

every instance, these "outsiders" gave information to students on types of courses that would be advantageous before seeking employment in their field. In most cases, the practitioners agreed to serve as consultants for future curriculum revisions. Departmental majors also made suggestions for future guest speakers. They particularly wanted to hear from remote sensing specialists, from economic geographers in non-government service, and from personnel managers from a variety of corporations.

Overall, students were satisfied with the course. In a discussion assessing the class at the end of the Spring Term, students suggested that the course would be more attractive if several two-day field trips were made to visit government offices and corporate headquarters where geographers are employed in the tri-state area of North Dakota-South Dakota-Minnesota. Students had been encouraged to take a sponsored field trip to the job fair at the 1982 South Dakota State University Geographical Convention, and many indicated an interest in attending more job fairs, so there will be a field trip to the Brookings, South Dakota program in 1983. We are also investigating the possibility of taking a vanload of departmental majors to a national job fair being held in conjunction with the annual convention of the Association of American Geographers in Denver in 1983.

CONCLUSION

Reflecting upon the course from the standpoint of a faculty advisor, this class was worthwhile. It will be offered again, albeit with some modifications. First, there is a need to make it available to departmental majors before the semester of their graduation; it may be wise to offer it in the Fall Term of each academic year. Second, there is a need for better record-keeping on the overall academic advising of each departmental major; hopefully part of this problem will be solved with the new procedures for documenting pre-registration and enrollment changes. A system of mandatory academic advising is being adopted at the University of North Dakota, emphasizing more interaction between faculty advisor and advisee in long-range course planning. Third, there is a need to create a fund for future guest speakers and for any projected field trips. This year's guest speakers were sponsored and funded by their firms or governmental agencies, but their tightening budgets may eliminate future visitations, so small grants must be sought to continue the program. Finally, there must be active advertising of the course directed towards undergraduates who might wish to consider taking geography as their second major or who are undecided with respect to a major. Despite warnings that geography is floundering as an academic discipline,⁴ job opportunities outside academe do exist. Informing graduates and faculty advisors in other departments of career opportunities in geography is one step to building better intracollegiate ties. Maximizing career-oriented academic advising at the departmental level must be done in cooperation with other members of the university and also with practitioners in the field. Together, we can develop successful strategies for creating and implementing what Borgard has referred to as pragmatic philosophy of academic advising.

⁴Malcolm G. Scully, "Academic Geography: Few Students, Closed Departments, Fuzzy Image," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 24:13 (26 May 1982), 1, 12.

Organizational Change and the Improvement of Faculty Advising

DAVID R. HOLMES, *Director*, JOHN H. CLARKE, *Associate Director and* CYNTHIA A. IRVINE, *Program Developer, Instructional Development Center, University of Vermont.*

The literature on faculty-based advising has progressed significantly over the past five years, reflecting a growing consensus in higher education about the importance of faculty advising and the need to develop improved advising programs on American campuses. However, the literature to date has emphasized the advising process—the philosophy of academic advising, the need for improved advising, alternative models and practices, the development of necessary skills and attitudes and different measures of impact—without engaging directly the problem of integrating advising improvement within a complex professional organization. Current research and experience has given rise to a more sophisticated conception of advising than was available earlier, but no change strategy has emerged that would help an academic administrator or advising specialist tailor an approach to advising improvement that fits the unique culture of higher education.

What is absent in the effort to improve academic advising is an understanding of the institutional framework that currently restrains academic advising, and a conception of a change strategy that fits that framework. Advising specialists, and often academic administrators, remain the staunch advocates of advising improvement on the college campus. However, to the extent that they remain marginal to the faculty culture that governs faculty conduct within an institution, they remain relatively powerless to effect improvement. Advising specialists and administrators dedicated to advising improvement need a change strategy that accommodates faculty culture and challenges the institutional constraints that impede progress toward improved faculty advising.

Clearly, these comments assume that, for philosophical and practical reasons, advising by faculty is essential to an excellent academic advising program. The philosophical justification is embedded in the nature of the educational enterprise, and the practical justification is supported by at least two points. First, faculty have knowledge about the disciplines not held by others. This makes for better advising. Second, most institutions can not afford to employ advising specialists to do all that needs to be done. Despite competing demands on their time, the faculty resource must be used. We know, then, that faculty are necessarily at the center of academic advising on most campuses, however, the faculty member's dual and sometimes conflicting responsibilities must be recognized. Each institution must find the proper mix between professional and institutional demands on faculty and support each role.

