

Assessment of Academic Advising: A Cross-Sectional Study

Alice G. Reinarz, University of Michigan

Nathaniel J. Ehrlich, University of Michigan

We highlight a study of an academic advising program at the University of Michigan. Students were surveyed via the Internet, and we summarize data obtained in 2001 and 2002. The majority of respondents reported taking actions that they would not have considered without interaction with an academic advisor. These data have been used for staff discussion and program development. By annually adding cohort data to the survey results, we will be able to assess the students as they move through the university and to compare first-year student responses in year-to-year data sets.

KEY WORDS: advisor role, evaluation and assessment, student attitudes, student perceptions of advising

Background

We developed the research plan for this study at the University of Michigan (U-M) Academic Advising Center of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (LS&A) with support by the U-M Institute for Social Research. Our goal was to establish a comprehensive quantitative student assessment of the academic advising process in LS&A at U-M. From 1996 through 2000, the LS&A Academic Advising Center received increased staffing, and altered academic-advising delivery systems were implemented to better meet the needs of undergraduates. These changes were based on recommendations of an external review committee, but no follow-up of this implementation strategy was initiated. Therefore, objectively and recently obtained information from students could help LS&A Academic Advising Center administrators evaluate student services, consider resource deployment, and plan long-term; they wanted an annual method in which to monitor student responses to academic-advising satisfaction levels so that the center staff could continue to improve delivery systems. Moreover, they wanted to provide student feedback about the advising process that would give all advisors a complete overview of the advising system so that they need not rely exclusively on their perceptions, which were typically based on interactions with individual students.

We began this study for our own understanding as advisors in the department; we were under no accreditation or outside review pressures. Our colleague, Dr. Eric R. White at Penn State University–University Park, helped us significantly in the genesis of this project. Although our study is being conducted at a large, public university and the results may not be universally generalized, we hope that other advisors can modify and utilize the information to meet the needs of their students. In addition, we hope that we can compare the data obtained from other institutions for benchmarking purposes. This model may have the most direct applicability for advising delivery analysis on comparable campuses.

As part of a large public-research institution, the College of LS&A at U-M has approximately 15,500 students who were chosen through a highly selective admissions process. Approximately 60% of LS&A students are from Michigan, and nearly 40% come from out of state (approximately 6% are international students). Primarily from suburban and urban schools, LS&A students generally have relatively affluent, college-educated families. With the exception of two specialized cohorts (those in the Residential College or Honors Program), all the LS&A students, referred to as “mainstream students” (approximately 80%), are advised at the LS&A Academic Advising Center. They are admitted to the college as undeclared students and are expected to declare a concentration (major) within 2 years. Summer orientation for first-year students is mandatory and is handled by the center. Continuation of advising is voluntary.

The center has 30 professional academic advisors; they were recruited based on their teaching experiences and so that the disciplinary backgrounds of the center staff mirror the divisions of the college (humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences). The center provides centralized advising delivery for the college, and each department/program has unit advisors (some faculty, some professional) to handle concentration questions. Students come to the center from their first year through graduation. Unless they request a change, they meet with their original advisor over the course of their careers in LS&A. So that students experience continuous and valuable advising, the advis-

ing delivery system must change if student needs or perceptions change.

Literature Survey

Advising administrators who share information through various venues of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) often decry the lack of assessment information that makes them and their advisors susceptible to criticism from students (or parents) unhappy with university policies, facilities, or academic decisions. Through continual, intentional assessment, advisors can reduce reactive feedback to get overarching information over extended time.

In the first stages of an assessment program, the goals of the unit must be carefully defined, and researchers need to be attentive to process and methods. In an excellent reference that is helpful for those considering a variety of approaches, Banta (2002) explained the value of assessment in higher education. For a general overview of survey methodology, Groves's (1989) *Survey Errors and Survey Costs* is a good source. A complete overview and summary of many important aspects of advising assessment can be found in Gordon and Habley's (2000) handbook.

