

Executive Summary

During Ohio State's recent transition to semesters (summer 2012), our community of academic advisors proved their commitment to supporting students' academic progress. This Quality Initiative (QI) reflects the university's commitment to enhance and better support academic advising and focuses on the following goals:

1. Improving students' engagement with advising resources
2. Training and providing professional development for advisors
3. Defining and assessing the learning outcomes for academic advising
4. Improving access to information needed to guide and support students
5. Enhancing collaboration among advising staff, and between advising offices and other university offices

Following several initial assessments—including a baseline survey, analysis of data from the 2013 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement, OSU's Culture Survey, and focus groups of advisors and students, along with focus groups of university colleagues who provide content for our training program—work teams from the Committee on Undergraduate Advising identified outcomes and actions that aligned with the goals of the initiative. Year-one goals were distinguished from goals to be addressed and completed later in the five-year project. This process was completed by the end of May 2015, and in June 2015, we provided an interim report to the Provost to summarize our findings and provide initial recommendations on course of action.

From July 2015 through June 2016, volunteer advisors worked on completing action items identified by our work teams. We did not lack for participation in this central effort. Although academic advising at Ohio State is distributed in the colleges and departments in which students complete programs, academic advisors see themselves as part of a larger community—a dedicated community that extends beyond office walls—and this project provided an opportunity to work together.

As the project progressed, two major occurrences influenced its course: Ohio State contracted with the Education Advisory Board (EAB) to implement its Student Success Collaborative, a “predictive analytics platform,” by August 2016; and President Drake convened an Advising Summit in March 2016. Both the technical implementation and the Summit were critical to the goals of the QI, and both required a concentrated adjustment of priorities and resources, resulting in some action items being added and others being assigned an extended due date.

Our efforts will not end in March 2017: the QI was designed to ensure continued momentum. While most of the shifted efforts are tasks that can be completed independently of broader university changes to advising culture, a few will require us to engage with stakeholders across Ohio State. Our plan to develop and execute a communication strategy, for example, was put on hold because of the Advising Summit and will require further consultation and approvals. President Drake's review of the recommendations from the Advising Summit is forthcoming.

Scope and Impact of the Initiative

Through the end of June 2015, project members employed multiple methods to assess the current status of academic advising at Ohio State, and our work teams wrote objectives, action items, and recommendations to assess each of the five QI goals. From June 2015 through June 2016, we worked to complete action items and manage the project. We will begin by summarizing what we learned from our assessment activities, followed by discussion of our action items, ending with an overview of impacts, challenges, and opportunities.

1. Initial Assessment

Following, organized by QI goal, is a summary of what we learned from our various assessment activities: a baseline survey of students; an analysis of data from the Academic Advising Module the 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement; analysis of Ohio State's 2014 Culture Survey; focus groups of students, academic advisors, and partners from other university offices; and data provided by the Arts and Sciences Technology Service team responsible for coding AdvisingConnect, Ohio State's homegrown system of advising notes, appointments, and roster management (See Appendix B for assessment details).

Goal #1: Improve students' engagement with advising resources (academic advisors, Degree Audit, and AdvisingConnect)

Two assessments helped inform our actions: student focus groups and a baseline survey of students.

Student Focus Groups

During the 2015-16 academic year, we conducted nine focus groups with diverse groups of students (including, for example, Undergraduate Student Government, Engineering Living-Learning residents, and volunteers), totaling about 65 students. The questions we asked were aimed to help us better understand

- Whether students thought it important to have an assigned academic advisor, rather than meeting with any available advisor
- Students' expectations and perceptions of academic advisors
- Best practices for communicating with students
- General thoughts about the college Survey course taught by academic advisors to new first-year students during their first term of enrollment

Much of what we heard aligned with what we had expected, based on experience with advising at Ohio State. Students value having an assigned advisor, and even though students' relationships with an advisor will vary, advisors should be available for students who want to establish a relationship that goes beyond occasional check-ins. Generally, students are not aware of the depth of support that an advisor can provide, beyond scheduling classes. Even students who had worked more extensively with their advisors on degree and career planning often found it

difficult to articulate the benefits more specifically than “advisors helped me figure things out.” Students generally agreed that it could be challenging to see their advisor for an appointment within the time they expected or needed, and to help address this concern, they recommended providing easy-to-navigate information online.

