclared majors, non-traditional or first-generation college students).

*Action:* Each USG institution will determine its academic advising administrative model which clearly defines its organizational structure, including authority, responsibilities, and accountability. Once the structure has been identified and received institutional approval, it should be promoted campus-wide and easily accessible on the institution's web site.

*Budget:* Estimated cost to USG institutions is minimal and implementation can be achieved with existing staff.

---

<sup>2</sup> White, E.R. (2000). Developing mission, goals, and objectives for the advising program, in V.N. Gordon, W.R. Mobley, et al. (eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 180-191). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

### *Recommendation #3: Mandatory Advising Sessions*

Each USG institution will develop a policy that mandates undergraduate students to meet with their advisors before registration is completed. The frequency of these advising meetings will vary by each institution's mission; however, mandatory advising is recommended for all incoming and transfer students with required checkpoints at 30, 60, and 90 hours.

*Objective:* The EAP team recognizes the varying opinions regarding mandatory advising; however, the EAP believes that data will show that mandatory advising will lead to improved retention, progression, and graduation rates.

*Action:* Each USG institution's advising plan will include its mandatory advising requirements and establish appropriate safeguards to ensure students are following the established advising guidelines. USG institutions will provide documented evidence that all undergraduate students are meeting with their advisors as outlined in the institution's established advising guidelines.

*Budget:* Cost is contingent upon the institution's decision regarding mandatory advising requirements.

### *Recommendation #4: Academic Advising Handbook*

Each institution will develop an online advising handbook that includes the following:

- Advising Mission Statement
- Responsibilities of advisors and students
- List of advising tools
- Proactive/intrusive advising information
- Referral information and links

*Objective:* An academic advising handbook serves as an essential resource guide for both the advisors and the students. The development of an advising handbook will require contributions from a variety of campus constituent groups.

*Action:* Each USG institution will have an academic advising handbook that is reviewed annually and updated to integrate necessary changes within advising training for academic advisors.

*Budget:* Cost is contingent upon the institution's decision regarding publication (printed or online) cost and other related training expenses.

### *Recommendation #5: Mandatory Advising Plans*

Require all academic departments to post comprehensive advising plans, including such elements as degree requirements, program map, roles and responsibilities of advisors and students, and training and assessment plans.

*Objective:* An academic advising plan includes materials from the institution's academic mission statement, administrative structure, and handbook. Departments must regularly evaluate this plan for continuous improvement in the advising process.

*Action:* Each academic department must develop an advising plan that will be included in appropriate institutional documents, such as the institutional strategic plan, annual reports, and the comprehensive program review. Once the advising plan has received institutional approval, it will be promoted campus-wide and easily accessible on the institution's web site.

*Budget:* Estimated cost to USG institutions is minimal and implementation can be achieved with existing staff.

### *Recommendation #6: Published Two-Year Course Schedule*

Ensure all departments post a projected two-year course schedule to facilitate advising and academic planning.

*Objective:* The establishment of a two-year course schedule will assist advisors and students as they plan projected course selections.

*Action:* Each department will develop and publish a two-year course schedule and use multiple methods to communicate the schedules to students and advisors.

*Budget:* Cost is contingent upon the institution's decision regarding publication (printed or online) cost and other related implementation expenses.

### *Recommendation #7: Advising Training*

Require a two-tier professional development system for all individuals responsible for undergraduate academic advising including professional advisors, faculty, and academic department chairs and deans. First year advisors would participate in tier one which would require focus on the informational aspect of advising (campus advising policies, registration procedures, etc.). As advisors gain experience they would progress to tier two, which would continue to provide informational updates (i.e., changes in curricular policy, registration procedures, etc.) as well as conceptual topics (i.e., how to interact effectively with the diverse population served through academic advising). The training program will include the following:

- An overview of the institution's advising mission as it relates to the institution's strategic plan and consistent with the USG's advising mission

- The institution's academic advising philosophy as it is expressed in National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education document (Appendix D)
- Responsibilities of advisors and students
- Use of advising tools (Banner, CAPP, etc.)
- Advantages of proactive/intrusive advising
- Referral information
- Handbook access

*Objective:* Advisor development programs provide vital training for academic advisors as they seek to meet the needs of the diverse student population in higher education. These programs assist advisors as they develop the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to perform their duties in an appropriate manner. Koring (2005) notes that while advisor training is an essential part of the academic advising program, it is missing in many institutions because of inadequate time, money, and training for facilitators. The development and implementation of an effective advisor training program demonstrates institutional commitment to providing appropriate advising services to meet the needs of all students.<sup>3</sup>

"Developing effective training opportunities for academic advisors is important for student satisfaction and persistence" (Borns, 2002). Because of the importance of this type of training, programs must be customized to meet the needs of the advisors and the institutions which they serve. The content must be relevant and meaningful, and presented in an engaging and interactive manner. When considering the training needs of full-time and faculty advisors, some similarities and differences are evident. In planning for such experiences, program developers must consider the background of the participants as they develop the format, content, and scope and sequence of such a training program.<sup>4</sup>

*Action:* Each USG institution will develop a training program for all professionals responsible for undergraduate academic advising.

*Budget:* Cost is contingent upon the institution's plan to implement its training program, including printed materials and other related implementation expenses.