Some research reports of advising assessment provide good models. Miville and Sedlacek (1995) reported an evaluation of student use of and satisfaction with college advising. Surveying students who sought personal advising and also surveying by mail, the authors compared student perceptions about a central advising office and departmental advising. Using a survey approach, Kern and Engels (1996) gathered data from students in a particular curriculum. They were able to use their results to recommend changes in advising delivery: more advisors, staff development for current advisors, and refocus of advising goals on individual student needs.

By comparing print and electronic resources, one finds that Web-based information is extremely helpful and relatively available for planning an assessment strategy. When armed with background information and clear assessment goals, one may find the NACADA Clearinghouse (www.nacada.ksu.edu/clearinghouse) to be the most important resource. Using links to "advising_issues" and then "assessment," one will find valuable opportunities to compare best practices and strategies with colleagues through the Assessment of Advising Interest Group. One can find links on the Clearinghouse Web site for assessment tools developed at various institutions and for reports of institutional projects.

An extremely useful link is "Exemplary Practices in Academic Advising" at Penn State University, www.psu.edu/dus/uac/assessme.htm.

Results

Data Collection Strategy

Our plan, developed in 2000, was to collect detailed, quantitatively valid information from the entire first-year class via a Web-based instrument. The data were analyzed by split-half reliability measures that demonstrated internal consistency. First-year students were surveyed in March of 2001; freshmen and sophomores were surveyed in March of 2002. The findings from 2001 and 2002 are reported here. Freshmen, sophomores, and juniors were surveyed in April 2003, and we plan to survey the classes of 2004–07 in March of 2004. After the first survey was implemented in 2001, we reviewed the data with administrators and advisors and determined that the questions (and answers) we had obtained were valid in measuring student perceptions and behavior.

Survey Construction

Based on nondetailed feedback from previously conducted, informal, student focus groups and helpful suggestions from colleagues at Penn State University, we decided to focus on assessing programmatic effectiveness by measuring student behavioral outcomes as well as student perceptions of advising. We were eager to know if students were acting on the advice received and if they valued the role of the advisor.

A primary purpose of our survey was to determine the degree to which academic advising delivery was meeting the goals of the center and the college. Once this information was established, administrators and advisors could focus on maintaining the beneficial aspects of the program and reevaluate strategies in areas reported as relatively less productive.

Survey Content

To understand if LS&A Academic Advising Center programs could be considered successful, we planned formal focus groups involving both advisors and program administrators in fall 2001. The groups were facilitated by survey professionals associated with the U-M Institute for Social Research. Within these groups, we found a consensus about the topics of importance in the survey. This qualitative research showed that a principal goal for LS&A advisors is to function as educators as well as resources for explanation of rules and policies.

Advisors expressed the desire to expand the students' horizons to broaden advisee intellectual experiences in the university and their lifetime and career aspirations and opportunities. At the same time, advisors recognized that clarifying the route through college requirements and regulations is a vital part of their role. The college goals for advising are consistent with those of academic advisors in the center: Particular emphasis is placed on helping students understand the breadth of opportunity in a liberal arts education.

Questionnaire Design

The Human Subjects Protection Office of the U-M Institutional Review Board approved the survey questionnaire and data collection procedures. See Appendix for a copy of the instrument.

We designed the questionnaire to cover the following six areas:

1. To determine if advisor access (timeliness and convenient availability) is adequate to meet student needs, we included items on ease, type, recentness, and frequency of advisor-student contact.
2. To determine if advisees are making choices based on adequate information and fully utilizing center programs, we measured student familiarity with the various aspects of the LS&A advising program.
3. To determine the nature of advisee and advisor interactions in the LS&A Academic Advising Center, we also probed into the content and outcome of the most recent contact.
4. To assess means of satisfaction, we measured student perceptions of advising as it exists and as they would consider ideal.
5. To determine if advisors are considered an important source of information, we obtained descriptions of other channels of advice and information used by students.
6. To determine if attitudes are specific to any subcategory of participant, we compiled information on student demographics, including academic performance.