Beyond affirming what we thought we already knew, students provided us with important insights and ideas. When asked what prevents a student from seeing an advisor, the participants mentioned that students often they think they have things under control. They know what they are doing and/or are already getting advice from someone else, or able to find information online. If they are getting what they think they need, they may see no need to seek advising. There were many useful suggestions on how to best to communicate with students (with the understanding that email is the primary mode of communication at Ohio State):

- If a concern is urgent, calling is appropriate
- An email coming from an advisor should be personal, meant for the individual student (students are more likely to delete an email directed to a large group of students)
- Subject lines should be focused, informational, and personalized if we want to avoid students deleting an email after only a quick scan
- All students felt that social media were only appropriate for community-building activities and should not be used for anything related to the business of attending Ohio State (*i.e.*, academic status, course and/or scheduling information, financial concerns, etc.).

Other recommendations included having the ability to provide feedback about their advising experiences (as they do with faculty in courses); training the RAs about the value of advising, so they can convey that information to residents (since many new students seek academic advice from their RAs); and encouraging advisors who don’t have an academic background in the area they are advising in to learn as much as they can about courses and the discipline.

Advising Baseline Survey of Students

Our questions on this survey (See Appendix B.1) focused on three particular topics of concern: 1) the perceived value of having, knowing, and consulting with an assigned academic advisor; 2) students’ use of their advising notes, to which they have access in our current notes system (access developed in response to recommendations from undergraduate students); and 3) students’ awareness and use of the degree audit to help track their own degree progress.

1) Advising Rosters and Appointments

Assigning students to academic advisors is a nationally recognized and encouraged practice, one that supports retention, persistence, and a sense of belonging. When an advisor proactively reaches out, a student is more likely to respond if, more than simply recalling a name, he or she feels good about a relationship introduced and encouraged as early as orientation for new

students. We have strongly encouraged units to ensure that all enrolled students have an accurate advisor assignment posted in the Student Information System.

Due to complex variables (program budget, student needs, number of advisors, advisor responsibilities, advising delivery methods, etc.), student-to-advisor ratios vary significantly across and often within enrollment units. As a result, instead of formally assessing practices in all advising units, we plan to consult with units to understand their data needs, to document guidelines, and provide resources to help each arrive at the ratio best suited to its program.

After students have been formally assigned to an advisor (generally either during or right after orientation programs and campus change processes), they are encouraged to begin scheduling individual appointments. The reality, of course, is that a student's questions, issues, and personal constraints influence preferred method of contact (email, phone, walk-in, individual appointment, group sessions, etc.); not all students require an individual appointment to be properly served and/or satisfied.

Individual appointments, however, are valued by both advisors and students, and as we increase our proactive outreach, this personal contact will become even more important. During peak times, access to academic advisors for individual appointments can vary greatly, based on factors such as student procrastination, program budget, advisor turnover, the duties of an advisor that are unrelated to advising (recruitment, departmental scheduling, teaching, etc.). As a result, instead of formally assessing the landscape of appointment availability, we will campaign for all units to use the same appointment scheduling tool and to measure student contact annually, including its ebbs and flows, to better identify times when it is most feasible to encourage students who may benefit from support to schedule appointments.

2) AdvisingConnect (advising notes)

Ohio State is at the forefront in having a regularly used and referenced university-wide system of online advising notes—AdvisingConnect—a system in which students can easily access their advisor's notes on past interactions. Over the last 10 years we have seen how beneficial using this system is for consulting and collaborating, and in reducing bureaucracy, especially for students. AdvisingConnect contains an “institutional memory” summarizing the student's advising history, and access to that information can serve to improve efficiency, increase the continuity and coherence of advisors' conversations with the student, and provide a more personal sense of contact, whether the student is seeing the same advisor, some other advisor, or staff in some other university office.

For our initial assessment, we were interested in determining student awareness and advisor use. Our Advising Baseline Survey (autumn 2014) indicated that only 27.7% of respondents were aware of AdvisingConnect. During autumn 2014, 28.6% of enrolled undergraduate students had at least one login attempt (a percentage based on aggregate counts, with results that tend to validate the results from the smaller sample). (See Appendices B.1 and B.4 for more details.)

