

# Academic Advising Program Review

University of California, Santa Cruz

January 2017

Dr. Brett McFarlane

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

**OVERVIEW..... 1**

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK ..... 1**

    Historical Background and Context..... 1

        Changing Student Demographics ..... 2

        The Need for Advisor Training ..... 2

    Training and Development Conceptual Framework..... 3

        Desired Advisor Competencies ..... 3

            Conceptual..... 3

            Informational ..... 4

            Relational ..... 4

**ACADEMIC ADVISOR COMPETENCIES AT UC SANTA CRUZ ..... 4**

    Data Collection..... 4

    Data Analysis ..... 5

    Results ..... 5

        Advisor-Identified Needs..... 5

            Survey Results ..... 5

            Table 1: Competencies & Identified Training Needs ..... 6

            Focus Group Results ..... 6

        Student-Identified Needs ..... 7

**ACADEMIC ADVISING CERTIFICATE CURRICULUM..... 7**

    Curriculum Design..... 8

    Theoretical Framework ..... 8

        Culturally-responsive..... 8

        Strengths-based..... 8

        Learner-centered..... 8

    Competency-Based Curriculum ..... 8

    Assessment and Evaluation ..... 9

        Table 2: Competencies, Outcomes, & Performance Indicators ..... 10

    Sample Advising Certificate Curriculum ..... 11

        Table 3: Core Courses / Learning Activities..... 11

        Table 4: Elective Courses / Learning Activities ..... 11

    Additional Issues and challenges ..... 11

    Additional Resources..... 13

**REFERENCES ..... 15**

## OVERVIEW

In December 2016, Stacey Sketo-Rosener, assistant vice provost for academic advising, initiated a review of academic advisor training needs on the UC Santa Cruz (UCSC) campus to inform the development and implementation of a campus-wide advising certificate program enlisting the services of the NACADA academic advising consultants service. NACADA, the global community for academic advising, is a non-profit association of over 11,000 professional advisors, faculty, counselors, administrators, and graduate students working to enhance the educational development of students across the world. The NACADA consultants service was established to assist institutions with the review, establishment, development, or reorganization of advising services.

Brett McFarlane, UC Davis executive director of academic advising and NACADA consultant, undertook the review, which included examination and analysis of 1) extant materials related to the current state of advisor training at UCSC; (2) current versus desired advisor competencies; and 3) data collected through three focus groups (advising leadership, college advisors, departmental advisors) on January 4, 2017. The following report provides initial results of the inquiry and recommendations<sup>1</sup> to inform the development of the certificate program for staff advisors at UCSC.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### Historical Background and Context

The profession of academic advising has changed dramatically over the last twenty years as institutions further recognize the important relationship that academic advising can have with student persistence and academic success. Advisors are integral to helping students navigate the complexity of higher education, connecting students to campus resources crucial to their academic success, and helping students to align academic, career, and life goals. In addition, recent scholarship has highlighted key learning that should result from quality academic advising (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999; Hemwall & Trachte, 2005; Lowenstein, 2005; Smith & Allen, 2006; Smith & Allen, 2014). Quality academic advising is intentional, outcome focused, and steeped in meaningful personal and academic relationships.

As a result of significant transformation in the advising profession, many institutions have placed a greater reliance on primary role advisors within their institutions. Primary role advisors are those who have full-time responsibility for academic advising within their institutions. These roles, historically, were centered around more prescriptive duties such as class scheduling, paperwork, and degree tracking. Within the last twenty years these positions have transformed significantly to focus on a much more holistic approach to academic advising. Lowenstein (2005) notes, "...an excellent advisor does the same thing for the student's entire curriculum that the excellent teacher does for one course." Quality academic advising involves significant integration functions that help students understand the value of the curriculum, how coursework builds to develop critical learning, and provides a roadmap and tools for integrating academic, social, and career goals.

---

<sup>1</sup> The scope of this report is limited to staff advisors who were included in the data collection efforts.