Implementation

U-M provides each student with a unique E-mail address. Through these E-mail addresses, we invited students to go to a secure Web site to take the survey. The invitation included a standard confidentiality statement and guaranteed that none of the center staff would see any answers. Students

received no compensation for participating in the study. Second and third invitations were sent to nonrespondents. The survey was available on the Web for 4 weeks.

Summary of Findings

We are reporting results from surveys taken in 2001 and 2002. A total of 1,519 students responded for an overall response rate of 16.6%.

Note that the question used to identify race and ethnicity in the survey respondents was modeled after the 2000 U.S. Census question, which does not correspond to the identifiers used by U-M. Of the categories used, only Black, White, and Asian are measured in the same way in both databases. A comparison between the sample and the data on all students in LS&A reveal no significant differences in distribution of race (chi square did not reach the level of significance at the 0.05 level). In fall 2002, the self-reported ethnicity at U-M was 6.9% Black, 4.0% Hispanic, and 11.5% Asian.

A higher proportion of women (70%) responded to the survey than is represented in the LS&A population (56%). The difference is statistically significant: $\chi^2(1, N = 1,519) = 44.10, p < 0.0001$ indicating an over sampling of women. We found no consistent differences in pattern of response between men and women.

Because we were interested in the patterns of advisor utilization, we asked students the number and type (face-to-face [FTF], E-mail, phone, and mail) of contact(s) experienced since summer orientation. We also wanted the student to be thinking about the most recent contact, rather than just a random interaction, in answering other elements of the survey. Of all respondents, 83% reported contact with an advisor. Of the 17% who had no contact with an advisor, only 14 respondents (<1% overall) reported any difficulty in arranging such a meeting. Of the students reporting contacts, 64% reported that they had met with an advisor within the 2 months directly preceding their participation in the survey. Although the statistics kept by all advisors indicate a much larger number of E-mail contacts than FTF appointments, 63% of the respondents reported that their most recent contact was a FTF meeting with an advisor. This interaction could have occurred in the center or with one of the residence hall advisors during office hours. At U-M, approximately 98% of first-year students live in the residence halls, and based on contacts tallied by residence hall advisors, the students utilize this type of advising service with greater frequency than services offered through the center or the faculty.

We are interested in the awareness of all student cohorts in LS&A advising programs. Over 80% of the respondents were familiar with the availability of advising in residence halls, but fewer than 50% were aware of the academic outreach program for students with academic difficulties.

All of the remaining advising-specific questions in the survey asked students to refer to their most recent contact with an advisor. See Table 1. Students were asked the topics discussed and those that were most beneficial to them. The predominant topics discussed with advisors concerned choice of courses for distribution requirements or ultimate career. Students reported receiving the most helpful advice on the general goals and benefits of a liberal arts education.

In our key question, we asked students their levels of agreement with the statement, "I took some action that I would not have without the advising session." Fifty-three percent "strongly agreed" or "agreed." The overwhelming majority of actions taken because of the advising interaction (approximately 70%) involved specific courses; an additional 15% of respondents mentioned topics relating to general academic issues, such as choosing a major or departmental requirements; and the remainder indicated the action taken was of a general nature such as "made me work harder" or "helped be reconsider my career options." More detailed analyses revealed that the students who reported the greater benefits and the greater propensity to take action following advising sessions were having more frequent FTF contact with their advisors.

We asked students to report their perceptions of advising as it exists and as they would consider ideal. Using a 7-point Likert scale to choose between positive (rated 7) and negative (rated 1) attributes, students rated the advising delivery on nine dimensions.

The data in Table 2 show average results of stu-

dent-scored ratings on existing and ideal advising. The rating of 4.0 is the midpoint rating for both ideal and existing advising. For existing advising, respondents gave the highest scores (4.0 and 4.2 existing rating) to those elements that they also rated as being most important to ideal advising, such as being informative (5.8 ideal rating). They gave the lowest scores of existing advising to the elements that they considered to be least important to ideal advising.

