

2011 Advising Training Needs Survey Results

Survey administered and data compiled by Stacey Sketo-Rosener, Coordinator of Academic Advising
Division of Undergraduate Education

Overview

The 2011 UCSC Advising Training Needs Survey was made available as an online survey in late summer, 2011. An invitation to complete the survey was sent to academic advisers in the departments, academic advisers in the colleges, and those auxiliary advisers who work with students in what is closest to an academic advising role: EOP, STARS, and Career Center advisers. An invitation to complete the survey was also sent to those who supervise advisers in these areas, including college provosts and department managers.

51 people completed the survey, including 19 (37%) who identified themselves as college academic preceptors or advisers, 17 (33%) who identified themselves as department advisers, 3 (6%) who identified themselves as EOP, STARS, or Career Center advisers, 7 (14%) who identified themselves as department managers, and 3 (6%) who identified themselves as college provosts. Two respondents (4%) did not identify their position.

This response rate represents an approximately 70% response rate from college academic advisers and preceptors, an approximately 55% response rate from department advisers, and approximately 37% of advisers from EOP, STARS, and the Career Center. Approximately 26% of department managers or others who supervise department advisers completed the survey, and 33% of college provosts completed the survey. In all, 41 respondents answered questions about their own training needs as an adviser, and 23 answered questions about the training needs of advisers they supervise (some respondents, who both advise students and supervise others who do so, answered both sets of questions).

The questions were designed to identify training needs in the following three areas of adviser training and development, which the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) identifies as important to address within a comprehensive adviser training program:¹

- **Informational**

Informational issues include the knowledge advisers must have to provide accurate and timely information to students. This area includes knowledge of policies and procedures, programs and resources, and the technical and other tools necessary for success as an adviser.

- **Relational**

Relational skills are those that advisers need in order to build successful advising relationships with students. Included in this category are one-on-one advising skills, assisting a student in clarifying his/her goals, and effectively working with a diverse student population.

- **Conceptual**

Conceptual issues provide the contextual understanding necessary to successfully advise student populations, and include such concepts as the characteristics of the student populations with whom the adviser works, theories of student development, and the relationship between advising and retention.

¹ Folsom, P., Letawsky Shultz, N., Allen Scobie, N., and Miller, M. (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) (pp. 21-32). Manhattan, KS: NACADA.

Section I: Adviser Responses

Informational:

Within the “informational” category, advisers were asked to rank the level of their confidence in their knowledge in the following areas, with a score of 5 being “Very Confident,” and a score of 1 being “Not At All Confident.” They were then asked if they would attend voluntary trainings in these areas, if they were offered. The table below includes the rating average for each of their responses to the first questions, and the percentages of respondents who answered “Yes,” “Maybe,” and “No” when asked if they would attend a voluntary training.

	Rating Average (1-5): Confidence in their knowledge in this area	% Who would attend a voluntary training on this topic	% Who might attend a voluntary training on this topic	% Who would not attend a voluntary training on this topic
UCSC Policies and Procedures	4.21	59	26	15
AIS	4.18	41	34	25
FERPA and UC Privacy Regulations	4.13	44	32	24
Educational Opportunities available to UCSC students (i.e. EAP, UC/DC, etc.)	4.06	53	26	21
UCSC Academic Programs (Majors, Minors, etc.)	4.00	41	38	21
Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills	3.88	56	32	12
Academic Support Resources (i.e. Learning Support Services, tutoring, etc.)	3.74	62	26	12
Cognos	3.59	48	45	6
UCSC Student Demographics	3.38	53	38	9

The average rating of advisers’ confidence in their knowledge for all areas in the “informational” category was 3.91. Those areas in which overall adviser confidence is lowest (below 4.00) are Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills, Academic Support Resources, Cognos, and UCSC Student Demographics.