This significant transformation in the responsibilities of primary role advisors over the last two decades has resulted in additional training and development needs as many of the advisors originally hired based upon their curricular content knowledge or administrative expertise do not have sufficient training or backgrounds in holistic student development to support critical student learning objectives expected of institutions and of the academic advising profession as a whole (Folsome & Scobie, 2010). These training needs can be even more acute on campuses with decentralized or loosely coupled academic advising structures where reporting lines tend to support administrative functions and expertise over holistic student development and perpetuate the status quo, namely hiring new academic advisors based upon institutional familiarity or curricular expertise.

Other units (typically at the central administrative or college level) tend to focus on new hires that do have the formal training in student and adult development but may lack the specific institutional knowledge necessary for the position. These hires are trained in helping students develop agency and critical thinking skills but may lack the content knowledge to make sure that students are getting the appropriate policy, process, and curricular guidance. This resultant bifurcated distribution of training needs complicates the development of uniform training programs for primary role advisors.

### **CHANGING STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS**

An important consideration when constructing a comprehensive advisor training program is addressing the unique demographics of the student body. Institutional data at UCSC note that during the 1992-1993 academic year over 60% of the student body identified as white. Contrast that number to 2014-2015 where under 35% of the student body identified as white. In addition, over 50% of new first year admits are first-generation students; low income students continue to comprise a greater and greater percentage of fall quarter matriculated students (UC Santa Cruz, 2017). Given the changing demographics of the UCSC student body, having advisors knowledgeable regarding success strategies for diverse, first generation, and socioeconomically disadvantaged students should be an integral component of a comprehensive advisor training program.

A comprehensive report examining best practices for retaining low-income and first-generation students (Engle & Tinto, 2008) highlighted the need to develop an “active and intrusive approach to advising” (p. 27), noting the need for advisors to use case management approaches that focus on the “whole student”. A study at the University of Massachusetts that focused on ethnic and racial minority departure (Museus & Ravello, 2010, p. 47) found that proactive, multifaceted approaches to advising that “humanized the practice of academic advising” were essential characteristics that contributed to student success. Ensuring that advisor training and development programs encompass and synthesize essential skills focused on developing the “whole student” will be critical to enhanced student success.

### **THE NEED FOR ADVISOR TRAINING**

Creating comprehensive training and development programs for academic advisors may be one of the most powerful steps a campus can take to improve student success. George Kuh (2008) notes the “quality of academic advising is the single most powerful predictor of satisfaction with the campus environment for students at four-year schools” (p. 73).

A lack of comprehensive training for academic advisors continues to be a challenge. All six ACT national surveys on the status of academic advising highlight lack of training as “a major weakness to effective academic advising in all institutional types” (Folsome & Scobie, 2010, p. 17). The authors also note that less than 10% of survey respondents in 2005 reported participating in any type of formal training program (p. 17). It is no wonder then that many advisors feel ill equipped to handle the variety of challenges and expectations in their positions. Campuses looking to improve student success must start by ensuring that those in a capacity to significantly influence progress have the tools, resources, and knowledge to accomplish the task. Creating a comprehensive and inclusive advisor training and development program is a powerful step towards long-term success in this regard.

### Training and Development Conceptual Framework

The primary components of a comprehensive academic advising training conceptual framework have remained intact since first introduced by Wes Habley in 1986. These components are the conceptual, informational, and relational. The *conceptual* component encompasses the historical, theoretical, and philosophical foundations of academic advising (Folsom, 2007); the *informational* component encompasses the knowledge advisors must possess to provide accurate and appropriate advice to students; the *relational* are competencies that advisors need to develop that foster student learning, satisfaction, and success (Folsom, Shultz, Scobie, & Miller, 2010).

Although individual elements within each of these components have changed over time, the framework remains intact. In fact, in 2016 the NACADA Board of Directors charged the Professional Development Committee with reviewing the academic advising training conceptual framework. While new competencies were identified under each component, the core framework based upon conceptual, informational, and relational was left intact (<https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/About-Us/NACADA-Leadership/Administrative-Division/Professional-Development-Committee/PDC-Advisor-Competencies.aspx>). The NACADA Professional Development committee will continue to seek input on specific competency changes and additions before formal adoption at the October, 2017, annual conference.