To get perspective on how students use academic advisors relative to other resources, we asked students to describe other channels of advice and information (on any topic) such as other students, family, friends from home, and peers not at U-M. Students reported communicating with greatest frequency with other U-M students. They sought family members as resources more frequently than they did friends from home. We asked with whom, besides academic advisors, students discussed academic issues. Respondents reported roughly equivalent frequency of academic-issue discussions with friends, family members, and other students but noted fewer discussions with other U-M faculty, staff, counselors, and clergy.

We collected some demographic information including self-reported academic performance. Overall, 70% of the students who responded to this survey reported that their college experience had been either "excellent" or "very good"; 29% reported a "fair" or "satisfactory" experience; and fewer than 2% characterized their experience as "poor" or "hopeless." They reported an average grade-point average (GPA) of 3.3 (4.0 scale) and that they skip class less than 10% of the time. In general, the respondents self-report that they are doing quite well in college. We found a positive correlation between self-reported GPA and satisfaction ($r = 0.30, p < 0.0001$) that indicates that the higher the GPA the greater the satisfaction. We did not ver-

Table 1 Advisee responses to questions regarding the most recent advising session

Items Regarding Recent Advising Session	Agree and Strongly Agree (%)
I went with a simple agenda and the advisor satisfied that agenda	86
I went in with a simple agenda and the advisor went beyond it and raised other questions	53
After my most recent contact, I was motivated to consider alternatives that hadn't occurred to me before	47
The advisor listened to me and responded to what I had to say	91
I could have gotten the same information by reading about it without advising assistance	36
I wanted to learn more than I did from the advisor	49
I took some action that I would not have without the advising session	53

Table 2 Average student ratings on perceived attributes of advising and perceived ideals of advising, $N = 1,514$

Attribute	Perceived	Ideal	Gap
Informative	4.2	5.8	1.6
Efficient	4.0	5.7	1.7
Clear	3.7	5.6	1.9
Supportive	4.2	5.5	1.4*
Strong	3.7	5.4	1.8*
Warm	4.2	5.4	1.2
Personal	3.5	5.2	1.7
Active	3.5	5.2	1.6*
Necessary	4.5	5.1	0.6

Note. 7-point Likert scale: 1 = negatively viewed; 7 = positively viewed.

* Rounding error

ify that the self-reported data were consistent with the academic records on file. We were interested only in learning about advisee self-perceptions and made no statistical comparisons among groups based on students' self-reported GPAs, classifications, or class attendance.

Discussion

We began this project with several purposes. One was to solicit feedback about LS&A advising delivery from a large number of students so that advisors need not depend on anecdotal reports made during advising appointments as bases of improvements. If serious problems existed in how students were using advising or feeling about advisors, advisors wanted to know and be able to make proactive changes. They did not want to be blindsided by complaints. Another objective was to utilize the data to deploy optimally center resources and to initiate professional development activities that would ultimately help the staff improve advising delivery. Finally, advisors were eager to show administrators an objective assessment of advising that could be used to attest to work done at the LS&A Academic Advising Center and to demonstrate that effective advising adds value to the undergraduate experience.

The LS&A Academic Advising Center began a reorganization plan in 1996. A predominantly part-time staff has been replaced by full-time professional advisors. These resource changes resulted in more available time for FTF contacts (in the Academic Advising Center and in residence halls) and E-mail transactions. Therefore, we were eager to know if students might report difficulty in making advising contacts. The data (<1% of respondents reported difficulty in making contacts) helped administrators make decisions regarding support

methods for appointments and weekly time allocations for residence hall advisors.

We reported on the survey results from 2001 in several advisor staff meetings (with discussions of the data) prior to the survey in 2002. For example, by considering the topics reported to be discussed in advising appointments and the extent that those discussions were valued, advisors could be increasingly purposeful in talking about the value of the liberal arts education. In these in-house professional development workshops and in a variety of meetings to share best practices for advising (LS&A Summit Meetings on Academic Advising, U-M Annual Advising Conference sponsored by LS&A, and NACADA regional and national meetings), administrators have made deliberate programmatic efforts to increase advisor preparedness.