Relational:

Within the “relational” category, advisers were asked to rank the level of their confidence in their skills in the following areas, with a score of 5 being “Very Confident,” and a score of 1 being “Not At All Confident.” They were then asked if they would attend voluntary trainings in these areas, if they were offered. The table below includes the rating average for each of their responses to the first questions, and the percentages of respondents who answered “Yes,” “Maybe,” and “No” when asked if they would attend a voluntary training.

	Rating Average (1-5): Confidence in their skills in this area	% Who would attend a voluntary training on this topic	% Who might attend a voluntary training on this topic	% Who would not attend a voluntary training on this topic
Assisting a student in developing an academic plan to meet his/her educational goals	4.59	44	41	15
One-on-one advising skills such as interviewing, rapport-building, and making referrals	4.55	50	29	21
Effectively advising transfer students	4.45	38	47	15
Assisting a student in clarifying his/her educational goals	4.30	50	41	9
Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins	4.21	58	30	12
Effectively advising first-generation students	4.12	56	35	9
Public speaking/ Effective presentation skills	4.12	35	50	15
Effectively advising LGBT students	4.06	62	26	12
De-escalating a student's anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options	3.94	65	32	3
Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities	3.91	73	21	6
Responding to a student in psychological crisis	3.70	73.5	23.5	3

The average rating of advisers' confidence in their knowledge for all areas in the "relational" category was 4.18. Those areas in which adviser confidence is lowest (below 4.00) are de-escalating a student's anger and/or anxiety, effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities, and responding to a student in psychological crisis.

Conceptual:

Within the "conceptual" category, advisers were asked to rank the level of their confidence in their knowledge in the following areas, with a score of 5 being "Very Confident," and a score of 1 being "Not At All Confident." They were then asked if they would attend voluntary trainings in these areas, if they were

offered. The table below includes the rating average for their responses to the first questions, and the percentages of respondents who answered “Yes,” “Maybe,” and “No” when asked if they would attend a voluntary training.

	Rating Average (1-5): Confidence in their knowledge in this area	% Who would attend a voluntary training on this topic	% Who might attend a voluntary training on this topic	% Who would not attend a voluntary training on this topic
UCSC’s advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisers in UCSC’s advising system	4.29	46	33	21
Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation	4.21	56	38	6
Adviser responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility	4.21	53	26	21
“Advising as Teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes	3.38	59	35	6
Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC	3.30	59	38	3
Student development theories	3.12	62	32	6

The average rating of advisers’ confidence in their knowledge for all areas in the “conceptual” category was 3.75. Those areas in which adviser confidence is lowest (below 4.00) are “advising as teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes, characteristics of college student populations, and student development theories.

Section II: Supervisor Responses

Those who supervise academic advisers were asked about their impression of their staff's knowledge in numerous areas within each of the three broad categories of Informational, Relational, and Conceptual knowledge and skills. They were then asked whether they would encourage or allow staff to attend trainings in these areas if they were offered.

Informational:

Within the "informational" category, supervisors were asked to rank the level of their staff's knowledge in the following areas, with a score of 5 being "Very Knowledgeable," and a score of 1 being "Not At All Knowledgeable." They were then asked if they would encourage or allow staff to attend voluntary trainings in these areas, if they were offered. The table below includes the rating average for each of their responses to these two questions, and the percentage of supervisors who would encourage or approve their staff's attendance at trainings focused on these topics.

	Rating Average (1-5): Knowledge	% Who Would Encourage Attendance at Training	% That Would Approve Attendance at Training
UCSC Policies and Procedures	4.28	67	33
Educational Opportunities available to UCSC students (i.e. EAP, UC/DC, etc.)	4.18	67	33
FERPA and UC Privacy Regulations	4.11	61	33
AIS	4.06	67	33
UCSC Academic Programs (Majors, Minors, etc.)	3.94	61	39
Academic Support Resources (i.e. Learning Support Services, tutoring, etc.)	3.94	72	28
Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills	3.83	61	39
UCSC Student Demographics	3.17	82	18
Cognos	3.06	78	22

The average rating of supervisors' impression of their staff's knowledge for all areas in the "informational" category was 3.84. Those areas in which supervisors' impressions of their staff's knowledge is lowest (below 4.00) are in UCSC Academic Programs, Academic Support Resources, Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills, UCSC Student Demographics, and Cognos. Their response rates showed a high level of correlation with advisers' confidence levels in the most areas (see table #8).