While some of the competencies within each component (*conceptual, informational, relational*) have remained fairly static over time, more recent competency discussions have generally focused on (1) how to more effectively work with a broader and more diverse population of students, (2) how to more effectively help students develop agency and decision making skills, (3) the importance of self-awareness and reflective work with students and within the profession, and (4) how to effectively utilize technology and analytics in advising. Each campus should examine each competency according to institutional context to best determine appropriate training needs.

Analogous to the trajectory of many professions, additional higher order competencies continue to be necessary in order to frame what campuses look for when hiring and recruiting new primary role academic advisors. The base components of the three competencies are detailed below (as presented to NACADA membership in draft form for further input) (NACADA, 2017):

#### DESIRED ADVISOR COMPETENCIES

##### *Conceptual*

- The history and purpose of advising in higher education

- Core values of advising
- Theories relevant to and informing advising
- The practice of advising (approaches and methods)
- Expected outcomes of advising
- How equitable and inclusive environments are created and maintained

#### *Informational*

- Institution specific history mission, vision, values, and culture
- Curriculum, degree programs, and other academic requirements and options
- Institution specific policies, procedures, rules, and regulations
- Legal guidelines of advising practice, including privacy regulations and confidentiality
- The characteristics, needs, and experiences of major and emerging student populations
- Campus and community resources that support student success
- Information technology applicable to relevant advising roles

#### *Relational*

- Articulate a personal philosophy of advising
- Create rapport and build advising relationships
- Communicate in an inclusive and culturally competent manner
- Facilitate student appointments
- Promote student understanding of the logic and purpose of the curriculum
- Facilitate problem solving, decision-making, meaning-making, planning, and goal setting
- Engage in ongoing assessment and development of self and the advising practice

## **ACADEMIC ADVISOR COMPETENCIES AT UC SANTA CRUZ**

In order to make recommendations for UC Santa Cruz which align with national articulation of desired advisor competencies, it was important to identify the current state of advising competencies. The following section describes the collection and analysis of data relating to the review.

### **Data Collection**

In 2011, Assistant Vice Provost Sketo-Rosener conducted a detailed and comprehensive survey of UCSC training needs based upon the NACADA core competencies applied to the UCSC context. This survey was re-administered with a few additional questions late in 2016 by Assistant Vice Provost Sketo-Rosener and Colleges Advising Coordinator Danielle Mello. In addition to reviewing the two comprehensive surveys conducted by UCSC, I conducted three focus group sessions (advising leadership, college advisors, departmental advisors) to help illuminate the more qualitative comments and statements that were included as part of both surveys, as well as elicit other responses that may not have been included.

## Data Analysis

The data analysis process involved reviewing advisor and advising supervisor identified training needs, focus group clustered responses, as well as student needs as identified through the 2012 UCUES report with a campus focus on satisfaction with advising by Latino students at UC Santa Cruz. The overall analysis was focused on response items with lower means (survey results) and on multiple responses (focus groups) between groups.

## Results

The analyses of the survey and focus group data reveal alignment among the self-identified training needs of UC Santa Cruz staff advisors, advising competencies desired by UC Santa Cruz students, and national advisor competencies recommended by NACADA. The results are presented below within the categories: Advisor-Identified Needs, Student-Identified Needs, and Additional Issues.

### ADVISOR-IDENTIFIED NEEDS

In both the surveys and focus group data sets, advisors and advising supervisors identified specific training needs. In some cases, advisors, supervisors, college representatives, and departmental representatives consistently identified training needs. The results below are organized by data source.

#### *Survey Results*

On both the 2011 and 2016 surveys, participants were asked to indicate their level of confidence in their knowledge of informational, conceptual, and relational advising activities on a 5-point Likert-type scale (Not at all confident [1] to Very confident [5]). Table 1 (below) includes items for which the mean scores were below 4. These issues can therefore be seen as those have identified areas in which participants believe further training is necessary.