### *Recommendation #8: Annual Assessment*

---

<sup>3</sup> Koring, H (2005). Advisor training and development. Retrieved November 16, 2006 from the NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site:  
[http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/adv\\_training.htm](http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/adv_training.htm).

<sup>4</sup> Borns, R.F. (2002). Creating an academic advising training program for your campus. Retrieved November 16, 2006 from The Mentor: An Academic Advising Journal Web site:  
<http://www.psu.edu/dus/mentor/020506rb.htm>.

Mandate that all USG institutions annually assess their advising effectiveness in each of the following categories:

- Individual advisors and advising unit
- Proactive/intrusive advising information
- Intervention for students experiencing academic difficulties
- Proactive communication
- Student satisfaction
- Course advising accuracy

*Objective:* As institutions seek to serve their diverse student populations through best practices in academic advising, they must develop a comprehensive assessment system that is implemented in a systematic manner. Such a system includes input from all significant stakeholders and allows advisors and administrators to make informed, data-driven decision about campus advising services. It also supplies administrators with the data necessary to justify the allocation of resources through cost-benefit analyses (Grites, 2003).<sup>5</sup>

An effective advising assessment program should meet the criteria delineated by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Academic Advising Standard 13 (CAS, 2000, p. 424).<sup>6</sup> These criteria include the following:

1. Systematic qualitative and quantitative evaluations;
2. Multiple measures of assessment to ensure comprehensive and objective assessment;
3. Data collected from students and other stakeholders; and
4. Utilization of results to improve the performance of advising personnel

*Action:* Each USG institution must develop and implement an assessment vehicle to address the issues outlined in the above recommendation.

*Budget:* Cost is contingent upon the institution's plan to develop and implement an assessment vehicle.

### *Recommendation #9: Annual evaluation of all faculty and professional advisors*

Each USG institution will evaluate the advising effectiveness of all faculty and professional advisors annually. This evaluation will be considered as part of their annual review, and where academic faculty are advisors, it shall be included in the promotion and tenure process.

---

<sup>5</sup> Grites, T.J. (2003). Determining the worth of an advising unit. *Academic Advising Today*, 26(1), Retrieved November 26, 2006 from NACADA Web site: [http://www.nacada.ksu/AAT/NW26\\_1.htm](http://www.nacada.ksu/AAT/NW26_1.htm).

<sup>6</sup> Council for the Advancement of Standards. (2000). *Academic Advising: Council for the Advancement of Standards and Guidelines*. In V.N. Gordon, W.R. Habley, et al. (eds), *Academic advising: A Comprehensive handbook* (pp. 417-424). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

*Objective:* A clearly defined assessment system that evaluates and rewards advisors is an essential part of an effective, comprehensive advising program. Such a system demonstrates the institution's commitment to high quality advising services for all students; encourages excellence in academic advisement; and recognizes academic advising as a significant responsibility. It also encourages academic advisors and advising administrators to engage in appropriate training and professional development opportunities which allow further refinement of their knowledge base and skills. A reward and recognition system communicates that institutions understand the important relationship that academic advising has to the success of students and value the individuals serving as advisors.

Evaluating and rewarding best practices in the field of academic advising provide evidence that this process is valued and that it plays a major role in the life of the institution. The role of the advisors has evolved into a multifaceted position that requires appropriate knowledge, skills, and disposition to effectively meet the needs of all students. To that end, advisors need to be evaluated in meaningful ways that provide authentic, relevant data that will help improve their practice. The implementation of a reward or recognition system provides positive feedback to advisors and demonstrates that the institution values the individuals serving in this important role.

*Action:* Development of a system-wide assessment vehicle to evaluate all advisors for annual review, and where faculty are advisors, it shall be included in the promotion and tenure process.

*Budget:* Cost is contingent upon the USG's plan to develop and implement an evaluation system that is included in the promotion and tenure process, including possible reward incentives for outstanding advising performance.

### *Recommendation #10: Mandatory use of system-wide electronic advising programs*

Each USG institution will utilize an appropriate system-wide technology process to improve advising communication, the advising process, and assessment of its advising programs.

*Objective:* The EAP team researched two viable options for an advising technology process: one an internally-developed system and the other the commercial program DegreeWorks. The internally-developed system would provide the basic documentation requirements for advising, scheduling of advising sessions and comparing advised individual course enrollment with the available course schedule. The DegreeWorks system provides those capabilities and more. The internally-developed prototype was initially constructed by Valdosta State University's Information Technology division and was well received by the EAP team during presentations at the November 28, 2006, and February 28, 2007, meetings. However, the DegreeWorks product evoked positive reactions among some EAP team members due to its ability to go beyond basic recording of advising facts to providing students with a tool to explore options with a "what if" analysis and its ability to quickly and accurately recalculate degree plans. DegreeWorks would also allow institutions to predict demand for courses and

assist in the overall course scheduling process.

Members of the EAP team participated in a demonstration of the DegreeWorks system and commented positively. The DegreeWorks product provides advanced degree planning functions for students and advisors, giving them a complete matrix of proposed courses. It also provides institutions with reports that can forecast student demand for courses. It potentially provides better, more accurate and flexible audit and “what-if” analyses by the use of scripting and therefore could replace CAPP. While the licensing costs are relatively low and represent an excellent value, implementation costs will be substantial and the timeline for system-wide implementation is estimated at 18 to 24 months.