Supervisors showed a good deal of support for both encouraging and allowing staff attendance at trainings in all areas; only one supervisor noted for one topic that the staff would not be allowed to attend – that respondent's response to the other question indicated that he/she felt staff was already very knowledgeable in this area, which may explain this response.

Relational Skills:

Within the “relational” category, supervisors were asked to rank the level of their staff’s knowledge/skills in the following areas, with a score of 5 being “Very Knowledgeable,” and a score of 1 being “Not At All Knowledgeable.” They were then asked if they would encourage or allow staff to attend voluntary trainings in these areas, if they were offered. The table below includes the rating average for each of their responses to these two questions, and the percentage of supervisors who would encourage or approve their staff’s attendance at trainings focused on these topics.

	Rating Average (1-5): Skills	% Who Would Encourage Attendance at Training	% That Would Approve Attendance at Training
One-on-one advising skills such as interviewing, rapport-building, and making referrals	4.31	65	35
Assisting a student in clarifying his/her educational goals	4.13	65	35
Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins	4.13	65	35
Effectively advising transfer students	4.07	56	44
Effectively advising first-generation students	4.00	59	41
Assisting a student in developing an academic plan to meet his/her educational goals	4.00	59	41
Effectively advising LGBT students	3.81	71	29
De-escalating a student’s anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options	3.81	76.5	23.5
Public speaking/ Effective presentation skills	3.75	69	31
Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities	3.69	88	12
Responding to a student in psychological crisis	3.69	75	25

The average rating of supervisors’ impression of their staff’s skills for all areas in the “relational” category was 3.94. Those areas in which their impression of their staff’s skill is lowest are in are effectively advising LGBT students, de-escalating a student’s anger and/or anxiety, public speaking/ effective presentation skills, effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities, and responding to a student in psychological crisis.

Supervisors showed a good deal of support for both encouraging and allowing staff attendance at trainings in all areas; all supervisors who responded to the survey would allow staff to attend trainings in any of these areas.

Conceptual:

Within the “conceptual” category, supervisors were asked to rank the level of their staff’s knowledge in the following areas, with a score of 5 being “Very Knowledgeable,” and a score of 1 being “Not At All Knowledgeable.” They were then asked if they would encourage or allow staff to attend voluntary trainings in these areas, if they were offered. The table below includes the rating average for their answers to the first questions, and the percentage of supervisors who would encourage or approve their staff’s attendance at trainings focused on these topics.

	Rating Average (1-5): Knowledge	% Who Would Encourage Attendance at Training	% That Would Approve Attendance at Training
UCSC’s advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisers in UCSC’s advising system	3.88	59	41
Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation	3.76	71	29
Adviser responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility	3.59	76.5	23.5
“Advising as Teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes	3.06	76.5	23.5
Student development theories	2.94	65	35
Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC	2.88	59	41

The average rating of supervisors’ impression of their staff’s knowledge for all areas in the “conceptual” category was 3.35. Supervisors’ impression of their staff’s knowledge in all topics within this category were lower than in other categories; the areas in which their impression of their staff’s knowledge is lowest are in are “advising as teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes, student development theories, and characteristics of college student populations.

Supervisors showed a good deal of support for both encouraging and allowing staff attendance at trainings in all areas; all supervisors who responded to the survey would allow staff to attend trainings in any of these areas.