Table 1: Competencies & Identified Training Needs

Competency	Identified Training Needs
CONCEPTUAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advising as Teaching (curriculum/pedagogy/learning outcomes)</li> <li>• Characteristics of college student populations</li> <li>• Student Development Theories</li> <li>• How UCSC’s status as an HSI can or should affect the work we do (2016)</li> <li>• Advisor responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility (2016 only/2011 at 4.0)</li> <li>• UCSC’s advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisors in the UCSC advising system (2016 only/2011, 4-5)</li> </ul>
INFORMATIONAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic Support Resources</li> <li>• Cognos (2011 question)/Infoview (2016 question)</li> <li>• UCSC Student Demographics</li> <li>• UCSC Academic Programs</li> <li>• Educational opportunities available to students (2016 question)</li> </ul>
RELATIONAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• De-escalating a student’s anger and/or anxiety</li> <li>• Responding to a student in psychological crisis (as identified by supervisors)</li> <li>• Public speaking/effective presentation skills (as identified by supervisors)</li> <li>• Coaching a student through becoming a self-directed learner (2016)</li> <li>• Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities</li> <li>• Effectively advising international students (2016)</li> <li>• Effectively advising LGBT students (as identified by supervisors)</li> <li>• Understanding and responding to social justice oriented issues (2016)</li> </ul>

Focus Group Results

While most of the comments in the three focus group sessions with advisors and advising supervisors reflected the advisor survey results, there were a few competencies identified that were not included in the survey.

- **Financial Aid:** Advisors in all three sessions highlighted the need to better understand how to effectively assist students in navigating the intersection of advising decisions with financial aid implications. They highlighted what they see as an “impersonal” handoff that happens with financial aid that does not meet the case management level they would like to achieve with students. This competency has both an *informational* and *relational* component.
- **Strengths-Based Approaches:** Both departmental and college advisors highlighted the need to be better versed in strengths-based advising approaches such as “appreciative advising”. This competency has both a *conceptual* and *relational* component.
- **Cultural Competence:** Also highlighted in both surveys, all three focus groups addressed the need to develop more effective skills in working with a more diverse student body, particularly given the demographic changes in the student body at UCSC. The competency has an *informational*, *conceptual*, and *relational* component.



- **Measuring Impact:** All three focus groups were interested in further training on evaluating effectiveness of both personal and programmatic work in advising. This competency is primarily *conceptual*.
- **Academic/Career Advising:** All three focus groups touched on various aspects of helping students navigate the complexity of major selection, career pathways, and more effective transition into the workforce. The college advisors were more focused on the exploration aspects, while major advisors noted the need to better help students transition out of the university into worthwhile pursuits. This competency has an *informational*, *conceptual*, and *relational* component.

### STUDENT-IDENTIFIED NEEDS

While the advising surveys and focus groups are essential for determining training needs, student feedback on the quality and experience of advising is essential when designing a comprehensive program. The most recent applicable survey of student satisfaction with academic advising provided for this consultation was the 2012 UCUES report on the “need for and satisfaction with advising by Latino students at UC Santa Cruz”. Several results from this survey pertain to the development of advisor training at UCSC.

- Students (Latino) admitted to **needing help but not getting it from advisors:** 23% of students reported needing help on major selection but not getting it; 30% reported needing help about specific majors but not meeting with an advisor; 32% reported needing help with planning a course schedule but not meeting with an advisor.
- Students (Latino) reported **needing much more help than white students** regarding research opportunities, academic challenges, internship/volunteer/community opportunities, career plans, academic performance
- Students (Latino) reported **greater academic and non-academic barriers** when compared to white students.
- Roughly 1/3 of students (Latino) reported **not feeling welcomed** “most of the time” from a college or major advisor
- Comments reflected that students **want to be required to see an advisor** regarding crucial decisions at crucial stages in their academic career.

