

thers who were interested in clustering. (We called them hard-core clusterers.) Students who chose to take the courses were generally more serious and better motivated but not necessarily brighter. (Gryll rarely took clustered courses.) Finally, we gave teachers money for class lunches, trips to the theater, parties, panel discussions — whatever they felt would foster academic excellence and a sense of community among the students.

The experiment worked. The clustering of courses was so successful that under the terms of the new curriculum of Fordham College, which took effect fall of 1980, all freshmen now take two clusters, one in the fall and one in the spring. Although the Grylls is the world — among the faculty and students (both, by nature, very soft-core clusterers) who must teach and take clustered courses, the system continues to be successful in fostering a sense of community in the classroom.

As I look back over what I have written here, I realize I have said a great deal about Fordham College, and I hope that my experience there, particularly with the Values Program, might be of some help to others who must find ways to build community or communities in their own institutions and in the process create an environment that will support the effort to advise students well. If the experience of Fordham proves not to be helpful, then I ask that when faced with cynicism, indifference, pessimism, selfishness, or intransigence in your own institution, you not despair, but rather, like the palmer, shrug your shoulders, remember Gryll, and continue the quest. It's the only way to live.

Rewards for Academic Advising: An Evaluation

MAX D. LARSEN, *Professor of Mathematics* and BONNIE M. BROWN, *Assistant Professor of Spanish, Assistant Dean, Arts & Sciences, University of Nebraska — Lincoln*

The Academic advising profession does not rank high on the rewards ladder in higher education. Evidence for this assertion is abundant. An increased interest to improve academic advising renews concern for the plight of the advisor, and prompts more questions about the topic.

The Final Report of A National Survey of Academic Advising concludes that there is little reward or recognition attached to the successful delivery of academic advising.¹ In an attempt to identify research priorities for academic advising on behalf of the National Academic Advising Association, Polson and Cashin requested descriptions of things which might improve the respondent's advising program. In an open-ended format the largest number of responses dealt with improving the rewards for effective academic advising, either directly through pay raises or indirectly by weighing advising more significantly in promotion and tenure decisions.² Teague and Grites concluded that faculty cannot be expected to perform advising adequately without appropriate recognition and support.³ Dressel asserts that actions that can be taken to improve faculty advising systems include reducing the teaching load for faculty who become advisors, and an acknowledgment of that service at time of promotion and salary decisions.⁴ Borgard, Hornbuckle, and Mahoney state that if teaching, research, and service are to be the benchmarks of faculty professional and personal advancement at a particular institution, the relative merit of advising within this structure must be defined. Faculty need to understand to what degree performance in advising is related to review for salary, tenure, and promotion.⁵ Kramer said changes in the institution's reward and incentive structure may be required if the institution's operational goals become, in part, the faculty's professional and personal goals.⁶ The literature cited contains other instances documenting the low reward level for academic advising.

¹ Carstensen, Donald J. and Constance Silberhorn, "Final Report: A National Survey on Academic Advising," American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa, 1979.

² Polson, Cheryl J. and William E. Cashin, "Research Priorities for Academic Advising: Results of Survey of NACADA Membership," NACADA Journal 1 (1981), pp. 34-43.

³ Teague, Gerald V. and Thomas J. Grites, "Faculty Contracts and Academic Advising," Journal of College Student Personnel, 21 (1980), pp. 40-44.

⁴ Dressel, Fred B., "The Faculty Adviser," Improving College and University Teaching, 22 (1974), pp. 57-58.

⁵ Borgard, John H., Phyllis A. Hornbuckle, and John Mahoney, "Faculty Perceptions of Academic Advising," NASPA Journal 14 (1977), pp. 4-10.

⁶ Kramer, Howard C., "The Advising Coordinator: Managing from a One-Down Position," NACADA Journal, 1 (1981), pp. 7-15.

METHOD

A questionnaire addressing this issue was administered to 1,367 faculty members in the colleges of Arts and Sciences at the University of Wyoming, Mankato (Minnesota) State University, Kansas State University, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Usable responses were obtained from 541 for a response rate of 40 percent.

SUBJECT:

For the purpose of cross tabular comparisons, the faculty population can be subdivided into *Chairs* (and heads) of departments, *Advisors* indicating faculty who have major responsibility for advising or coordinating advising, and *Faculty* consisting of the remainder of the professional staff. Responses are used from 49 Chairs, 97 Advisors, and 5 Faculty for subgroup response rates of 62, 60, and 35 percent.

PROCEDURE:

Respondents were to register agreement or disagreement using the following seven point scale by circling a number: (1) strongly agree, (2) moderately agree, (3) slightly agree, (4) slightly disagree, (5) moderately disagree, (6) strongly disagree, (7) no opinion.