Because a major goal of advising in the College of LS&A is to promote appreciation of the liberal arts education, advisors were pleased that students reported frequently discussing this topic with advisors and said that these discussions would be useful in addressing other topics. The survey responses provided confirmation that the primary goal of the advisors and the administrators of the program was being met; that is, advisors were educating undergraduates on opportunities embedded in the courses and curriculum of the college. In addition, the interactions most associated with these influential deliberations were FTF meetings rather than the result of E-mail.

In some instances, the data did not change the tactics of the advisors. For example, with regard to actions reported as a result of the advising transaction, we were not surprised that most students named some action related to specific classes or concentration (major). These reports agree with the observations of advisors. Advisors were pleased,

however, that students also reported a greater awareness of options, increased utilization of referrals, and greater likelihood for the student to overcome some obstacles in their ability to make academic choices.

The data in Table 2 confirm that current practices for advising delivery are in line with advisee perceptions of their importance. Center staff intend to continue to monitor these attitudes but have presently chosen to make no practice adjustments.

The survey data have helped administrators deploy resources to develop a more holistic outreach for academic advising. Advisors were pleased by the significant awareness (>80% of respondents) of hours spent by advisors in the residence halls. Because nearly all first-year students are living in the halls, advisors need to spend time on site to build on contacts made with students at the center, and advisors are pleased with the utilization of residence hall advising by first-year students. With the departure of sophomores from residence halls (47% of sophomores live in residence halls), advisors looked for other methods to maintain close contact with this cohort. The result was a fall-term reorientation program and tailored E-mails targeted to sophomores. LS&A Academic Advising Center staff are continuing to build on this sophomore initiatives outreach and plan future assessment of its effectiveness.

We found no consistent differences in pattern of responses between men and women. For example, when asked for level of agreement with the critical question, "I took some action that I would not have without the advising session," the results show remarkable consistency across gender.

The question on behavior is crucial because we wanted to quantify the degree to which students are influenced in their behavior by advising. We found no statistical difference between the overall agreement in the 2001 and 2002 surveys. Although the overall agreement remained about the same, more students reported "strongly agree" in 2002 than did those in 2001. These data provide evidence that the continuing discussions of advising effectiveness among advisors through staff meetings planned for professional development (between surveys

2001 and 2002) may have influenced the effect of advising on behavior: $\chi^2(1, N = 1,519) = 11.49$, $p = 0.00069$.

The data on other resources that students use to make academic decisions (family, other U-M students, other peers not at U-M, faculty members, and campus office staffs) suggest that students utilize information from many sources. We were not surprised by this result, nor do advisors intend to try to lessen the influence of nonadvisor sources for students. As long as students name the advisors in the center as useful and an important resource in answering academic questions, the LS&A Academic Advising Center advisors feel that their primary mission is being accomplished.

Individual advisors and advising administrators at LS&A understand that assessment combined with professional development and strategic planning can improve the advising process for students. Most of the changes in resource deployment and planning for professional development opportunities for advisors were accomplished through internal administrative deliberations and in conjunction with valuable advice from colleagues in NACADA. The assessment model was developed to verify that LS&A advisors were making progress toward advising goals. We measured the success level of LS&A advising by assessing students' perceptions of advisors' own goals as proponents of a liberal arts education, resource persons, and advocates of life-long learning and intellectual exploration. We looked specifically at how advisee behavior was changed through the advising process and the students' perceived benefits of liberal arts discussions. We used measures of advisor-advisee contact and student satisfaction to gain a further understanding of how the LS&A advising program benefits students and the college. Most administrators in the academic advising community agree that increased (or redeployed) resources and advisor development contribute to advising effectiveness. Our goal is to substantiate these viewpoints with objective analysis. We intend to expand the assessment program to include other surveys and additional focus groups in the next few years.

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising

Introduction:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey of LS&A academic advising. Your responses to this survey will be completely confidential. No one will see your individual responses; all responses will be reported as part of group scores only.

PQ. Before we start, do we have your consent to participate?