These results point towards several aspects of a training curriculum that seem important to include:

1. Tools for creating a welcoming and inviting atmosphere (*Relational*).
2. Techniques for better outreach and engagement with diverse populations (*Relational*).
3. Creating intentional and proactive advising programs (*Conceptual*).

### ACADEMIC ADVISING CERTIFICATE CURRICULUM

The Academic Advising Certificate Curriculum described below is designed to meet specific training needs that have been identified by the campus, particularly in relation to how advisors can work most effectively with students from diverse socioeconomic and first-generation backgrounds. The intended participants are staff advisors (college and departmental); however, components of the certificate may be applicable to faculty and/or peer advisors as well.

## CURRICULUM DESIGN

Developing an effective curriculum entails more than identifying and offering courses, although those are two important tasks within the design process. Effective curricular design includes:

- clearly articulated goals for learners drawn from relevant theoretical frameworks;
- intentionally aligned, varied, and multiple opportunities to work toward mastery of key learning goals; and
- systematic assessment of participants' learning and on-going evaluation of program effectiveness.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

There are three salient theories of teaching and learning which inform the proposed curriculum for academic advisors: culturally-responsive, strengths-based, and learner-centered. Each is described *briefly* below.

### *Culturally-responsive*

First coined by Ladson-Billings (1992), “Culturally Responsive Teaching” refers to “a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes” (Ladson-Billings, 1994, p. 17–18). Applying this approach to curricular design will increase academic advisors' capacity to create environments which use, “The cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning more relevant to and effective” (Gay, 2000, p. 29). Culturally-responsive curriculum builds on learners' prior knowledge and cultural experiences.

### *Strengths-based*

A strengths-model of education takes as a given that every individual has resources which s/he can leverage to achieve success. This belief differs from the deficit-remediation approach which often characterizes education (e.g., students arrive flawed and in need of being fixed). According to Liesveld & Miller (2005) a strengths-based curriculum seeks to empower individuals to flourish rather than simply survive. This approach to teaching presupposes that capitalizing on one's best qualities is likely to lead to greater success than a focus on overcoming perceived personal weaknesses or deficiencies (Clifton & Harter, 2003).

### *Learner-centered*

Effective learner-centered teaching “engages students in the hard, messy work of learning; includes explicit skill instruction; encourages students to reflect on what they are learning and how they are learning it; motivates students by giving them some control over learning processes; and encourages collaboration” (Weimer, 2012).

In developing the Advising Certificate program, UC Santa Cruz can provide opportunities for advisors to experience first-hand the curricular principles described above. They will then be better able to apply the concepts and theories to their individual advising practices.

## COMPETENCY-BASED CURRICULUM

Table 2 (below) depicts a curriculum framework for the proposed Advising Certificate. The left-hand column represents the Goals for Learning of the Certificate program. The middle column represents

suggested Certificate Program Learning Outcomes. The right-hand column presents suggested performance indicators. Taken together, the framework will enable UC Santa Cruz to implement a curriculum which will create opportunities for academic advisors to master the desired competencies.

### **ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION**

Alignment describes the clear, direct, and intentional connection between learning outcomes, learning opportunities, and evidence of learning used for assessment. At the course-level, alignment means that student learning is assessed in the context of learning activities which are linked to specific outcomes. At the program level, alignment refers to the ideal cohesive and intentional relationship between curriculum and outcomes.