Section III: Aggregate Results: Adviser Confidence and Supervisor Impressions

The table below includes adviser confidence in the knowledge and skill areas surveyed and supervisors' impressions of their staff's knowledge and skill in the same areas. Please note that although we can draw certain conclusions from this information in terms of comparing various training needs with each other, it would be a mistake to draw the conclusion that individual advisers' levels of confidence is higher than their supervisor's confidence of their knowledge in the same areas, since respondents are a random sampling of advisers and supervisors. A higher number of advisers than supervisors responded to the survey, and the supervisors who responded may or may not have been referencing advisers who also responded.

Areas in which both adviser and supervisor rankings fell below 4.00 are highlighted in yellow and may be seen as areas in which training is needed. Areas in which either adviser or supervisor rankings fell below 4.00 are highlighted in blue, and also may indicate a training need.

	Adviser Rating Average: Confident in their knowledge/ skills in this area	Supervisor Rating Average: Impression of advisers' knowledge/ skills in this area
UCSC Policies and Procedures	4.21	4.28
AIS	4.18	4.06
FERPA and UC Privacy Regulations	4.13	4.11
Educational Opportunities available to UCSC students (i.e. EAP, UC/DC, etc.)	4.06	4.18
UCSC Academic Programs (Majors, Minors, etc.)	4.00	3.94
Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills	3.88	3.83
Academic Support Resources (i.e. Learning Support Services, tutoring, etc.)	3.74	3.94
Cognos	3.59	3.06
UCSC Student Demographics	3.38	3.17
Assisting a student in developing an academic plan to meet his/her educational goals	4.59	4.00
One-on-one advising skills such as interviewing, rapport-building, and making referrals	4.55	4.31
Effectively advising transfer students	4.45	4.07
Assisting a student in clarifying his/her educational goals	4.30	4.13
Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins	4.21	4.13
Effectively advising first-generation students	4.12	4.00
Public speaking/ Effective presentation skills	4.12	3.75
Effectively advising LGBT students	4.06	3.81
De-escalating a student's anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options	3.94	3.81
Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities	3.91	3.69
Responding to a student in psychological crisis	3.70	3.69
UCSC's advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisers in UCSC's advising system	4.29	3.88
Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation	4.21	3.76
Adviser responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility	4.21	3.59
"Advising as Teaching" components of curriculum,	3.38	3.06

pedagogy, and student learning outcomes		
Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC	3.30	2.88
Student development theories	3.12	2.94

Section IV: Comparisons in Training Needs and Interests Based on Longevity in Advising at UCSC

The tables below summarize the confidence rating in surveyed areas based on advisers' longevity in an advising position at UCSC. The comparisons will be important in identifying both initial training needs for advisers, as well as development opportunities for long-term employees.

Informational:

	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 0 – 1.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 2 – 4.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 5 – 9.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 10 + years
UCSC Policies and Procedures	3.5	4.17	4.43	4.38
UCSC Academic Programs (Majors, Minors, etc.)	3.5	3.50	4.14	4.27
Educational Opportunities available to UCSC students (i.e. EAP, UC/DC, etc.)	2.75	3.83	4.29	4.31
Academic Support Resources (i.e. Learning Support Services, tutoring, etc.)	2.50	3.50	3.29	4.31
UCSC Student Demographics	2.75	3.17	3.43	3.63
FERPA and UC Privacy Regulations	4.25	3.67	4.00	4.38
AIS	4.00	4.33	4.43	4.25
Cognos	3.75	3.50	3.43	3.81
Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills	4.00	3.83	3.71	4.00
Average rating for all topics in this area	3.44	3.72	3.91	4.15

Relational:

	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 0 – 1.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 2 – 4.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 5 – 9.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 10 + years
One-on-one advising skills such as interviewing, rapport-building, and making referrals	4.33	4.83	4.43	4.5
Assisting a student in clarifying his/her educational goals	3.67	4.33	4.43	4.31
Assisting a student in	4.33	4.83	4.71	4.47

developing an academic plan to meet his/her educational goals				
Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins	3.67	4.17	4.14	4.31
Effectively advising first-generation students	4.00	3.67	4.29	4.19
Effectively advising LGBT students	3.33	3.60	4.29	4.31
Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities	3.33	3.00	4.00	4.31
Effectively advising transfer students	4.0	4.17	4.71	4.50
De-escalating a student's anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options	3.33	3.17	4.14	4.19
Responding to a student in psychological crisis	3.33	3.17	3.57	4.00
Public speaking/ Effective presentation skills	3.67	4.17	4.14	4.13
Average rating for all topics in this area	3.73	3.92	4.26	4.29