Yes – I understand that my participation is voluntary and confidential

No – Although I understand that my participation is voluntary and confidential, I choose not to participate

Q1. Since orientation, have you met, or spoken, or had an email correspondence with an academic advisor from the LS&A Academic Advising Center?

Yes – skip to question Q1a 1

No 2

Q1a. Below is a list of reasons that you might have for not contacting an LS&A advisor. Please check all that apply

I have tried but have not been able to schedule a meeting 1

I haven't had the time 2

I haven't had any issues that I think are appropriate for LS&A advisors to handle 3

I don't believe that LS&A advising is effective 4

I don't know anything about LS&A advising 5

Others who have been to LS&A advising have told me that they were not helped 6

I'm doing just fine without it 7

Q2. Approximately how many times since Orientation have you had contact with person[s] from the LS&A Academic Advising Center?

of contacts:

Face-to-face _____

Email _____

Telephone _____

Regular Mail _____

Total Contacts _____

Q3. How long ago was your last contact with an LS&A advisor? Was it within the...

Last week 1

Last two weeks 2

Last month 3

Last two months 4

More than two months ago 5

Q4. Thinking about your most recent experience, was it:

Face-to-face in Angell Hall 1

Face-to-face in a residence hall 2

Via email 3

On the telephone 4

Other [regular mail, etc.] 5

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

Q5. How easy – or difficult – was it for you to arrange for your most recent contact?										
Very easy		1								
Easy		2								
Somewhat easy		3								
Somewhat difficult		4								
Difficult		5								
Very difficult		6								
Q6. In your most recent contact with LS&A advising, was the advisor someone you'd met with before?										
On previous advising contact(s) I saw a different advisor		1								
On previous advising contact(s) I saw the same person		2								
On previous advising contact(s) I saw other people as well as the person I saw most recently		3								
[MATRIX 1 HEADER]										
Q7. In this next section, you will find a list of topics that might have been touched on in your most recent contact with LS&A advising. For each topic, please indicate the extent of the discussion you had with the advisor.										
[MATRIX 2 HEADER]										
Q8. Below are the discussions you indicated that you had with your advisor. For each topic, please indicate your estimate of how much the advice you received has helped you.										
		Extent of the Discussion					How Helpful was the Advice			
		Discussed at length	Discussed briefly	Brought up by advisor, not discussed	Brought up by me, not discussed	Not mentioned	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not at all Helpful	Counter productive
Q7-1	The general goals and benefits of a Liberal – arts education	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-1										
Q7-2	The courses I need to take to satisfy distribution requirements	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-2										
Q7-3	My curriculum as it relates to my career choice	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-3										
Q7-4	Understanding and using University of Michigan policies	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-4										
Q7-5	Understanding the role of LS&A advising	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-5										
Q7-6	Personal issues not related to academic requirements	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-6										
Q7-7	Graduate school-law school, medical school or business school	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-7										

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

		Extent of the Discussion					How Helpful was the Advice			
		Discussed at length	Discussed briefly	Brought up by advisor, not discussed	Brought up by me, not discussed	Not mentioned	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not at all Helpful	Counter productive
Q7-8	Non-career oriented/ temporary working opportunities	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-8										
Q7-9	Internships	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
Q8-9										
Q9. MATRIX 1: LS&A offers a number of programs designed to benefit students. For each of these programs, please indicate your interest in the program, regardless of whether or not you are aware of or have participated in the program.										
Q10. MATRIX 2: Looking at those same programs offered by LS&A advising, which ones were you aware of?										
Q11. MATRIX 3: Of those LS&A advising programs that you are aware of, how often have you participated in each of these programs?										
		Awareness		Interest				Participation		
		Aware		Very interested	Interested	Slightly interested	Uninterested	Have participated more than once	Participated once	Not participated
Q 9-1	Advising in residence halls	Yes	No	4	3	2	1	2	1	0
Q10-1										
Q11-1										
Q 9-2	Academic outreach for students with academic difficulties	Yes	No	4	3	2	1	2	1	0
Q10-2										
Q11-2										
Q 9-3	Advising about study abroad	Yes	No	4	3	2	1	2	1	0
Q10-3										
Q11-3										
Q 9-4	Pre-professional workshops	Yes	No	4	3	2	1	2	1	0
Q10-4										
Q11-4										