Table 2: Competencies, Outcomes, & Performance Indicators

	To meet identified student needs and achieve programmatic goals, advisors will:	Performance Indicators
CONCEPTUAL	Intentionally and proactively apply theories of advising and student development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguish between theories of advising &amp; student development (orally and in writing)</li> <li>• Apply theories to practice (e.g., Strength-based, Advising as Teaching, Culturally-responsive and inclusive)</li> <li>• Integrate the foundational purposes of academic <i>and</i> career advising</li> <li>• Articulate a personal philosophy of advising</li> </ul>
	Apply understanding of changing student demographics (cultural, socioeconomic, first-generation status, language), to inform advising practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify potential barriers to student achievement</li> <li>• Identify potential strategies to support student success</li> </ul>
INFORMATIONAL	Effectively leverage complex university systems to support student success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop working knowledge of institutional policies, processes, and procedures (e.g., degree pathways, academic program structures, financial aid)</li> <li>• Promote effective and consistent use of advising technology</li> <li>• Make recommendations to campus and community resources, as appropriate</li> <li>• Provide accurate and timely information</li> </ul>
RELATIONAL	Create and maintain equitable, inclusive, effective, culturally-responsive, and welcoming advising environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate cultural competence (e.g., know student as individual; recognize complexity of self-identification, understand student background and experience)</li> <li>• Develop advising relationships based on rapport</li> <li>• Support students' mastery of problem solving, decision-making, meaning-making, planning, and goal setting</li> <li>• Effectively respond to students in crisis (emotional / psychological / other)</li> </ul>



**SAMPLE ADVISING CERTIFICATE CURRICULUM**

*Table 3: Core Courses / Learning Activities*

Core Courses / Activities	Primary Competency	Format
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundations of Academic Advising                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Advising as Teaching</li> <li>○ Academic Advising Theories</li> <li>○ Theories of Student Development</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Principles and Practices of Integrative Academic and Career Advising</li> </ul>	CONCEPTUAL	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build Your Advising Toolkit                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Resources and Services</li> <li>○ Advising Technologies</li> <li>○ University Policies in Action</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	INFORMATIONAL	B
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enacting Culturally-Competent Advising                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Interpersonal and inclusive communication</li> <li>○ Identity awareness of self and others</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Responding to Students in Crisis / Distress</li> </ul>	RELATIONAL	C  D
KEY to Format Codes: A = Cohort-Based Hybrid Delivery; B = Fully-Online; C = Multi-session, In-Person Cohort Model; D = Facilitated Workshop. See <a href="#">Appendix A</a> for details.		

*Table 4: Elective Courses / Learning Activities*

Elective Courses / Activities	Competency	Format
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessing Learning in the Context of Academic Advising</li> </ul>	CONCEPTUAL	B
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social Justice Issues in Advising</li> </ul>	RELATIONAL	A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effective Public Speaking / Presentation Skills</li> </ul>	CONCEPTUAL	D
KEY to Format Codes: A = Cohort-Based Hybrid Delivery; B = Fully-Online; C = Multi-session, In-Person Cohort Model; D = Facilitated Workshop. See <a href="#">Appendix A</a> for details.		

**ADDITIONAL ISSUES AND CHALLENGES**

*Preparation and background*

According to the participants in the focus groups, new advisors at UC Santa Cruz have traditionally been hired with preparation and background reflecting two different sources: (1) **peer advisors** pipeline, which reflects a value on institutional and curricular knowledge; and (2) **graduate program** pipeline, which reflects higher level training in student development. Not surprisingly, these two tracks to staff advising positions result in highly variable knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Understanding the variance in preparation and background will be important in the development of an advising curriculum which meets the needs of UC Santa Cruz and also presents opportunities for professional growth for advisors. While varied experiential and formal education backgrounds of campus staff advisors can present content challenges, it does provide a rich environment for staff to learn through each others’ experiences. It is important that the training design elements are flexible enough to maximize this opportunity for shared growth.

### *Time with the Institution*

In the 2011 and 2016 surveys, respondents with longer time in advising or advising-related jobs at UCSC consistently rated their own competencies higher than advisors who were newer to campus rated their competencies. The advisors who had been in their positions longer rated their willingness to participate in training as lower than those newer to campus across almost all of the survey items. This result, although not unexpected, does add complexity to a uniform advising certificate and may impact decisions related to voluntary versus mandatory participation in such a program.

The analyses above clearly support the need for a formalized academic advising training and development program at UC Santa Cruz. The next section includes recommendations for the development, implementation, and assessment of an Advisor Certificate Curriculum for UCSC.