Conceptual:

	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 0 – 1.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 2 – 4.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 5 – 9.9 years	Confidence Rating Average: Advising at UCSC 10 + years
Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation	4.00	4.17	4.29	4.25
Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC	3.75	3.67	3.00	3.19
“Advising as Teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes	2.75	3.83	3.71	3.19
Student development theories	3.00	3.17	3.00	3.06
Adviser responsibility,	3.50	3.67	4.57	4.50

institutional responsibility, and student responsibility				
UCSC's advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisers in UCSC's advising system	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.44
Average rating for all topics in this area	3.50	3.75	3.81	3.77

As might be expected, confidence ratings in overall areas increased with years of experience in nearly all categories (informational, relational, and conceptual). Within individual topics, the correlation between confidence levels and years of experience is not so clear; this may be explained by the small sample sizes in some individual categories of advisers.

The following tables compare the percentages of respondents who answered "yes" when asked: "If a voluntary training were offered on the following topic, would you attend?" based on longevity in advising at UCSC.

Informational:

	% Answering "Yes": Advising at UCSC 0 – 1.9 years	% Answering "Yes": Advising at UCSC 2 – 4.9 years	% Answering "Yes": Advising at UCSC 5 – 9.9 years	% Answering "Yes": Advising at UCSC 10 + years
UCSC Policies and Procedures	75	83.3	28.6	62.5
UCSC Academic Programs (Majors, Minors, etc.)	75	66.7	38.6	25
Educational Opportunities available to UCSC students (i.e. EAP, UC/DC, etc.)	100	66.7	42.9	43.8
Academic Support Resources (i.e. Learning Support Services, tutoring, etc.)	100	83.3	71.4	43.8
UCSC Student Demographics	50	83.3	42.9	43.8
FERPA and UC Privacy Regulations	25	66.7	57.1	37.5
AIS	50	33.3	57.1	33.3
Cognos	25	60.0	57.1	50
Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills	50	66.7	71.4	43.8
Average percentage who would attend a training for topics in this area	61.1	67.8	51.9	42.6

Relational:

	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 0 – 1.9 years	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 2 – 4.9 years	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 5 – 9.9 years	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 10 + years
One-on-one advising skills such as interviewing, rapport-building, and making referrals	75.0	83.3	57.1	31.3
Assisting a student in clarifying his/her educational goals	75.	66.7	57.1	37.5
Assisting a student in developing an academic plan to meet his/her educational goals	75.0	66.7	42.9	31.3
Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins	100.0	80.0	71.4	37.5
Effectively advising first-generation students	100.0	66.7	57.1	43.8
Effectively advising LGBT students	100.0	66.7	71.4	43.8
Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities	100.0	100.0	85.7	56.3
Effectively advising transfer students	75.0	66.7	28.6	25
De-escalating a student’s anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options	100.0	83.3	71.4	50
Responding to a student in psychological crisis	100.0	100.0	85.7	56.3
Public speaking/ Effective presentation skills	50.0	50.0	42.9	25
Average percentage who would attend a training for topics in this area	86.4	75.5	61.0	40

Conceptual:

	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 0 – 1.9 years	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 2 – 4.9 years	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 5 – 9.9 years	% Answering “Yes”: Advising at UCSC 10 +

				years
Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation	75	66.7	71.4	43.8
Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC	75	66.7	71.4	43.8
“Advising as Teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes	75	83.3	57.1	50
Student development theories	75	83.3	57.1	56.3
Adviser responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility	75	83.3	42.9	37.5
UCSC’s advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisers in UCSC’s advising system	50	66.7	42.9	40
Average percentage who would attend a training for topics in this area	70.8	75.0	57.1	45.2