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

		Awareness		Interest				Participation		
		Aware		Very interested	Interested	Slightly interested	Uninterested	Have participated more than once	Participated once	Not participated
Q 9-5 Q10-5 Q11-5	Career Links	Yes	No	4	3	2	1	2	1	0
Q 9-6 Q10-6 Q11-6	Concentration Fair	Yes	No	4	3	2	1	2	1	0
Q 9-7 Q10-7 Q11-7	“Choosing a Major” workshops	Yes	No	4	3	2	1	2	1	0
Q12. Regarding your most recent contact with an LS&A advisor, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:										
				Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree			
Q12-1	I went with a simple agenda and the advisor satisfied that agenda			1	2	3	4			
Q12-2	I went in with a simple agenda and the advisor went beyond it and raised other questions			1	2	3	4			
Q12-3	After my most recent contact, I was motivated to consider alternatives that hadn't occurred to me before			1	2	3	4			
Q12-4	The advisor listened to me and responded to what I had to say			1	2	3	4			
Q12-5	I could have gotten the same information by reading about it without advising assistance			1	2	3	4			

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Q12-6	I wanted to hear more than I did from the advisor	1	2	3	4
Q12-7	I took some action that I would not have without the advising session	1	2	3	4
Q12-7x. You mentioned that you took some action that you would not have without the advising session. Please describe what action that was, and how the advising influenced your decision to take that action. _____ _____ _____					
In this section, we'd like you to describe how you view the LS&A advising program as it exists and also as you think it should be. For each item, circle the number between the two adjectives that corresponds to your view. As you view the current state of LS&A advising:					
Q13. Personal	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Impersonal			
Q14. Clear	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Vague			
Q15. Active	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Passive			
Q16. Strong	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Weak			
Q17. Informative	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Confusing			
Q18. Efficient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Inefficient			
Q19. Necessary	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Redundant			
Q20. Warm	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Cold			
Q21. Supportive	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Aloof			

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

What you think LS&A advising should be:								
Q22. Personal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impersonal
Q23. Clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Vague
Q24. Active	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Passive
Q25. Strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Weak
Q26. Informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Confusing
Q27. Efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inefficient
Q28. Necessary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Redundant
Q29. Warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cold
Q30. Supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Aloof

Q31. In this section, we'd like you to tell us about other sources of information or advice that you have used to address concerns – academic, career – centered, or personal – you've had this year. For each alternative source, please indicate how frequently you've used it, and if you've mentioned the same concerns to an LS&A advisor. So, for example, if you've spoken to other students about a problem several times, you might – or might not – have spoken to an LS&A advisor about the SAME problem.

Regarding your academic concerns, have you spoken with...		Never	Seldom	Often
Q31-1	Other students – individually or in group	1	2	3
Q31-2	Family members	1	2	3
Q31-3	Friends	1	2	3
Q31-4	Professional counselors. e.g. psychologist, social worker	1	2	3
Q31-5	Other University of Michigan Staff/faculty	1	2	3
Q31-6	Clergy	1	2	3
Q31-7	Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

Regarding your career concerns, have you spoken with...		Never	Seldom	Often
Q32-1	Other students – individually or in group	1	2	3
Q32-2	Family members	1	2	3
Q32-3	Friends	1	2	3
Q32-4	Professional counselors. e.g. psychologist, social worker	1	2	3
Q32-5	Other University of Michigan Staff/faculty	1	2	3
Q32-6	Clergy	1	2	3
Q32-7	Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3
Q33. Regarding your Personal concerns, have you spoken with...		Never	Seldom	Often
Q33-1	Other students – individually or in group	1	2	3
Q33-2	Family members	1	2	3
Q33-3	Friends	1	2	3
Q33-4	Professional counselors. e.g. psychologist, social worker	1	2	3
Q33-5	Other University of Michigan Staff/faculty	1	2	3
Q33-6	Clergy	1	2	3
Q33-7	Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3
Q34. What is your current course load, how many credits are you taking this semester? _____				
Q35. What field are you majoring in/considering as a major? _____				

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

Q36. Do you have a career plan?	
Yes	1
No	2
Q36x. What is your plan?	