Appendix F provides a list of the pros and cons associated with the internally-developed and DegreeWorks programs; Appendix G provides an estimated system-wide comparison between internally-developed and DegreeWorks options; and Appendix H provides individual licensing costs for DegreeWorks at each USG institution.

*Action:* The EAP team recommends that USG purchase DegreeWorks for implementation system-wide.

*Budget:* Estimated cost to purchase the licensing for DegreeWorks for all USG institutions is \$724,000 (this includes a 60% discount). This estimate does not include implementation and training; if a system approach is used, then implementation and training cost is estimated at \$1.5 million, bringing the total licensing and training cost to \$2.25 million. It is anticipated that no additional equipment is needed and that existing equipment supporting Banner is sufficient. Additional expenses include annual licensing fees at 15% of the original licensing cost (\$724,000).

## V. Appendices

---

- A. USG Institutions Current Advising Models
- B. 2005 NSSE results related to advising at USG four-year institutions and all NSSE participating institutions
- C. 2005 CCSSE results related to advising at USG two-year institutions and all CCSSE participating institutions
- D. USG Student Advisory Council Academic Advising Committee’s recommendations

- E. EAP team's list of USG institutions' advising strengths, weaknesses and related recommendations
- F. Electronic advising system: Internally-developed and DegreeWorks pros and cons
- G. Electronic advising system: System-wide cost comparison between internally-developed and DegreeWorks
- H. Electronic advising system: Individual cost analysis for DegreeWorks at each USG institution

## USG Advising Models

**Four Advising Models:**

- 1. Faculty advising**
- 2. Advising Centers at division/college levels**
- 3. Campus-wide centers**
- 4. Combination**

Institution	
<b>Research Universities</b>	
<b>Georgia Institute of Technology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus-wide structure of administration for advising</li> <li>• Few use faculty advisors</li> <li>• Advisors available for undecided in each college</li> <li>• Campus-wide pre-professional advising open to all students (Pre-Health, Pre-Law, etc)</li> <li>• Georgia Tech Academic Advisors Network (<a href="http://www.gtaan.gatech.edu">www.gtaan.gatech.edu</a>) provides workshops, certificates in advising training, best practices events for all Georgia schools, and serves as communication tool for disseminating</li> <li>• 2005 new position "Director of Academic Advising" to create consistency (and excellence) in academic advising across campus</li> <li>• Established "essential components" of an advising system based on common components of the top advising programs on campus</li> </ul>

<p><b>Georgia State University</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination advising process</li> <li>• Three-tiered system             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tier 1: Freshmen advised in Student Advisement Center—centralized center for all majors (except nursing, which are advised directly by that department). Center staffed with full-time academic advisors</li> <li>○ Tier 2: Each undergraduate college has an Office of Academic Assistance staffed with a varied number of full-time academic advisors</li> <li>○ Tier 3: Students are encouraged, and in some instances required, to visit academic departments to talk with faculty members about their discipline, major course content and requirements, goals, and options for careers in their specific area</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Medical College of Georgia</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advising</li> <li>• Students are advised by faculty within the academic department of the discipline being studied</li> <li>• Undergraduate advising: students complete their general education requirements and USG Core Curriculum at another institution and transfer as juniors into the program of their choice at MCG</li> <li>• Graduate advising: Students, other than PhD in biomedical sciences are advised at the department level by assigned faculty advisors, who normally do not have more than five students as advisees</li> <li>• Doctoral Students in the biomedical sciences are assigned a general academic advisor during their first year of enrollment, during the second year after they select a major and research/dissertation an advisor is assigned that guides them through the degree program of study</li> <li>• Students in the School of Dentistry are advised by the Assistant Dean of Students, who serves as the overall advisor for the 62 students in the dentistry program</li> <li>• Students in the school of Medicine are assigned a faculty advisor as first year student and this advisor remains with them through graduation</li> </ul>

<p><b>University of Georgia</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination advising model</li> <li>• Academic advising is decentralized to and administered by the dean’s offices of the 11 schools and colleges which offer baccalaureate degrees</li> <li>• Some of the larger units combine an advising center for lower-division students with faculty advising at the upper division, some colleges offer professional advising throughout the student’s academic career, and some provide faculty advising throughout</li> <li>• Advising is required of every student each term prior to registration</li> <li>• Academic Advising Coordinating Council (meets monthly during academic year) offers campus-wide Advisor Workshops (fall and spring semesters); developed an advisor assessment instrument utilized by all schools, and works to improve academic advising across the campus</li> </ul>
<p><b>Regional Universities</b></p>	
<p><b>Georgia Southern University</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination advisement model</li> <li>• Each college has an Advising Center with specifically trained staff to advise all undergraduate students and specific majors in the college. For some colleges, this model is followed for a student’s entire academic career. For other colleges, a hybrid model is utilized with the college advisement center working in conjunction with faculty advisors</li> <li>• Undeclared students are advised through the First Year Experience Office</li> <li>• Graduate students are advised by faculty</li> </ul>
<p><b>Valdosta State University</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination of faculty advising with departments as well as advising centers at the college level</li> <li>• The Colleges of Education and Business Administration have advising centers with staff members working with students during their first two years, once students are officially admitted to these colleges, they are then advised by faculty members within their major</li> <li>• Undeclared majors are advised through the College of Arts and Sciences Oasis Advising Center Students have their first contact with advisors during orientation sessions. These advisors may not remain the students’ permanent advisor, some are reassigned</li> </ul>