3) Degree Audit

The Degree Audit, managed by the University Registrar using a third party vendor, is the university's online degree progress tool, enabling both advisor and student to run an updated progress report. Additional features include a transfer credit evaluation report and a “what-if” degree projection, which helps a student understand how a change of major will affect degree progress. All of these features support national efforts around time-to-degree, and it is imperative that all of our students use the audit regularly to review progress and plan future course work.

Most students—88.5% of the Advising Baseline Survey respondents—are aware of the Degree Audit. (See Appendices B.1 and B.4 for more information.) Though we would prefer a higher percentage, we have decided this is an acceptable number, for now, and will include further promotion of the audit in our strategic communication plan at a later time.

Goal #2: Train and provide professional development for advisors

Focus groups with full-time professional advisors from all campuses helped us better understand where we are and where we need to move.

Training

The questions we asked helped us better understand awareness and use of the Office of Undergraduate Education's training program (which complements training provided in individual units); how advising units structure their training program; and the current shortcomings and successes of both central and local training. Lastly, we sought to better understand the time needed for a new advisor to become confident in the position and what kinds of training could better advance that goal.

Advising offices onboard advisors differently, and while there are opportunities for advising administrators to share practices, advising units typically train their own advisors. Driven by exigency, training for a new advisor ranges from two to six weeks before the advisor begins to see students, and different units cover different topics, with varying gaps in coverage. Among those who participated in the focus groups, 100% were aware that Undergraduate Education's training program exists. Most advising offices, however, viewed our central program as a professional development opportunity—something a new advisor should attend if time permitted. The only session out of nine they saw as a training requirement was our *Introduction to Academic Advising* session. (See <http://u.osu.edu/advisortraining/in-person-sessions/> for descriptions of this and all of our sessions.) Because advisors are hired at different times throughout the year—and to avoid conveying the impression that training is somehow complete after an initial crash exposure—we have encouraged advising administrators to make sure their new staff are scheduled to attend all of these sessions, which are offered over a six-month rotation.

Most advisors agreed that it took about one year to feel confident in their role, even if they had previously advised at another institution. This period of adjustment may depend, to some extent, on the time of year when an advisor is hired: because of high student demand, someone hired during summer orientation or autumn semester will likely receive information at a faster pace.

The Office of Undergraduate Education asks for evaluations after each training session, but did not have a formal way to evaluate our training program. If advising offices are evaluating their training programs, they are doing it independently of each other and our office.

To better understand how Undergraduate Education could more effectively support the onboarding process, our questions focused on the shortcomings (and successes) of training; and whether training on a particular topic occurred in the academic units, in sessions involving university partners, and/or through our office. Clearly, advisors thought they needed more support, beyond the available online training, in learning how to use the Student Information System (SIS) more efficiently, including better information on policies for SIS actions (effective dating, lifting holds, etc.). They also noted that they wanted 1) more support in teaching the Survey course—help in becoming better teachers, along with creative, effective ways to deliver content; 2) more case studies, for help in applying processes and policies to concrete situations involving students; and 3) online training modules. Advisors repeatedly indicated that they wanted more framework and context around the details they had received during the first few weeks of training, which most found overwhelming (two days of immersion in the minutiae of curricular requirements, for example, absent any overview of the role and value of the liberal arts). Additional suggestions included arranging a formal tour of the campus for advisors new to Ohio State, connecting smaller advising offices with larger ones for support, and providing each new advisor with an advising support team.

Professional Development

The questions we asked helped us understand how often advisors seek professional development (and for what experiences), as well as the availability of opportunities and the type of support (funding/time/etc.) they receive from their units. We also wanted to understand better what an “ideal” portfolio for career progression looks like.

As with training, support (funding and time) for professional development varies across advising units. Other than the funding that the Office of Undergraduate Education provides to ACADAOS, the Academic Advising Association of The Ohio State University (<http://u.osu.edu/acadaos>), and the professional development incentive program sponsored by ACADAOS, there is not a central pool of money dedicated to professional development for advisors, who must generally rely on their individual units. During the focus groups, it became clear that many advisors believe that professional development is not supported in their units, either through lack of funding or lack of information about whether funds are available (supervisors general do not bring up the topic funding unless an advisor inquires).