### *Competing priorities*

The cyclical demand for advisor time as well as office coverage limitations, particularly for departmental advisors, dictate that the overall training format be as flexible as possible and for in-person trainings, be timed in a way to offset the busiest times of the academic year. While the *informational* and *conceptual* competencies lend themselves to more flexible delivery approaches, the nature of the *relationship* competency typically requires interactive exercises and role playing scenarios to maximize learning. While over 60% of campus advisors indicate a willingness to participate in voluntary trainings on most content areas, a significant percentage of advisors do not feel the necessity to participate in some trainings, meaning that the campus may need to consider mandating those trainings most crucial to desired student outcomes. Regular training and professional development is not yet an expectation of all advising positions on campus, and until it is a measured expectation and ingrained as a perpetual paradigm, this will remain a challenge.

### *Reporting alignment*

A significant challenge to developing integrative academic advising programming at most research intensive campuses is the actual staff advisor reporting structure. Most professions develop their key employees by having a reporting relationship that helps the more junior member learn directly from a senior member possessing deep knowledge of the subject. Unfortunately, this is not the case for many departmental advisors at UC Santa Cruz. While most campuses would never think of having a staff psychologist report directly to an accounting manager, the corollary does not hold true for staff advisors. Staff advisors report to a variety of experts on campus, many who do not have deep knowledge of advising theory, practice, or assessment. This type of reporting structure, lacking in informed professional mentorship and guidance, can also create barriers to effective and uniform training and development designed to ensure that all students receive consistent and appropriate advising based upon research and best practices in the field. In addition, the campus could benefit from having college preceptors with a formal or “dotted” reporting line to the Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Advising or the Colleges Advising Coordinator. This change would encourage further campus-wide alignment and provide the preceptors with a content expert in their reporting line. There are a variety of reporting models at research intensive universities designed to address this structural deficit that could be worthy of further exploration by the campus.

## ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

### NACADA Resources

#### *eTutorials*

NACADA has developed a series of eTutorials that may be useful options, particularly related to the theory and practice of advising (<http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Programs/Online-Education/eTutorials.aspx>)

#### *NACADA Consultant Service*

The NACADA Consultants Service has consultants experienced in creating eLearning modules and materials (<http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Consultant-Speaker-Service.aspx>)

### Campus Models

The following institutions and organizations have formal advisor training programs in place, some with formalized certificate programs which may be useful when referencing alternate approaches and delivery methods. Most institutions utilize their campus learning management systems (LMS) such as Blackboard, Canvas, Desire to Learn, to deliver informational and some conceptual content.

American Student Association of Community Colleges: <http://asacc.org/advisor-certification-program/>

Hudson Valley Community College: <http://www.hvcc.edu/cet/profdevelopment/aac.html>

University of Montana: [http://www.umt.edu/oss/for\\_faculty\\_staff/academic\\_advising\\_certificate.php](http://www.umt.edu/oss/for_faculty_staff/academic_advising_certificate.php)

University of California Davis: <https://academicadvising.ucdavis.edu/professional-development/advising-certificate.html>

University of Louisville Master Advisor Certificate: <http://louisville.edu/advising/advisors>

University of Missouri Basics and Master Advisor Workshops: <https://www.missouristate.edu/advising/8389.htm>

University of Alaska Fairbanks (policies and procedure modules): <https://advising.community.uaf.edu/>

Washington State University: <https://ascc.wsu.edu/faculty-and-staff/advisor-training/>

Western Kentucky University: <https://www.wku.edu/advising/mac.php>

## **APPENDIX A: FORMATS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

### **A – Cohort Based Hybrid**

1. Interactive video introduction to topical area
2. Foundational articles assigned (online)
3. Review of understanding (online)
4. Intro to case studies (scenarios) as appropriate (online)
5. Reflect on practice (online)
6. Integrative application (discussion) (in person)