<b>State Universities</b>	
<b>Albany State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily faculty advising model</li> <li>• All academic departments are charged with advising</li> <li>• First year freshmen and transfer students are provided restricted orientation sessions to set guidelines for their first and second year experience which includes concentration on core curriculum</li> <li>• Undeclared majors are referred to Academic Advising Department to be guided through the core curriculum and counseled until a major is selected</li> </ul>
<b>Armstrong Atlantic State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination advising center and faculty advising</li> <li>• Academic Orientation and Advisement Office advises undeclared majors, Freshman Learning Community participants, joint-enrollment students; and students admitted under Presidential exceptions, provisionally or academic appeal</li> <li>• Students with chosen major are advised by faculty members within the department of the major</li> <li>• Non-traditional students advised through Adult Academic Services/Academic Assistance</li> <li>• Student-athletes meet with advisors within Department of Athletics</li> </ul>
<b>Augusta State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination advising model</li> <li>• In 2004, ASU began reviewing its advising process and established an advising group with members from all sectors of the campus community that is involved in the advising process</li> <li>• Advising at ASU is currently a decentralized process—advising matters are the primary responsibility of the various academic sub-units (college, departments and programs), and they determine how and by what advising shall be provided</li> <li>• College of Arts and Sciences and Education (heaviest advising loads) uses faculty only advising model and develops its own advising procedures</li> <li>• College of Business Administration uses a total intake model, where the staff in an administrative unit is responsible for advising all students and ensuring all specific requirements have been met</li> <li>• Special population (Learning Support and Honors students) use either split model or staff-based advising center</li> </ul>

<b>Clayton State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus-wide centers and faculty advising</li> <li>• Most advising functions are coordinated through advising center housed in each of the colleges, size of advising staff and procedures vary by department</li> <li>• Faculty advisors take over depending upon the students' majors</li> <li>• At orientation, all professional advisors discuss advising, general education, and the degree program requirements with new students in their college</li> <li>• All first-time, full-time freshmen take the College Student Inventory and the results are shared with the students</li> <li>• Advisors use AdvisorTrac online scheduling software</li> </ul>
<b>Columbus State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination advising model</li> <li>• College of Education has a centralized advising centers</li> <li>• College of Arts and Letters, College of Business, and College of Science primarily uses faculty advisors</li> </ul> <p>Center for Academic Advising, within University College and uses a split advising model, working with undeclared, learning support, associate degrees, transient, high school joint enrollment, audit and post-baccalaureate</p>
<b>Fort Valley State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus-wide advising center</li> <li>• Academic Success Center (ASC) addresses the need to ensure students meet curriculum with their selected major</li> <li>• ASC has six academic advisors and two professional counselors responsible for collaborating with faculty advisors in academic departments and monitoring the class attendance, course enrollment, and the successful achievement of specialized departmental requirements of each student</li> <li>• ASC provides tutoring, counseling, workshops, and specialized referrals to help student meet program requirements</li> </ul>

<b>Georgia College and State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty based advising system</li> <li>• Undeclared students are assigned to a clustered learning community lead by faculty members in School of Liberal Arts and Science</li> <li>• Recently established Advising Center provides supplemental advising to key student populations. The Center provides support to students who are experiencing academic difficulty and transfers students with undeclared majors. Advising Center also provides training, workshops and resources for faculty advisors campus-wide</li> </ul>
<b>Georgia Southwestern State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty and staff advisors</li> <li>• Three types of advisors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ General Education Advisor advises students who have not declared a major</li> <li>○ Major Curriculum Advisor specializes in specific program of study and provides division requirements for graduation, in addition to core curriculum</li> <li>○ Learning Support Advisor advises only Learning Support students until they are classified as a regular students</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Kennesaw State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination advising model based on a centralized, decentralized and classroom advising model</li> <li>• Undeclared students are advised in the Counseling Advising Program Services (CAPS) center</li> <li>• Colleges used combination of centralized and decentralized advising systems along with faculty advising</li> <li>• Athletes are advised by professional staff in the Student Athletes Success Services center KSU has an Undergraduate Advising Council that meets once a month to improve academic advising at KSU and to improve communication across campus</li> </ul>

<b>North Georgia College and State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination faculty advising and campus-wide advising center</li> <li>• Students with declared majors (with exception of pre-education) are assigned to an academic advisor within the academic department housing their major</li> <li>• Students with undeclared majors and those majoring in pre-education are assigned to the Academic Advisement Center</li> <li>• Academic Advisement Center is staffed with volunteer faculty advisors</li> </ul> <p>University recently re-implemented mid-term grades for all students and has established an academic early alert system by which instructors may refer student for various types of assistance with issues related to poor academic performance</p>
<b>Savannah State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decentralized advising system</li> <li>• Each college determines how to provide advising</li> <li>• Students advised by faculty within the academic department of their area of study</li> <li>• Campus-wide system is used to advise undecided majors through the Office of Retention and Student Success</li> <li>• College of Business Administration staffs the Office of Student Services, which is staffed by two fulltime employees, and assists with registration and advising</li> <li>• College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences views the relationship between student and advisor is process-oriented and an intentional relationship that plays an important role in the student's undergraduate and graduate experience <a href="http://www.savstate.edu/class/indexhandbooks/advising/handbookadvise.htm">www.savstate.edu/class/indexhandbooks/advising/handbookadvise.htm</a></li> <li>• Office of Retention and Student Success advises students regarding core curriculum requirements as well as resources and programs available to them at the University</li> </ul>
<b>Southern Polytechnic State University</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Primarily faculty advising; however, some aspects of advising centers are used</li> <li>• School of Computing and Software Engineering maintains an advising center staffed by a professional advisor, who advises all students within their department</li> <li>• Undeclared students are advised at the University's Advising, Tutoring, Testing, International Center</li> </ul>