ACADEMIC ADVISING AND FACULTY CULTURE

Although the structure of the **modern** university resembles that of **other organizations**, the culture that thrives within that **structure** is largely a creation **of** the **faculty**. For example, faculty

- cherish the **principle** of academic freedom
- retain the prerogative of self-regulation
- maintain a tradition of faculty government and
- cling to methods and **intellectual** focus established by the **academic disciplines**.

Because advising **specialists** and **administrators** are marginal figures in academic culture, they may **lack leverage** to induce **the** kind of **change** that would improve faculty participation in advising. How can advising specialists promote a **better sense** of agreement between faculty culture and the need for improved advising within the structure of the college or university?

Academic faculty **represent** a discipline by virtue of training, and an institution by virtue of job placement, and as faculty advisors, they have professional and organizational **responsibility** to their student **advisees**. Professional faculty **members** can bring to bear years of accumulated **wisdom** in the ways of academia, and a broad **perspective** on the purposes of higher education in **behalf** of **student needs**. Faculty members as job holders in the hierarchy of a complex institution also **represent** the **established** regulations and procedures (e.g. **requisites**, **prerequisites** and program selection **processes**), and also the established goals and **priorities** of the University. As in **any** modern professional institution, professional conduct **does not** always **rest** easily along side **institutional** imperatives.

We know that **scholars** have not **acted** **as** independent professionals since the 11th century (or perhaps since **Socrates**). Today, only a **minority** of **lawyers** in private **practice**, **doctors** in **general family** practice and architects in **small offices** retain the rights and responsibilities of independent professionals: **licensure** and oversight by peers, **access** to an **esoteric** body of knowledge and the obligation to render **service** to a client based on **an** independent **assessment** of the client's need. **Like** most doctors, **lawyers** and architects, professors have given over to **institutions** some responsibility for **efficiency** and order in daily events, receiving in return **some responsibility** for representing the needs of the **institution** as well as those of the client—the **student**.

Institutional life **competes** **remorselessly** with the professional **privilege** of professors, attempting to control faculty decision-making. In a **large university**, many **faculty members** **feel** they must favor **their** professionalism over institutionalized duty **because** the gathered mass of bureaucratic **processes** in the university threatens to overwhelm the **prerogatives** they have earned through their **professional** training. **However**, **as** universities have grown toward complexity, advising activity, as a prominent example, has **often** **become** **more** **bureaucratic** than professional. **Since** the advising **process** must **contend** with **administrative** rules, anonymous "clients" and entrenched **systems**, the faculty tend to **avoid** it.

It is possible (from what has been **said**) to **see** advising as two distinct sequences of events:

Organizational Change. Improvement of Faculty Advising

Institutionalized Advising
identify student programs
list **requisites** and **rules**
check course selection
sign card

Professional Advising
identify **student needs** and **interests**
clarify student goals
prepare educational options
guide student decisions
maintain **contact**

Many **faculty** have **observed** that **institutionalized** advising **deserves** a **minimum** of **professional** attention, and a machine could perform most of the tasks. **Professional** advising, **however**, **offers** **greater** **rewards**, but it **entails** **personal** commitment and considerable **time**.

Professional advising **occurs** **often** on **most** campuses. A **student** **seeks** out a **professor** early in **his** undergraduate **experience**, establishes a **basis** of **trust**, **begins** to spend **time** in contact with that **advisor**, **establishes** a program with the advisor's assistance and moves toward graduation with **personal faculty support**. The faculty advisor **takes** **time** to **understand** **student's** **background**, **uses** knowledge of higher education to **lay** out the options, **helps** **student** through **decisions** and **provides** continuing guidance. **The** professional relationship **between** an **advisor** and **student** **is** **as** **personal** as that **between** any **person** and a **chosen** physician, **lawyer** or **architect**.

Professional advising **relationships** **are** **not** **all** **professional** **interactions**, with the mutual consent of the participants and **within** **limits** **set** by **professional** **decorum**. Such **relationships** **arise** **regularly**, but it **is** **not** likely that **all** **students** (or **even** **all** **faculty**) have participated in such a **relationship**. **However**, we can **be** **sure** that **all** **students** (and **most** **faculty**) have participated in institutionalized advising. **Both** **parties** find the **institutionalized** **form** of advising to be **necessary** but not **sufficient**; with its **attention** to regulation, credit **distribution** and **prerequisites** it is **degrading** and **averse**.