A few other concerns were mentioned. In addition to being in direct contact with students seeking advice, advisors are engaged in various activities that require them to leave the office. In some units, leaving the office to pursue professional development may lead to a feeling of guilt arising from a supervisor's concern (spoken or not) that, in leaving the office, the advisor will be unavailable to serve students. Recommendations, listed below, were made to help counter this:

- Help supervisors think about the long-term benefits of professional development (better informed advisors, retention, additional skills for university committees and internal teamwork, etc.)
- Emphasize that continued learning is important for staff, who should model lifelong learning to students
- Assume positive intent (understand that advisors can handle student demand)
- Commit to support during work hours; not all professional development is feasible during lunch or after-work hours
- Provide institutional support for funding

One major concern involves the inequities in position and pay at Ohio State: academic advisors, across all of our campuses, start at different salaries, classifications, and titles. Additionally, there is no clear career progression for advising at Ohio State, which in this respect is similar to many other institutions across the country. A casualty in this independent, inconsistent arrangement is advisor retention—keeping quality advisors at Ohio State and preventing them from “hopping” from one advising unit to another within the university. The average starting salary for most of our units is \$32,000-\$36,000, with the exception of one unit that starts its advisors at \$41,000. An advisor who has been at Ohio State for five years (and not in an administrative role), will likely make well below the median salary in the position, for all institution types combined (<http://chronicle.com/article/What-Higher-Education/236012>).

Participants pointed out that we can address some of this by offering more professional development opportunities that are either free or cost-effective and encouraging advisors to talk about the importance of professional development with their supervisors; the bigger challenge, however, is the funding and the institutional commitment needed to work with stakeholders to address salary, job classification, and career progression.

Goal #3: Define and assess the student learning outcomes for academic advising

Central student learning outcomes (LOs) for academic advising have been defined and vetted with the administrators in our advising units; there has not yet been much “push” to use these criteria to do assessment, or to ensure that all academic advisors are aware these exist. As a result, our work group charged with assessing assessment did not know whether advising units were using the central student LOs or some version of their own. To begin understanding this, a group of advisors volunteered to design, administer, and evaluate the results of a survey, sent to all 230 full-time academic advisors (58 responded). While this survey asked multiple questions,

it focused on our immediate concerns—awareness and use. The results of this survey will be used as we progress through this goal, which aims to have all advising units use our central LOs and take them through the formal assessment cycle to inform policy and process. Additionally, we would like to put structure in place for each unit to provide annual updates on assessment efforts, to learn from each other and share practices.

Of 58 respondents representing diverse programs, 51% were aware that Ohio State has formalized student LOs for advising; 48% stated they actively use these central LOs in deliberate ways to inform unit policy and procedures. When asked if units that do not use the central student LOs had their own “outcomes,” 37 of 43 respondents stated no; some did indicate a few informally used learning outcomes.

In a parallel attempt to understand how Ohio State compares to other institutions, another group of advisors reached out to 15 comparable universities to ask about student learning outcomes and assessment practices at each: 2/3 reported having “central” student LOs for advising; a smaller number were able to provide information on formal assessment strategies. This is an area in which we expect to make progress later in the initiative.

Goal #4: Improve access to information needed to guide and support students

Focus groups conducted with full-time professional advisors from all campuses helped us better understand where we are and where we need to move. The questions we asked helped us understand what information advisors need and when they need it, along with their preferred mode of delivery. Advisors receive a great deal of information from multiple offices, and while individuals will prefer different modes of delivery, it was apparent that advisors receive too much email, much of which could effectively be consolidated. Emails could have more useful, focused subject lines, and information that an advisor will need to use most often should be efficiently accessible. Additionally, we learned that curricular decisions occurring in the Council on Academic Affairs (CAA) need to be provided to the advising community in a more timely manner.

Goal #5: Enhance collaboration among advising staff, and between advising offices and other university offices

Although some elements were discussed in focus groups, most of the recommendations came from the work team responsible for this goal. Some examples include encouraging colleagues from other university offices to join ACADAOS and increasing structured networking opportunities throughout the year, especially at our annual academic advising conference. Additionally, we need to do a better job of clearly defining how academic advisors and other university offices (the University Registrar, Student Financial Aid, the Student Services Center) could collaborate more effectively.