<b>University of West Georgia</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decentralized hybrid advising model</li> <li>• Four of the five major advising units incorporate professional advisors and the fifth uses faculty advisors exclusively</li> <li>• Some of the units with professional advisors, the advising of first and second year students is provided by professional advisors then faculty advisors when the student achieves admission into their desired program, or when they become juniors</li> </ul>
<b>State Colleges</b>	
<b>Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advising</li> <li>• Each academic department is responsible for advising students within assigned degree programs</li> <li>• Students are required to make contact with their advisor before registering for classes each semester</li> <li>• Students are taught how to do a CAPP evaluation in their required freshman seminar class and are expected to monitor their progress to degree completion by running a CAPP evaluation after each registration period</li> </ul>
<b>Dalton State College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Campus-wide advising center</li> <li>• Academic Advising Center (AAC) is currently in the fourth year under a Title III grant</li> <li>• AAC has two full-time and one part-time advisor</li> <li>• Grant mandates faculty work part-time as advisors in the AAC</li> <li>• Peer Advising program implemented in 2004, three peer leaders are employed and work part-time at the AAC. The peer leaders contact students for appointments, send birthday cards to advisees, provide secretarial support and answer general questions for new students</li> <li>• In 2005 began using AdvisorTrac</li> </ul>

<b>Gainesville State College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination of faculty advising and campus-wide advising center</li> <li>• Advising Center also serves to the “early alert program” and “academic improvement plan”</li> <li>• Advising Center serves as a central point of contact for students requesting information about academic programs, campus referrals, and transfer institutions</li> </ul>
<b>Georgia Gwinnett College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New institution and currently only has juniors and seniors, who have declared their majors and are assigned to faculty advisors within their chosen academic discipline</li> <li>• Faculty advisors expected to go beyond the typical degree compliance audits and scheduling of classes with students, but they also mentor students regarding career preparation and help determine if students are having academic difficulty</li> <li>• GCC’s draft of their Faculty Promotions and Merit Award System is based, in large part, on faculty evidence of student engagement of which advising is a key indicator</li> </ul>
<b>Gordon College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advising within each college</li> <li>• New students advised in group settings during orientation, during their first semester they meet with their permanent advisor</li> <li>• Faculty advisors assist with course selection and assist students who may be experiencing academic difficulties</li> </ul>
<b>Macon State College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination faculty and campus-wide advising</li> <li>• Students with declared majors are advised by faculty in appropriate academic divisions</li> <li>• First-time students, Learning Support students, and undeclared majors are advised in the Academic Advising Center</li> <li>• The Center utilizes Learning Support faculty members and contract faculty advisors in the advising process</li> </ul>
<b>Middle Georgia College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advising</li> <li>• Students are assigned to faculty advisors according to their declared major</li> <li>• Students taking Learning Support courses are advised by the Learning Support faculty until they exit</li> </ul>

<b>Two Year Colleges</b>	
<b>Atlanta Metropolitan College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advising</li> <li>• Students requiring Learning Support courses are assigned to faculty members who teach in the Learning Support area</li> <li>• Students who do not need Learning Support classes report to the division under which their program of study is listed</li> <li>• The academic division becomes the advising center for the students</li> </ul>
<b>Bainbridge College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty and staff advisors</li> <li>• Learning Support students are required to see a Learning Support faculty advisor</li> <li>• Bainbridge is currently adapting a Self-Contained Model of advising, allowing all academic advising from orientation through departure from the institution to take place in a centralized unit</li> </ul>
<b>Coastal Georgia Community College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty and professional staff personnel serve as advisors</li> <li>• Students who declare a major or certificate intent are assigned a faculty advisor from that area of academic area Learning Support students are advised by Learning Support advisors</li> </ul>
<b>Darton College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combination faculty advising and campus-wide advising center</li> <li>• First-time and returning students who have not declared a major are advised within Advising Center</li> <li>• Once a student declares a major they are assigned to a faculty major within their chosen academic degree program</li> </ul>
<b>East Georgia College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advising</li> <li>• During orientation students are divided into teams of 15-20 and advised by a faculty team leader</li> <li>• After orientation students are assigned a faculty advisor within their chosen academic degree program</li> <li>• Every new student must take a Student Success course, during this course they must declare a major, if they have not done so already, and then assigned a faculty advisor</li> </ul>