### **B – Fully Online Module**

1. Interactive video introduction to topical area
2. Review of Understanding
3. Case studies/student scenarios

### **C – Multi-Session In-Person Cohort Model**

1. Introduction to material and process (cohort in person)
2. Interactive video modules with self-reflective components (online)
3. In-person discussions to deepen understanding, practice material, techniques (cohort in person)

### **D – Facilitated Workshop**

1. Presentation by content expert
2. Interactive case scenarios/role play



## REFERENCES

- Clifton, D. O., & Harter, J. K. (2003). Investing in strengths. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 111-121). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Engle, J., & Tinto, V. (2008). *Moving Beyond Access: College Success for Low-Income, First-Generation Students*. Washington DC: Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education.
- Folsom, P., (Ed.). (2007). *The new advisor guidebook: Mastering the art of advising through the first year and beyond* (Monograph No. 16). Manhattan, KS: NACADA.
- Folsom, P., & Scobie, N.A. (2010). Creating Effective Training and Development Programs. In J. G. Voller, M.A. Miller, and S.L. Neste (Ed.), *Comprehensive Advisor Training and Development: Practices that Deliver* (Monograph No. 21). Manhattan, KS: NACADA.
- Folsom, P., Miller, M.A., Scobie, N.A., & Shultz, N.L. (2010). Creating Effective Training and Development Programs. In J. G. Voller, M.A. Miller, and S.L. Neste (Ed.), *Comprehensive Advisor Training and Development: Practices that Deliver* (Monograph No. 21). Manhattan, KS: NACADA.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Habley, W.R. (1986). Designing advisor training programs. ACT National Conferences Series unpublished
- Hemwall, M. K., & Trachte, K. C. (1999). Learning at the core: Toward a new understanding of academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, 19(1), 5-11.
- Hemwall, M. K., & Trachte, K. C. (2005). Academic advising as learning: 10 organizing principles. *NACADA Journal*, 25(2), 74.
- King, N.C. (2000). Designing effective training for academic advisors. In V.G. Gordon, & W.R. Habley, & Associates, *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G.D. (2008). Advising for student success. In V.N. Gordon, W. R. Habley, & T.J. Grites (Eds.) *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) (pp. 68-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). "Culturally relevant teaching: the key to making multicultural education work." In C.A. Grant (Ed.), *Research and multicultural education* (pp. 106-121). London: Falmer Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful teaching for African-American students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). "But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy." *Theory into practice* 34(3), 159-165.
- Liesveld, R., & Miller, J. A. (2005). *Teach with your strengths: How great teachers inspire their students*. New York: Gallup Press.
- Lowenstein, M. (2005). If advising is teaching, what do advisors teach? *NACADA Journal*, 25(2), 65-73.
- Museus, S.D., & Ravello, J.N. (2010). Characteristics of academic advising that contribute to racial and ethnic minority success at predominantly white institutions. *NACADA Journal*, 30(1), 47-58.
- NACADA. (2017). *Academic advising core competencies model*. Retrieved from <https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/About-Us/NACADA-Leadership/Administrative-Division/Professional-Development-Committee/PDC-Advisor-Competencies.aspx>
- Robbins, R. (2013). Implications of advising load. In Carlstrom, A., *2011 national survey of academic advising*. (Monograph No. 25). Manhattan, KS: National Academic Advising Association. Retrieved from the NACADA *Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources* website <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/tabid/3318/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/94/article.aspx>
- Smith, C. L., & Allen, J. M. (2006). Essential functions of academic advising: What students want and get. *NACADA Journal*, 26(1), 56-66.
- Smith, C. L., & Allen, J. M. (2014). Does contact with advisors predict judgments and attitudes consistent with student success? A multi-institutional study. *NACADA Journal*, 34(1), 50-63.
- University of California Santa Cruz. (2017). *Institutional research, assessment, and policy studies student characteristics*. Retrieved from <https://planning.ucsc.edu/irps/studentCharacteristics.asp>.
- Weimer, M. (2012). Five characteristics of learner-centered teaching. *Faculty Focus*. <http://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/effective-teaching-strategies/five-characteristics-of-learner-centered-teaching/>.