Observations regarding comparisons of faculty and student responses to items in the questionnaire are made by considering the percent indicating "strongly agree" or "strongly disagree" and by considering the "cumulative agreement" obtained by summing the percent of respondents circling 1, 2, or 3.

RESULTS:

Initially, the perceived importance of academic advising was ascertained by direct questioning. The answer: 92.5 percent of the respondents agreed that academic advising should be regarded as a significant part of the institution's mission. Strong agreement was recorded by 55.2 percent of the sample. Opinions were consistent across all subcategories.

To explore attitudes and perceptions regarding rewards for academic advising two sets of questions were posed. The first, clearly labeled as dealing with *current* conditions, expresses perceptions of rewards for advising as they existed when the questionnaire was administered. The second set of questions asks how academic advising *should* be rewarded or regarded. The importance of the results may be not so much in the attitudes expressed by the population sampled but rather in the differences in opinions across the groups.

TABLE I

Perceptions of Current Rewards for Academic Advising
by Faculty, Advisors, and Chairs

		Strongly Agree	Cumulative Agreement	Strongly Disagree
Academic advising is adequately rewarded at your institution.	FAC	1.6%	15.2%	47.7%
	ADV	2.1	13.6	62.5
	CHR	2.0	20.4	40.8
Academic advising counts toward merit salary increases.	FAC	2.1	16.1	50.9
	ADV	1.0	14.6	63.5
	CHR	4.1	30.7	38.8
Academic advising is considered in promotion and tenure evaluation.	FAC	1.1	16.5	51.6
	ADV	2.1	9.5	71.6
	CHR	2.1	31.9	36.2

The data for perceptions of rewards currently operating within the respondent's institution are summarized in Table I. One-half strongly disagreed that academic advising was adequately rewarded confirming opinions cited in the literature. However, note that while 62.5 percent of Advisors disagreed only 40.8 percent of Chairs did. Concomitantly, one fifth of the Chairs felt that the rewards given currently for academic advising were adequate. But only 13.6 percent of those with primary responsibility for advising, and thus presumably those most affected by the adequacy (or inadequacy) of rewards for advising, agreed.

The differences of opinions were more striking when specified reward mechanisms such as merit salary increases and promotion and tenure evaluations were considered. While 63.5 percent of Advisors strongly disagreed that academic advising counted toward merit salary increases, only 38.8 percent of Chairs strongly disagreed. In fact, 30.7 percent of Chairs agreed that it did count towards merit. In an open-ended format, respondents were asked where the decision was made on merit salary increase for academic advising. Responses to the questions were limited; "Considered with teaching" and "In overall service record," were the answers often given. Table II lists the most frequent responses to the question of decision on merit salary.

TABLE II

Where Decision Is Made on Merit Salary Increases for Academic Advising.

	Times Mentioned
Department Chair	41
In Department	25
Dean	17
Chair and Dean	14
Salary-Rewards Committee	10
University Governing Board	10
Don't Know	6
October 1983	

The respondents were asked next whether academic advising was considered during promotion and tenure of faculty. The percent of Advisors (71.6 percent) denying that it is considered, was nearly twice the percent of Chairs (36.2 percent) of that opinion, while 51.6 percent of Faculty strongly disagreed. In terms of agreement, nearly as many chairs agreed as strongly disagreed that academic advising was considered in promotion and tenure. If it were considered in promotion and tenure evaluations, by whom and at what level was it considered? Answers to these open-ended questions are summarized in Table III. The departmental chair, as in Table II, was pivotal in terms of affect of academic advising on promotion and tenure evaluations.

TABLE III

By Whom and At What Level Is Academic Advising Considered in Promotion and Tenure Evaluations?

By Whom?	Times Mentioned	At What Level?	Times Mentioned
Chair	31	Department	16
Department	26	All Levels	15
Dean & Chair	15	University Level	11
Tenure Committee	14	Dean's Office	5
College	4	Dean & Vice President	4
Don't Know	10	Don't Know	5

Decisions about rewards for academic advising performance in merit salary increases and in promotion and tenure evaluations were made primarily by departmental chairs. A higher percentage of departmental chairs believed that academic advising was taken into account in these decisions than did faculty members, especially faculty members with responsibility for advising or coordination of advising. This difference in perception was probably due to the imprecision of all evaluation and the lack of clean-cut statements of responsibility tied to evaluation. Larsen and Brown make the case for development of statements of advising responsibilities. If such statements and methods of evaluation of advising were available, there might be more agreement about the role academic advising plays in the reward system.

DISCUSSION

HOW SHOULD ACADEMIC ADVISING BE REWARDED?

A comparison across academic areas of responses from faculty regarding rewards for advising shows a gradual change in attitude. Faculty in the fine arts feel less strongly that

Larsen, Max D. and Bonnie Brown, "Student and Faculty Perceptions of Academic Advising," paper presented American Association of Higher Education annual meeting, March 5, 1982.