To **establish** advising within the established **culture** of the faculty, advising specialists and **administrators** should relegate institutionalized advising (the procedural issues that **faculty** find repugnant) to other **processes**. A **most** **promising** advising mechanism for institutionalized advising is computerized **record** review; it or such a **mechanism** **is** **accurate** **and** **humane**. When **computer** programs have not **been** **developed**, colleges have trained **or** organized **peer** **advisors** **under** the **direction** of the **registrar**, the **student** **services** **director**, the **college** **dean** or the advising **specialist**. **Academic** faculty may **prove** much more **willful**, **wise** **well** when they **feel** that **clerical** and **procedural** problems have been solved **elsewhere** (computer or **peer** advisors).

By **removing** **procedural** **concerns** from the **advising** function, advising specialists and **administrators** may concentrate **on** supporting long-term **advising** **relationships** **between** **students** and **faculty**. **Professional** advising functions **are** **compatible** with faculty culture. **In** **tradition** as old as Aeneas and Mentor. **Students**, as well, would approach their **faculty** **advisor** with **great** **ease** if the **policing** function were **removed** from the faculty role. **May** faculty want to **serve** students to the same **extent** that students want **access** to them as **reliable** adult guides.

ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES AFFECTING ACADEMIC ADVISING

Though faculty advising may best occur beyond the scope of institutional needs, procedures and regulations, the institutional context still exerts profound influence on the willingness of faculty to advise. Commonly, the institutional framework offers as much resistance to the process of improvement as support. For advising relationships to thrive, advising specialists and administrators must change the context in which it occurs. Change must take place within the formal structure, which generates faculty rewards; within administrative processes, which can lend coherence to the advising process; and within the human resource area, where both students and faculty can be prepared to interact beneficially.

A. Formal Structure

The formal structure of the university dictates:

1. the advising responsibilities that are designated to faculty and administrative units.
2. the rewards and recognition that reinforce effective advising,
3. the definitions and criteria that are identified and
4. the time and resources that are allocated for the advising function.

Unfortunately, the formal structure, as it has existed, has not always promoted the development of advising. For example, on many campuses advising is not well defined. Criteria for effective advising are not identified and, in turn, advising is not evaluated. Logically, something that is not evaluated cannot be rewarded in any formal way. The formal structure rarely includes systematic procedures for rewarding excellent advising or punishing poor advising.

Although the pattern is changing, many campuses do not specifically allocate resources for advising. Time is rarely set aside for faculty to provide advising, either as regular time on the weekly calendar or as a general commitment (a load designation) over the academic year. Obviously, many faculty take such steps on their own but it is rarely a matter of formal institutional policy and procedure. Finally, more tangible resources, such as budgets for workshops or advising materials, are not always provided.

While the formal structure for supporting advising is crucial, it is important to recognize that the existence of an elaborate formal structure does not in itself guarantee success. Faculty and student priorities, and aspects of campus culture and environment, probably play a stronger role in an academic setting. Nevertheless, we find that the absence of a formal structure supporting advising positively dooms any ambitious efforts to failure. Good advising, like good teaching, rests finally on internal energies and intrinsic rewards but, without formal institutional support, the majority of faculty and academic leaders (chairpersons and deans) are unlikely to elevate the importance of advising.

It may be that alterations of the formal structure are the most difficult steps to take. The organization of work and revision of evaluation criteria have great symbolic significance for faculty. We know also that in an academic setting faculty must participate in decisions

that would alter these aspects of academic life. There is no question that the obstacles are great. Indeed, given the costs involved in attempting to alter aspects of the formal structure, one is led back to the fundamental question: How truly important to institutional welfare is the improvement of academic advising? Is one prepared to do what is necessary to shift the formal commitments of the institution? Fortunately, more faculty and administrators have come to recognize that we have entered an era in which students must be recruited, supported and retained in much more effective ways. The health of the institution in the 1980s and 1990s depends on moving strongly in these directions. Thus, administrative leaders are becoming less hesitant in making proposals that require unusual commitments, leadership and change.

