

From the coeditors:

This issue excites us because it shares academic advising scholarship representing different methodologies and highlighting the breadth of advising approaches. The articles in this issue provide rich contexts and global perspectives, with scholarship of academic advising in Australia and Hong Kong. We, as coeditors, continuously seek submissions from across the world because scholarship from global voices strengthens the impact of academic advising research.

The first two articles consider students who are high achieving. In “Should Students with AP Credit Repeat Coursework in College? A Multi-level Analysis,” Hurt and Maeda examined the academic performance of students who entered college with Advanced Placement (AP) credit to see whether a difference existed if they repeated prerequisite courses despite having earned the AP credit. In the context of whether faculty and primary-role advisors encourage students with AP credit to repeat a course before continuing to advanced classes, Hurt and Maeda discovered that the students performed similarly in advanced courses regardless of repeating a course or just taking the AP credit for it. These AP students outperformed those with similar academic backgrounds who did not enter college with AP credit.

Continuing the conversation about high-achieving students, Richard et al. considered the impact of students’ engagement in high-impact practices in their pursuit of health science graduate education in “High Impact Practices and Professional School Acceptance in Health Science Concentrations.” They examined the variables of acceptance to graduate professional healthcare programs, grade point average, enrollment in a minor, specific items from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and other high impact practices. They found that specific high impact practices and variables correlate with admission to students’ desired graduate programs, including grade point average, finishing a minor, and completing a capstone course.

Academic advisors support high impact practices and involvement for their students through different advising approaches. In “Navigating College with MAAPS: Students’ Perceptions of a Proactive Advising Approach,” Van Jura and Prieto explored students’ experiences with and perceptions of advisors through the implementation of the Monitoring Advising Analytics to

Promote Success (MAAPS) program, which targeted first-generation students and students with limited-income backgrounds to support their academic success and improve retention. While some students who participated benefitted from the program, Van Jura and Prieto noted some design issues with MAAPS’ implementation, thus providing suggestions for improving this approach for future success.

Analyzing another advising approach, Wang and Houdyshell considered the context of the COVID-19 pandemic in their article, “Remote Academic Advising Using Synchronous Technology: Knowledge, Experiences, and Perceptions from Students.” First, they explained how academic advising was one of many important college units that used various technologies to better support students when shifting online. Next, they surveyed students engaged with remote academic advising, considering several demographic variables to understand their experiences. While there were no statistically significant differences for knowledge or experiences with remote academic advising amongst demographic variables, Wang and Houdyshell found significant differences in student opinions about remote academic advising based on age and gender groups. As colleges continue to adapt through the uncertainty of the pandemic, this study provides valuable insights for supporting students remotely and with different technologies.

Taking us into the application of an advising approach in Hong Kong, Siu et al. aimed to validate the Appreciative Advising Inquiry instrument in “A Strength-Based Inventory for Assessing the Needs for Academic Advising of University Students in Hong Kong.” With Dr. Jennifer Bloom’s permission, the authors adapted the Appreciative Advising Inquiry instrument based on the context of higher education in Hong Kong. They surveyed 410 students, 38 of which were on academic probation. Through principal component analysis and Rasch analysis, Siu et al. found good reliability on all four subscales of the instrument. In addition, there were statistically significant differences in scores between students on academic probation and those who were not (though noting the small number of students surveyed on probation), and between local (Hong Kong residents) and non-local (non-native to Hong Kong) students.

Completing the issue is a qualitative case study exploring the academic advising experiences of advisors in Australia. In “Academic Advisors in Australian Higher Education: Perceptions, Role Identities, and Recommendations,” Dollinger et al. described the experiences of 11 advisors through the implementation of an academic advising unit at an Australian university. Utilizing advisors’ reflective diaries, the authors sought to understand participants’ adjustment to new roles and how they believed others on campus perceived them over time. Some advisors in the study were assigned to academic disciplines, while others supported specific student populations. The findings showed misunderstanding and clarification of academic advisor roles, student confusion about the title and meaning of “Academic Advisor,” and struggles

with advisors’ gaining access to necessary data to do their job.

We hope you will enjoy the articles in this issue of the *NACADA Journal* and will be motivated to contribute to the research and scholarship to advance the field of academic advising. We especially call on authors around the globe to contribute new perspectives to academic advising scholarship. Lastly, we must thank Susan Campbell for her incredible service to the *NACADA Journal* as coeditor for the past five years. Her vision and hard work have elevated the scholarship of academic advising in immeasurable ways. She is a dedicated professional, serving us even while in retirement. It has been a joy to collaborate with and learn from you, Susan!

Lisa M. Rubin
Karen Mottarella