October 1983

Rewards for Academic Advising

academic advising was not rewarded adequately than faculty in the humanities, the social sciences, and the physical sciences. For instance, the percentages expressing cumulative agreement that academic advising was considered in promotion and tenure evaluations were:

- 23.0 for fine arts,
- 17.6 for humanities,
- 17.2 for social sciences, and
- 14.3 for physical sciences.

The rank, assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor, of respondents made little difference in their perception of current rewards for advising.

Three questions were asked about how academic advising should be rewarded:

- (1) Through reduction in teaching and research responsibilities;
- (2) Through merit salary increases; or
- (3) Through promotion and tenure evaluations.

A summary of the responses is given in Table IV. Note that there was a higher percent of agreement that reduction in teaching and research responsibilities should accompany heavy advising duties than for rewarding academic advising with merit salary increases or by considering it in promotion and tenure evaluations. In all cases faculty members who did not have a major responsibility for academic advising were less likely to agree that it should be rewarded.

TABLE IV

How Should Academic Advising Be Rewarded?

		Strongly Agree	Cumulative Agreement	Strongly Disagree
Where a faculty member's advising load is particularly heavy, she/he should receive a commensurate reduction in teaching or research responsibilities.	FAC	49.9%	84.6%	5.2%
	ADV	60.4	92.7	1.0
	CHR	51.0	87.7	6.1
Effective or superior academic advising should be rewarded with merit salary increases.	FAC	35.8	75.5	9.1
	ADV	54.3	88.4	1.1
	CHR	40.4	84.7	6.4
The caliber of academic advising should be considered in promotion and tenure evaluations.	FAC	33.1	72.0	11.9
	ADV	44.6	84.8	4.3
	CHR	40.4	78.7	8.5

Table V summarizes the opinions of faculty members by rank and by academic area regarding appropriate ways of rewarding academic advising. In general, assistant professors expressed more agreement with the notion that academic advising should be rewarded than did associate or full professors. The strongest support for rewards came from the fine arts faculty, followed by the faculty for humanities, social sciences and physical sciences.

October 1983

TABLE V
How Should Academic Advising Be Rewarded?
Faculty Opinion By Academic Rank and Discipline

		Strongly Agree	Cumulative Agreement	Strongly Disagree
Where a faculty member's advising load is particularly heavy, she/he should receive a commensurate function in teaching or research responsibilities	asst. prof.	62.3%	89.5%	2.6%
	assoc. prof.	49.2	86.5	3.8
	full prof.	48.2	84.1	6.5
	fine arts	59.5	90.5	0
	humanities	54.2	86.6	4.2
	social sciences	51.0	86.1	6.6
	physical sciences	46.9	84.6	5.7
Effective or superior academic advising should be rewarded with merit salary increases.	asst. prof.	38.6	74.6	8.8
	assoc. prof.	41.6	74.6	7.0
	full prof.	36.7	78.4	10.2
	fine arts	35.1	79.7	5.4
	humanities	39.4	73.2	10.6
	social sciences	39.1	78.8	7.3
	physical sciences	40.0	76.0	9.7
The caliber of academic advising should be considered in promotion and tenure evaluations.	asst. prof.	38.6	73.7	10.5
	assoc. prof.	36.2	71.9	7.8
	full prof.	31.4	72.7	12.2
	fine arts	39.2	71.6	6.8
	humanities	35.4	76.1	8.5
	social sciences	33.8	74.2	8.6
	physical sciences	33.1	69.7	14.9

In the conclusions of the Final Report of A National Survey of Academic Advising, Carstensen and Silberhorn conclude that academic advising has been and still is perceived by administrators as a low-status function.⁹ In contrast, the results of this survey indicate that faculty members not having major involvement with advising feel the strongest about acknowledging it within the usual reward structure. Furthermore, the results of Table I show that a higher percent of departmental chairs and heads than faculty felt that rewards were being given for academic advising. Thus if chairs and heads are considered administrators, these results conflict with the conclusions of Carstensen and Silberhorn.

EVALUATION OF ADVISING

The national survey of academic advising by Carstensen and Silberhorn provides information about contemporary practices regarding evaluation of academic advisors.¹⁰ Kramer discusses evaluation of academic advising of two types: *Formative* evaluation in which data are gathered for the purpose of improving the effectiveness of academic advising and the skills of the individual doing the advising, and *summative* evaluation which seeks to

Carstensen and Silberhorn.

produce evidence about the influence or success of an individual to be used in personnel decisions, primarily regarding distribution of institutional rewards.¹¹ Beal and Noel advocate a carefully planned program of advisor evaluation to lead the way to improvements in the advising system.¹²

The structural analysis conducted by Hornbuckle, Mahoney, and Borgard warn of the difficulty in evaluating the "technical functions" of advising.¹³ However their study was performed without an established statement of responsibilities for advisors and students as partners in the academic advising process.¹⁴

Academic advising should be evaluated if it is going to be rewarded, according to 82.3 percent of the respondents of this survey. Opinions regarding this matter varied little across the subcategories. How and by whom should it be evaluated? Survey participants were asked to indicate their opinion about the appropriateness of four possible means of evaluating advising. The results are summarized in Table VI.