Q37. Not all students attend all their scheduled classes: in the last month or so, what proportion of classes would you say you have skipped [as opposed to missed because of illness or other obligations?]	
<10%	1
11-25%	2
26-50%	3
>50%	4
Q38. At this point in your academic career, how would you rate your OVERALL experience as a student at the University of Michigan?	
Excellent – Exceeds my highest expectations	1
Very good – generally positive, with only a few rough spots	2
Satisfactory – No real problems, but not generally a pleasant time	3
Fair – I’m getting by, but it’s pretty difficult	4
Poor – I’m doubtful about my lasting through to graduation	5
Hopeless – I ‘m certain to be leaving as soon as possible	6
Q39. What is your current GPA? _____	
Q40. Where is your most recent hometown:	
Ann Arbor	1
Other Michigan	2
Not Michigan	3
Q40a. How do you best describe your hometown?	
Major Metro [over 1 million population]	1
Suburb of Major Metro	2
Mid-size city	3
Small urban	4
Rural-agrarian	5
Q41. Non-academic activities in which you have participated this year: [CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY]	
Full-time work	1
Part-time work	2
Sports	3
Performing Arts	4
Volunteer work	5
Political activity	6
Fraternity or sorority	7
Debate	8
Student government	9
Other campus organizations [specify] _____	10

Appendix Survey of LS&A academic advising (continued)

Q42-1. How often do you communicate – on any topic – with family members?	
Several times per week	1
Weekly	2
2-3 times per month	3
At least monthly	4
Less than once per month	5
Q42-2. How often do you communicate – on any topic – with friends from home?	
Several times per week	1
Weekly	2
2-3 times per month	3
At least monthly	4
Less than once per month	5
Q42-3. How often do you communicate – on any topic – with other students here on campus?	
Several times per week	1
Weekly	2
2-3 times per month	3
At least monthly	4
Less than once per month	5
Q42-2. How often do you communicate – on any topic – with non-student contemporaries/friends here in Ann Arbor?	
Several times per week	1
Weekly	2
2-3 times per month	3
At least monthly	4
Less than once per month	5
Q43. What is your age? _____	
Q44. What is your gender?	
Male	1
Female	2
Q45. What is your ethnicity and race?	
Black or African-American	1
White or Caucasian	2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3
Other (specify) _____	4
Q46. Are you of Spanish or Latino origin?	
Yes	1
No	2

References

- Banta, T. W., & Associates. (2002). *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gordon, V. N., & Habley, W. R., & Associates. (2000). *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Groves, R. (1989). Survey errors and survey costs. New York: John Wiley and Associates.
- Kern, C. W., & Engels, D. W. (1996). Developmental Academic Advising: A paradigm shift in a college of business administration. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(1), 95.
- Miville, M. L., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1995). An assessment of centralized versus faculty advising in a college of engineering. *NACADA Journal*, 15(2), 20–25.

Authors' Note

This research project has been supported generously by Student Academic Affairs, College of LS&A, University of Michigan. Specifically, the authors

appreciate the encouragement of Assistant Dean Esrold Nurse and funding from the Monroe-Brown grant.

The authors acknowledge Dr. Eric R. White (Executive Director of the Division of Undergraduate Studies) and Jim Levin (Coordinator of Advising, College of Science) of The Pennsylvania State University, College Park campus, for helping us develop the strategy for this study based on some of their models. They have generously shared suggestions and information that have been extremely beneficial.

Alice Reinarz is Director of the LS&A Academic Advising Center and Adjunct Professor of Biology at the University of Michigan. Reinarz is the chair of the NACADA Commission for Advising Administrators. Nat Ehrlich is Senior Research Associate at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Interested readers can contact Dr. Reinarz at areinarz@tamu.edu.