Again, as we might have expected, advisers who have worked in an advising capacity at UCSC the longest were in nearly all categories less likely to answer “yes” when asked if they would attend a training. One notable anomaly is in the area of “UCSC policies and procedures,” in which those who have been advising at UCSC for 10+ years were more likely to attend such a training than those who have been advising at UCSC for 5 – 9.9 years. Overall, the level of interest in training and development opportunities is strong among UCSC advising staff.

The following table summarizes the results of the following question based on longevity of service in advising at UCSC: If a series of workshops or trainings were offered over the course of a year that led to a certificate of completion, would you be interested in pursuing that opportunity?

	Advising at UCSC 0 – 1.9 years	Advising at UCSC 2 – 4.9 years	Advising at UCSC 5 – 9.9 years	Advising at UCSC 10 + years
Yes	100%	83.3%	71.4	43.8%
Maybe	0%	16.7%	28.6	37.5%
No	0%	0%	0	18.8%

Section V: Comparisons between responses based on position:

The following tables compare responses both in confidence ratings and interest/willingness to attend trainings on various topics based on position held at UCSC. Please note that the number of responses for EOP, STARS, and Career Center advisers was quite low, and may as such be unreliable.

Informational:

	Confidence Rating Average: College Adviser or Preceptor	Confidence Rating Average: Department/ Major Adviser	Confidence Rating Average: EOP, STARS, Career Center Adviser
UCSC Policies and Procedures	4.33	4.13	3.50
UCSC Academic Programs (Majors, Minors, etc.)	3.87	4.14	4.00
Educational Opportunities available to UCSC students (i.e. EAP, UC/DC, etc.)	4.13	3.93	5.00
Academic Support Resources (i.e. Learning Support Services, tutoring, etc.)	4.00	3.40	4.50
UCSC Student Demographics	3.53	3.07	3.50
FERPA and UC Privacy Regulations	4.31	4.07	3.50
AIS	4.33	4.50	2.00
Cognos	3.53	3.80	2.00
Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills	3.93	3.93	3.50
Average rating for all topics in this area	4.00	3.89	3.50

Relational:

	Confidence Rating Average: College Adviser or Preceptor	Confidence Rating Average: Department/ Major Adviser	Confidence Rating Average: EOP, STARS, Career Center Adviser
One-on-one advising skills such as interviewing, rapport-building, and making referrals	4.67	4.57	5.00
Assisting a student in clarifying his/her educational goals	4.07	4.50	5.00
Assisting a student in developing an academic plan to meet his/her educational goals	4.43	4.83	5.00
Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins	4.07	4.43	4.50
Effectively advising first-generation students	3.93	4.36	4.50
Effectively advising LGBT students	3.93	4.36	3.50
Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities	3.73	4.07	5.00
Effectively advising transfer students	4.13	4.79	5.00

De-escalating a student's anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options	3.60	4.29	4.50
Responding to a student in psychological crisis	3.60	3.79	4.00
Public speaking/ Effective presentation skills	4.07	4.07	4.50
Average rating for all topics in this area	3.97	3.97	4.59

Conceptual:

	Confidence Rating Average: College Adviser or Preceptor	Confidence Rating Average: Department/ Major Adviser	Confidence Rating Average: EOP, STARS, Career Center Adviser
Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation	4.33	4.13	4.50
Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC	3.43	3.13	3.00
“Advising as Teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes	3.60	3.07	4.00
Student development theories	3.40	2.60	4.50
Adviser responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility	4.20	4.27	4.00
UCSC's advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisers in UCSC's advising system	4.33	4.20	5.00
Average rating for all topics in this area	3.88	3.57	4.17

The following tables compare the percentages of respondents who answered “yes” when asked: “If a voluntary training were offered on the following topic, would you attend?” based on position at UCSC.