TABLE VI
Appropriate Ways of Evaluating Advising.

		Strongly Agree	Cumulative Agreement	Strongly Disagree
Evaluation by Students	FAC	32.2%	73.9%	11.4%
	ADV	52.2	90.2	3.3
	CHR	39.1	84.8	4.3
Peer Evaluation	FAC	14.7	64.4	15.0
	ADV	22.7	70.4	9.1
	CHR	25.5	78.6	10.6
On Basis of Numbers Served	FAC	7.7	50.0	22.6
	ADV	15.1	54.6	19.8
	CHR	17.4	65.2	8.7
Performance of Student	FAC	9.8	37.8	32.9
	ADV	4.1	29.4	38.8
	CHR	11.1	39.0	24.4

Evaluation of advising by students is appropriate according to 77.8 percent of the respondents with Advisors making the strongest response. Although 66.9 percent agreed with peer evaluation, the percentage expressing strong disagreement was nearly as high as the percentage expressing strong agreement. Thus if peer evaluation were to be attempted,

⁹Carstensen and Silberhorn.

¹⁰Kramer, Howard C., "Evaluation Academic Advisors: Administrator and Faculty Perspectives," NACADA Journal (1982), pp. 30-36.

¹¹Beal, P.E. and L. Noel, "What Works in Student Retention: A Preliminary Summary of a National Survey," The American College Testing Program and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems: Iowa City, Iowa and Boulder, Colorado, 1979.

¹²Hornbuckle, Phyllis A., John Mahoney, and John H. Borgard, "A Structural Analysis of Student Perceptions of Faculty Advising," Journal of College Student Personnel 20 (1979), pp. 296-300.

¹³Larsen and Brown.

eful definition and preliminary work would be essential. Neither performance by the student or on the basis of numbers served appear to be appropriate.

CONCLUSION

Although academic advising is recognized as a significant part of an institution's mission, it does not rate high in terms of the traditional reward structure. What rewards are available come through departments and department chairs. But chairs and faculty who have a major involvement in advising differ in terms of the extent to which advising is currently being rewarded. However there is general agreement that it should be rewarded with commensurate reduction in teaching and research responsibilities, with merit salary increases, and by consideration in promotion and tenure evaluations.

If advising is to be rewarded, it must be evaluated. First, an institutional description of possibilities for advising must be developed and mechanisms using students and possibly peers for evaluating performance established. Second, the weight given to advising in the overall rewards system will depend upon institutional priorities and missions. Third, a clear definition and process for evaluating advising will help improve the current situation.

Producing A Comprehensive Academic Advising Handbook

JERRY FORD, *Dean of the Smith College of General Studies, Houston Baptist University.*

One of the basic elements in developing and implementing a successful academic advising program is the utilization of an advising handbook.¹ Producing a comprehensive academic advising handbook that is attractive, useful, versatile and inexpensive has been a point of concern on many college and university campuses. Administrators at Houston Baptist University (H.B.U.) during the past four years have met the challenge of developing a faculty advising handbook to assist advisors in making their advisees' educational experiences more meaningful and significant.

A few brief comments concerning part of the administrative structure of H.B.U. are essential for an understanding of the role of academic advising on this campus. The foundation unit in the organizational program of H.B.U. is the Smith College of General Studies. Since the Smith College is the academic advising arm of H.B.U., each student admitted to the University, regardless of past experiences, is assigned there for evaluation and guidance. The guidance and advising, both vocational and educational, are performed by a staff of faculty advisors under the direction of the Smith College Dean. Each advisor is responsible for counseling a group of student advisees, and it is imperative that he or she have the most current information available concerning H.B.U. academic advising procedures. Thus, the concept of disseminating ideas to the faculty advisors in the form of an advising handbook was born, and the responsibility for developing and updating such a handbook became operative under the Dean of the Smith College of General Studies.

Once the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Dean of Smith College made the decision in June, 1979, to develop an advising handbook, the following questions arose:

- (1) What should be the target date for the completion and distribution of the first handbook?
- (2) What should be included in the handbook?
- (3) What format should be used?
- (4) What costs will be incurred?
- (5) How should the faculty advisors be informed concerning the purpose and use of the handbook?
- (6) How often should the handbook be updated, revised, and/or produced? In other words, where do we go from here?

¹The American College Testing Program. *Midstate: A Model Use of the ACT Assessment Program*. Iowa City, Iowa: 1979a. p. 478.