<b>Georgia Highlands College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advising</li> <li>• Students are paired with a faculty advisor during orientation for their first semester registration</li> <li>• "Advising DAZE" a walk-in advising session is held several weeks prior to registration</li> <li>• Students may schedule one-on-one appointments with their advisors</li> <li>• 2005-2006 an Academic Advising Council was established to make recommendations on advising process</li> </ul>
<b>Georgia Perimeter College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advisors and Advising and Counseling Centers</li> <li>• Faculty advise students before every registration period and advise students during new student orientation on each campus</li> <li>• Students are not required to see an advisor before registering for classes</li> <li>• GPC is currently implementing an updated advisor training program for faculty and planning to implement a Master Advising Program that will support faculty members, who are master advisors, to be a resource for other faculty members as they advise students</li> </ul>
<b>South Georgia College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advisors</li> <li>• Students are assigned a faculty advisor; however, they are not required to see their advisor before registration</li> <li>• During peak registration time a "bank" of faculty advisors are available at a central location to advise students, students can elect to schedule an appointment with their advisor or see a faculty member within the advising bank</li> <li>• South Georgia College is moving toward a staffed Advising Center with professional advisors (scheduled to open 2007)</li> </ul>
<b>Waycross College</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty advisors</li> <li>• Students are assigned a faculty advisor with preference given to faculty within the student's degree plan</li> <li>• This year Waycross College hired a Director of Student Success who helps student with advising questions and/or issues after pre-registration has ended</li> </ul>

**National Survey of Student Engagement  
Results Related to Advising  
University System of Georgia and All NSSE  
2005**

		First-Year Students				Seniors			
		Georgia System		NSSE 2005		Georgia System		NSSE 2005	
		<i>Count</i>	<i>Col %</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Col %</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Col %</i>	<i>Count</i>	<i>Col %</i>
Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor.	Never	467	29%	10,637	23%	342	17%	6,728	14%
	Very often	134	8%	4,359	9%	321	16%	9,982	20%
Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically.	Very little	48	3%	1,264	3%	110	6%	2,008	4%
	Very much	434	28%	14,135	32%	493	25%	13,721	29%
Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?	Poor	112	7%	2,322	5%	225	12%	4,110	9%
	Excellent	362	24%	12,635	29%	529	27%	14,924	31%
During this academic year, how many times have you participated in academic advising at this college?	0	166	11%			274	14%		
	4 or more times	149	10%			379	20%		
How important is it to you that: An academic advisor helps students select courses?	Not important	57	4%			123	7%		
	Essential	711	48%			864	46%		
How important is it to you that: An academic advisor provides information about academic programs?	Not important	36	2%			56	3%		
	Essential	771	52%			983	52%		
How important is it to you that: An academic advisor talks with students about career opportunities?	Not important	47	3%			75	4%		
	Essential	755	51%			910	48%		
How important is it to you that: An academic advisor talks with students about non-academic/career interests and plans?	Not important	155	11%			291	16%		
	Essential	428	29%			483	26%		
My academic advisor was available when needed.	Strongly disagree	57	4%			119	6%		
	Strongly agree	412	29%			636	34%		
My academic advisor provided me with accurate information about courses, programs, and requirements.	Strongly disagree	68	5%			128	7%		
	Strongly agree	437	30%			605	33%		
My advisor provided assistance when academic difficulties occurred.	Strongly disagree	78	5%			149	8%		
	Strongly agree	325	23%			568	31%		

**Community College Survey of Student Engagement**  
**Results Related to Advising**  
**University System of Georgia and Overall CCSSE**  
**2005**

		<b>Part-Time Students</b>	<b>Full-Time Students</b>	<b>All Students (weighted)</b>	
		Georgia System	Georgia System	Georgia System	CCSSE 2005
		<i>Col %</i>	<i>Col %</i>	<i>Col %</i>	<i>Col %</i>
Providing the support you need to help you succeed at this college.	Very little	6%	5%	5%	6%
	Very much	25%	28%	26%	27%
Frequency: Academic Advising/Planning	Rarely/Never	39%	33%	35%	36%
	Often	12%	16%	14%	12%
Satisfaction: Academic Advising/Planning	Not at all	11%	12%	11%	10%
	Very	25%	29%	27%	26%
Importance: Academic Advising/Planning	Not at all	7%	6%	6%	11%
	Very	64%	68%	66%	60%
My academic advisor and I talk about my academic goals.	Strongly disagree	27%	21%	24%	
	Strongly agree	10%	14%	12%	
When I experience academic difficulties, I seek assistance from faculty or staff (advisor/tutor).	Never	23%	20%	21%	
	Very often	11%	12%	12%	
I am satisfied with the assistance received when faced with academic difficulties.	Never	8%	9%	8%	
	Very often	15%	15%	15%	

### **Student Advisory Council Academic Advising Committee**

The purpose of the academic advising committee is to articulate the student interest for achieving excellent advising within the University system of Georgia. The Foundation of advisement should stem from a collaborative effort between faculty and students with equal expectations placed on both parties. Academic advising should reflect the University System's vision to create a more educated Georgia. Proper advisement that is governed by a centralized body is a necessity in providing consistency throughout the system towards achieving a first-rate undergraduate and graduate education.