Informational:

	College Adviser or Preceptor	Department/ Major Adviser	EOP, STARS, Career Center Adviser
UCSC Policies and Procedures	66.7	53.3	50.0
UCSC Academic Programs (Majors, Minors, etc.)	53.3	33.3	50.0
Educational Opportunities available to UCSC students (i.e. EAP, UC/DC, etc.)	53.3	60.0	0.0
Academic Support Resources (i.e. Learning Support Services, tutoring, etc.)	60.0	73.3	0.0
UCSC Student Demographics	66.7	46.7	50.0
FERPA and UC Privacy Regulations	40.0	53.3	0.0

AIS	53.3	26.7	0.0
Cognos	71.4	33.3	0.0
Non-AIS Computer/Technical Skills	66.7	46.7	50.0
Average percentage who would attend a training for topics in this area	59.0	47.4	22.2

Relational:

	College Adviser or Preceptor	Department/ Major Adviser	EOP, STARS, Career Center Adviser
One-on-one advising skills such as interviewing, rapport-building, and making referrals	73.3	40.0	0.0
Assisting a student in clarifying his/her educational goals	73.3	40.0	0.0
Assisting a student in developing an academic plan to meet his/her educational goals	73.3	26.7	0.0
Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins	57.1	60.0	0.0
Effectively advising first-generation students	60.0	60.0	0.0
Effectively advising LGBT students	53.3	66.7	50.0
Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities	80.0	73.3	0.0
Effectively advising transfer students	60.0	26.7	0.0
De-escalating a student's anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options	73.3	66.7	0.0
Responding to a student in psychological crisis	80.0	80.0	0.0
Public speaking/ Effective presentation skills	46.7	33.3	0.0
Average percentage who would attend a training for topics in this area	66.4	52.1	4.5

Conceptual:

	College Adviser or Preceptor	Department/ Major Adviser	EOP, STARS, Career Center Adviser
Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation	73.3	40.0	0.0
Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC	60.0	53.3	50.0
“Advising as Teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes	60.0	60.0	0.0
Student development theories	73.3	53.3	0.0

Adviser responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility	66.7	40.0	50.0
UCSC's advising mission and structure; roles and responsibilities of different advisers in UCSC's advising system	53.3	42.9	0.0
Average percentage who would attend a training for topics in this area	64.4	48.3	16.7

The following table compares the percentages of respondents who answered “yes” when asked: “If a series of workshops or trainings were offered over the course of a year that led to a certificate of completion, would you be interested in pursuing that opportunity?” based on position at UCSC.

	College Adviser or Preceptor	Department/ Major Adviser	EOP, STARS, Career Center Adviser
Yes	60%	66.7%	50.0%
Maybe	33.3%	20.0%	50.0%
No	6.7%	13.3%	0.0%

Conclusions

The following topics either:

1. had both an adviser confidence rating and a supervisor impression rating below 4 (on a 5 point scale), or
2. had more than 50% of advisers indicate they would attend a training.

Asterisks indicate topics that met both the above criteria.

This suggests that offering training and development opportunities in the following areas would be most beneficial to a large segment of the UCSC advising community, with an emphasis on asterisked topics.

Informational:

Cognos

UCSC policies and procedures

Educational opportunities available to UCSC students

Non-AIS Computer/ Technical Skills*

Academic Support Resources*

UCSC Student Demographics*

Relational:

Effectively advising students from diverse races/ ethnicities/ national origins

Effectively advising first-generation students

Effectively advising LGBT students

De-escalating a student's anger and/or anxiety to allow them to focus on their options*

Effectively advising students with learning or other disabilities*

Responding to a student in psychological crisis*

Conceptual:

Relationship between academic advising and retention/ graduation

Adviser responsibility, institutional responsibility, and student responsibility

“Advising as Teaching” components of curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes*

Characteristics of college student populations, both nationwide and at UCSC*

Student development theories*