B. Systems of Advising Support

The process of advising is not often arranged so that students can perceive a logical relationship among all the units and people contributing to advising, nor has it been arranged so that those units and people can interact effectively. Frequently,

- a) No group on campus has taken responsibility for developing and monitoring the sequence of advising steps that would constitute an effective program.
- b) Even where effective programs exist, referral among programs remains to be established.

An overall framework for advising is needed to bring the disparate participants into one coherent flow.

The organizational symptoms of this situation include the absence of coordination of advising at the institutional level, the lack of clear designation of administrative responsibility for taking leadership in the advising area, and lack of regular processes for evaluating the effectiveness of advising. In larger and more complex institutions, it is difficult to achieve cooperative relationships and institution-wide leadership. However, the absence of these qualities dooms an institution to mixed signals, inadequate consensus about priorities and a failure to exploit in a resourcesful manner the resources that already exist.

C. Human Resources: Faculty and Students

Faculty members are not systematically prepared or rewarded for the role they must assume in a successful advising program. In those cases where effective advising occurs, two significant factors emerge:

- a) Faculty have become more active in units where the efforts receive recognition within the reward system as an element of their professional activity.
- b) Faculty prove effective when they are clear about what advising is and how it relates to student development.

Faculty across campus need to hold a shared definition of advising and develop whatever skills they will need to operate within that definition.

We know that faculty often lack necessary skills of communication, motivation, understanding of effective advising, and knowledge of the institution, and an advising program

cannot work if they are not prepared to perform effectively. The clear implication is that faculty skills, knowledge and attitudes must be assessed and, where necessary, improved.

The student situation is **equally** problematic; they do not often **recognize** or accept the **importance** of their responsibility to work within the advising system:

- a) Student **culture** may **promulgate** the **belief** that academic advising offers **little value** and the proper response to advising opportunities is withdrawal.
- b) **Students may lack** skill and confidence in conversing with faculty and **staff** in **advising** situations,

If advising is to work, **students** must **recognize** the **importance of** academic advising. **learn** to function **effectively** and help in shaping and improving the advising system.

Preparing and motivating **students** to participate **effectively** in academic advising is a much neglected step. Since advising is a very **personal process** (especially "**professional**" advising as defined above) it is **essential** that students **assume** responsibility for making **decisions** about their **lives** and that they know how to. and are sufficiently **skilled** to utilize advising **resources**. These capacities are not likely to emerge of their own accord. **except** in a minority of **cases**. Thus, deliberate institutional **steps** may **be necessary** to bring students to the point at which an effective **advising** system is possible.

In summary, the organizational environment for advising **includes** the **formal structure**, support systems and human resources. Each **component** may represent either an **asset** or an obstacle to good advising. However, the **general dissatisfaction** with academic advising on **most campuses** suggests that **these** components warrant detailed analysis by each institution. **Such** a study **can become** the basis for a program of **organizational** change **leading to the** improvement of academic advising. The following pages address the problem of how to **alter** the **organizational environment**.

ALTERING THE ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENT: PLANNED CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Given the construct of the problem presented above, one can envision an improvement program **simultaneously** operating on all three levels. At the structured level, **administration** and **governance** of the University must begin to prepare the **setting** for improved advising, providing **resources**, rewards and structural changes as necessary. The major units, whatever their size, must **begin** to arrange **systems and programs** that will bring **elements** of advising **together** into coherent sequences. **Given incentives**, structural support and a clear, **rational** process, faculty must **begin** to develop the skills they **need** to lead **students** effectively. The students must become active and ask **questions** relative to **personal, academic and career development** in order to use **available resources** effectively. A program with these goals in view must assume a developmental **stance**, **recognizing** the **contingencies** that limit change within the **three** separate areas. yet supporting **active exploration** and **movement** in all.