Suggested practices Throughout the System:

1. All faculty members will serve as an advisor/mentor and all students will participate as an advisee.
2. Each institution centralizes an advisement center with an established purpose, mission, and guidelines which will compliment the current advising philosophy that is set by the University System of Georgia. Specific schools/departments are expected to comply with the institution's advising principles, however, are empowered to not take away from but add to the principles that will compliment the university's philosophy.
3. An academic advising training program is implemented for all faculty members at each institution. All faculty members are required to achieve satisfactory completion of the training program prior to the advisement/registration period the advisement process includes, but is not limited of assisting in course selection, discussing career options, and discovering co-curricular, study abroad, internships, and other academic advising enhancing opportunities.
4. An introduction to academic advising program is implemented for all students at each institution. All students are expected to display satisfactory competency of academic advising prior to the advisement/registration period. Advising will be part of the curriculum for institutions that offer freshman seminar classes.
5. Advisors welcome their advisees with an introduction letter that states the mission/goal of the advisor and advisee, the name department and contact information for that advisor.
6. Students are given the opportunity and are expected to evaluate their advisor/advisement session in a form that offers feedback to individual institutions. This is conducted after every advisement/registration period and is incorporated into all faculty members' overall review.
7. An incentive program is established in every institution that encourages outstanding advising and motivates faculty members to educate students about university, community, academic and social opportunities that will lead to a well-rounded educational experience.
8. A component of tenure and promotions will be based on advising for those Faculty members that are involved.

*University System of Georgia  
Advising Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations*

Advising Strengths

- Mandatory advising at most institutions
- Electronic holds are used at some institutions, others are opposed unless student is having academic trouble
- Advising Centers at most institutions
  - Serve as a means to monitor students overall academic success; at times serving as a catalyst to higher level of success
  - Centers serve as the advising experts on campus, the professional staff will be used as a resource not only for student but faculty advisors
  - Many campuses have strong advising centers which offer mentorship programs, tutoring, career development assessment, etc.
- Freshmen seminar classes successful
- Freshmen/transfer orientation programs
- Professional advisors, some campuses use professional staff members for advising. These individuals have a singular focus, can provide a broad spectrum of advising and support services, and are connected to their profession through many regional and national professional development organizations
- Academic advising committees—many campuses have academic committees that meet regularly throughout the academic year. Many of these groups include student representation, as well as faculty and staff advisors.
- USG Student Advisory Council—strong committee working on advising issues
- Common use of BANNER at most institutions

Advising Weaknesses

- Most institutions do not have a comprehensive plan for academic advising or a definition of excellence in advising
- Learning support student may need to be advised differently
- Advising is viewed as a “registration process” with primary objective of enrolling the student in an adequate and hopefully appropriate set of courses
- On most USG campuses, advising is a “stand alone,” “one shot” activity disconnected from other academic support programs and services. Hence it’s educational efficacy in promoting higher levels of learning and success (i.e. retention rates) is extremely limited
- On many campuses, advisor orientation and training are “optional” thereby creating more variability in the overall quality of advising. In addition, some advisors do not possess the appropriate skill sets and/or knowledge bases necessary for being effective. Finally, advising is often treated with “aggressive neglect”... we say it’s important, but it is not valued in terms of institutional service and promotion and tenure

Appendix E: EAP team’s list of USG institutions advising strengths, weaknesses and related recommendations

- Lack of clarity and consistency regarding the role and scope of advising appears to be common among and between institutions in the USG. This contributes to the variability in effectiveness and overall efficacy among various campuses
- Advising information structure—lack of internal communication between individuals responsible for advising
- Voluntary advising—usually unsuccessful
- Lack of student training (CAPP module) on advising and their responsibility to the process
- Advising assessment—other than student satisfaction surveys, there are limited mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of student advising
- Lack of incentive for students to meet regularly with their advisors
- No systematic method for evaluating faculty advising
- Advising is not part of faculty job description/contract
- No reward system in place to recognize excellence in academic advising
- Academic advisors and the academic process are not evaluated consistently
- Faculty training—inadequate/non-existent
- Faculty uninformed on many aspects of advising—unable to answer questions
- Tenure and promotion system actually discourages faculty from spending quality time (that doesn't involve research) with students
- Growth of USG student population—larger classes, more adjunct instructors, higher advisee-advisor ratio, all results in less individual attention given to students
- Lack of financial support towards academic advising and student support infrastructures on campus—this includes lack of sufficient numbers of fulltime faculty for instruction, particularly freshmen

## RECOMMENDATIONS/DISCUSSION POINTS

### Advising Procedures

- Review all current methods of information dissemination for faculty, staff, and students regarding all aspects of advising
- CAPP-make a concerted system-wide effort to update the CAPP system for all undergraduate students; develop a method that would allow students to register from the CAPP record. If the CAPP system was updated and registration took place through this system, it would help minimize registration errors.
- Electronic holds
- Develop an electronic campus network for advisors with useful tools and information (EAP electronic advising model, currently in development)
- Develop on-line checklists/advising records, easy way for advisors to communicate with advisees
- Require academic advising check points—30, 60, 90 hours (complete review of student's transcript)
- Mandatory advising for all students with fewer than 60 hours of credit
- Every student should have an "advisor of record"
- Each academic department should be required to provide a sound advising plan
- Make appropriate referral mechanisms clear and put information on-line that may help both student and advisor (financial aid, student success center information, counseling center, etc)
- Each campus should intentionally link and align advising with other educational structure such as early-alert/intervention programs, learning communities, academic support initiatives, etc. to create an intentional, integrated and collaborative "performance support system" that fosters higher levels of student engagement, learning and success
- Use a national or local tool for assessment of advising that looks not only at student satisfaction with advising, but also at other success data connected with good advising (progression, probation rates, time to degree, etc)
- Seek ways to separate the processes of advising, scheduling, and registration such that students seek advising throughout the term and not only at registration time
- Automated early warning system for students who are disengaged or in academic trouble
- Funding from USG to support academic advising centers and programs
- Explore different models for advising (have an advisor teach certain classes and build a connection between advisor and students)
- Monitor advising loads to ensure that advisor has adequate time to interact with advisees in meaningful manner
- Create a "hotline" with senior academic advisors available for "on-call" types of inquiries from junior faculty and staff advisors