CHART A
MATRIX FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

Area	Problem	Possible Options/Steps	Locus of Leadership
Formal Structure	Advising not defined	Develop definition of advising tasks.	President, Vice Presidents, Deans and Faculty Committees
	Advising not recognized in reward system	Distribute responsibility for tasks	
	Criteria for effectiveness not stated	Recognize faculty contributions in reward system.	
System Support	Time and resources not allocated	Develop criteria for evaluation	
		Set aside time for advising load.	
	No coordination for whole process	Formalize Campus-wide committee	Vice President (Acad.)
Human Resources	Leadership responsibility not established	Charge Deans with leadership responsibility	
	Programs not developed.	Apply resources to Program development and coordination .	Deans, Chairpersons
	No process for evaluation in place	Develop comprehensive evaluation strategy.	"
Human Resources	Faculty lack: skills motivation understanding of advising knowledge of university	Sponsor workshops Develop materials	Deans, Chairpersons and Faculty committees
	Students lack: skills confidence	Develop workshops Develop materials	Dean of Students, Chairpersons

Chart A presents a matrix that identifies specific steps in response to specific organizational obstacles and problems. The suggested steps are matched with the aim of organizational concern, specific obstacles and the probable locus of leadership for the proposed initiatives. Although the listed steps are hypothetical and most appropriate for a larger institution, the logic of the analysis has relevance for all institutions. The matrix assures that major organizational variables are not ignored and that goals and responsibilities are defined. Such an analysis is an improvement on the often random and unsystematic efforts to improve advising that exists on college campuses. Most institutions are at the point that effective advising is simply too important to leave to chance. Institutions must move more self-consciously and with a plan that accounts for the critical variables used here.

Although this analysis provides useful guidance, improving academic advising must be seen as an aspect of the general problem of change in higher education. The obstacles to improved advising are similar to those facing general education proposals, the shifting of institutional resources to new program areas, the introduction of new instruction technologies, etc. Furthermore, the literature on higher education demonstrates the many forms of resistance to change. Martin, Hefferlin, Ladd, Lindquist and others have published useful studies.⁴ An important issue is whether the effort to improve advising can benefit from insights derived from the growing literature on planned change.

For example, one insight from the change literature is that organizations are systems of communication, influence and resources. They operate in hydraulic fashion, whereby a change of pressure in one sector has multiple effects elsewhere in the organization.⁵ Thus, the matrix of key organizational variables shown in Chart A implies several interrelationships. A loose dependency exists among the three areas as they are characterized. Alterations in the formal structure will tend to clear the path for movement toward coherence in the advising system. Clearly designated tasks and responsibilities will allow faculty development efforts to focus on a definite set of skills. Movement along defined lines in faculty skill will facilitate the definition of student responsibility and skill. The various interrelationships need to be monitored as improvement efforts go forward.

Another insight suggests that top-down support of change has limited effects in an academic environment. Many academic prerogatives reside in smaller units with individual faculty. In many cases, change must take the slower route of influencing units and individuals located at lower levels in the organizational hierarchy.⁶ The implication here is that an individual or unit (e.g., an advising support center) may need to function as an instigator and manager of change, and such a unit functions horizontally, rather than vertically, in the organization. The creation of instructional improvement centers on many campuses during the 1970s is an example of a lateral change strategy. The creation of an advising support center and the designation of a staff member to implement improvement strategies are logical steps to take.

⁴Warren Martin, *Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969); J.B. Hefferlin, *The Dynamics of Academic Reform* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969); Dwight Ladd, *Change in Educational Policy: Self-Studies in Selected Colleges and Universities* (Hightstown, New Jersey: McGraw-Hill, 1970); Jack Lindquist, *Strategies for Change* (Berkeley: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978).

⁵Joseph Axelrod, "Curricular Change: A Model for Analysis," *The Research Reporter*, Vol. 3, (1968), No. 3.

⁶David Holmes, *Reform from Within*, (Burlington, Vermont: University of Vermont, 1976), 124-127.

Another insight concerns the effective use of information to motivate change. Many studies have confirmed that the impetus for change, especially major change, usually comes from external sources.⁷ The link between demographic trends, budgetary pressures, attrition patterns and the quality of academic advising may present persuasive argumentation for the advocates of improved advising. Detailed and credible information about faculty advising activities may motivate faculty and administrators to take action.

Thus, the problem of improving academic advising must be seen as a problem of change. Organizational obstacles, including aspects of faculty culture, must be approved systematically and lessons from the change literature should be exploited. After assumptions about change become more overt, the basis for evaluation of progress is then established. More importantly, the conscious use of organizational change strategies are likely to improve the prospects of genuine improvement. It is time to shift from ad hoc, conceptually naive approaches to more measured, conceptually sound approaches. The task is too important to work otherwise.

⁷Hefferlin, *The Dynamics of Academic Reform* (1969), p. 146.