Appendix E: EAP team's list of USG institutions advising strengths, weaknesses and related recommendations

## RECOMMENDATIONS/DISCUSSION POINTS

### Advising Mission/Policies

- Publish two-year course rotations
- Each institution should articulate a clear advising mission statement with corresponding goals and student outcomes. The roles and expectations of the student and advisor should be clearly delineated
- Establish a comprehensive academic advisement assessment system that evaluates advising at all levels—institutional, college, department, and individual advisors
- Advising syllabus—each campus should have an advising syllabus that contains their academic advising mission statement and learning outcome and faculty and student responsibilities
- Each campus should create a “philosophy of advising” or “statement of purpose” that emphasizes the importance of educational planning as the core element in the advising process, especially for first- and second-year students
- Campuses should adopt one set of advising standards, such as CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards) that can serve as a “general architecture” for creating student learning-centered advising systems that have clear goals, effective processes and measurable outcomes
- System wide mandatory advising for students

## RECOMMENDATIONS/DISCUSSION POINTS

### Advising Training and Evaluation

- Develop and implement a process through which advisors can be systematically evaluated
- Comprehensive system to evaluate and reward excellence in academic advising and make it part of the tenure and promotion process; define expectations for the professional development of individuals serving as academic advisors and include participation in professional development activities as part of the annual assessment process for advisors
- Define expectations for the professional development of individuals serving as academic advisors and include participation in professional development activities as part of the annual assessment process for advisors
- Require training for new faculty and continual training for all faculty advisors
- Design, implement, and support a professional development system for advisors
- On-going professional development programs should be provided at the institutional as well as the college/school levels.
- Decide whether or not tenure track and tenured faculty need to be embedded in academic advising. If so, tenure and promotion expectations need to be adjusted accordingly, if not, investment in professional staff will be necessary
- Mandatory freshmen/transfer orientation
- Mandatory freshmen year experience (all freshmen)
- Each institution offering freshmen seminar classes should incorporate academic advising into the curriculum—teach students to take responsibility for their academic career; stress the importance of advising
- The faculty member teaching the class would become the advisor to the students enrolled in the class for that semester or first year of enrollment

Enhanced Advising Support Database Solutions

Proposed Solution	Pros	Cons	Costs & Timetables	Considerations and Issues
Do Nothing New; Use Existing Solutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaves departments and schools to seek their own solutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hidden costs in missed opportunities to achieve better effectiveness and efficiencies.</li> </ul>	
Internally-Developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low cost</li> <li>• Simple tool</li> <li>• Provides basic requirements for documentation of advising.</li> <li>• Integrates with Banner.</li> <li>• Provides scheduling function for advising sessions.</li> <li>• Compares advised individual course enrollments with available schedule of courses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technical support falls to existing staff.</li> <li>• Does not provide What-If analyses.</li> <li>• Does not provide institutional planning reports at this time, although some data is available.</li> <li>• Does not include what-if analysis or degree audit tool yet.</li> <li>• Does not have potential broad scale development, support, and standardization of products like Banner or Degree Works.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing technical and functional support staff would perform implementation.</li> <li>• Immediately available with a short implementation timeline.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not integrate or link to CAPP yet, but this would be possible.</li> <li>• Technical support is not well defined.</li> </ul>
Degree Works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robust tool</li> <li>• Provides advanced degree planning functions for students and advisors with a complete matrix of proposed courses.</li> <li>• Provides institutional planning tools to develop schedule of courses offered.</li> <li>• Integrates with Banner.</li> <li>• Potentially provides better, more accurate and flexible audit and what-if analyses by use of scripting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Costs and time to implementation.</li> <li>• Requires and duplicates work done to implement CAPP.</li> <li>• Does not provide scheduling function for advising sessions.</li> <li>• Does not compare advised individual course enrollments with schedule of courses. (?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• License cost of \$724,000 is projected for the USG.</li> <li>• Additional costs for implementation assistance, training, and on-going annual maintenance are required.</li> <li>• Implementation would require at least 18-24 months.</li> </ul> <p><i>(See Appendices G &amp; H for Degree Works implementation and additional costs)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replaces CAPP with potentially better, more accurate solution. Confidence in the accuracy of output with CAPP is not high.</li> <li>• Long implementation timeline.</li> <li>• Faculty advisors may find tool more complex than they like at first, so strong mandate, implementation, and training will be needed. Professional advisors appear to recognize the value this tool the most.</li> <li>• Special accommodation will be needed for OIIT Hosted Banner schools.</li> <li>• Centralized implementation model for the system should reduce implementation costs for each school.</li> <li>• A separate advising scheduling function will need to be provided, although some schools already have this.</li> <li>• Some schools may implement before the system is able to do so.</li> </ul>

Appendix F: Electronic advising system: Internally-developed and Degree Works pros and cons