Additional data: Analysis of data gathered through the Advising Module of the **National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)** provided strong evidence that fourth-year students feel considerably less connected to advising than first-year students. (See Appendix B.2.)

The **OSU 2014 Culture Survey**, administered every three years starting in 2008, was used to compare academic advisors to employees with comparable positions at Ohio State, based on questions around the following topics: work environment, senior leadership, opportunities for professional growth, unit administration, and accountability. The comparison revealed that academic advisors are significantly less satisfied than their peers across a number of the core items, particularly those assessing accountability and supervision. The following comparative responses are of particular interest, given the gaps between the two categories of respondents and the relevance of these concerns to advisor retention and student success:

- In my unit, we receive the training and professional development necessary to do our jobs effectively (Academic Advisors = 41.7% and Comparison Group = 78.6%)
- In my unit, I receive high levels of feedback and coaching (Academic Advisors = 41.7% and Comparison Group = 78.6%)
- My supervisor provides me with clear work directions and expectations (Academic Advisors = 41.7% and Comparison Group = 78.6%)
- My supervisor values the work that I do. (Academic Advisors = 55.1% and Comparison Group = 92.6%)

See Appendix B.3 for further information.

2. Goals and Action Items

Based on our assessment activities and the experiences of our advising staff, our work teams designed a list of objectives with associated action items for each QI goal. The Office of Undergraduate Education contacted advisors to seek volunteers, and more than 40 advisors contributed to this project, in addition to their normal work in their departments. Each action item involved one or more advisors responsible for executing the item assigned, while Undergraduate Education and an advisor who wanted project management experience managed the process to ensure action items were completed on time. In assigning each action item, we had three general timelines to choose from: completed within a 12-month period, started within a 12-month period, and “ongoing” (3-5 years after March 2017). Following, organized by QI goal, are details and descriptions of what we 1) accomplished, 2) began, and 3) assigned to a 3-5 year completion date.

Goal #1: Improve students’ engagement with advising resources (academic advisors, Degree Audit, and AdvisingConnect)

- *Completed*
 - Encouraged advising administrators to ensure advisors are entering timely and appropriate notes in AdvisingConnect

- Encouraged advisors to communicate to students the availability of advising notes, by providing fliers for offices and suggesting that advisors add information on accessing notes to their email signatures
- Added and shaped information about advising services to admission tours for prospective students
- Hosted an Advising Summit that included advisors and advising administrators, university administrators, and undergraduate students, to share perspectives and challenges related to academic advising
- *In Progress*
 - Implementing a central appointment scheduling tool across the Ohio State University advising community
 - Working with the communication office in the Office of Academic Affairs to develop “branding” and a communication plan for academic advising

Goal #2: Train and provide professional development for advisors

- *Completed*
 - Vetted central vision and mission statements for academic advising (see <http://u.osu.edu/advisortraining/guiding-framework/> for details)
 - Vetted a central list of essential advising tasks and functions, and mapped those to our training program; encouraged advising units to do the same
 - Collected case studies for use in training (these are “stored” in a central location, to encourage both use and continuing additions.)
 - Completely revamped Undergraduate Education’s Introduction to Academic Advising, a training course for new advisors, to address feedback on the need for framework and context around the details advisors receive during the first few weeks of training
 - Increased collaboration with ACADAOS by expanding opportunities to plan for and present in Undergraduate Education’s annual advising conference
 - Created a list of advising administrators willing to serve as mentors; this list is posted in an accessible location, and advisors are now aware of whom to contact for mentoring
 - Added Microsoft Office training content to Undergraduate Education’s advisor training website for the following programs: Office, Excel, Access, PowerPoint, and Publisher
- *In Progress*
 - Reviewing assessment trends through NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising, and other professional organizations
 - Reviewing a first draft of an annual evaluation for advisors who attended central training, to help in revising the program to meet advisors’ needs (expected to be ready by the end of spring 2017)

- Reviewing a first draft of a self-assessment for advisors to complete each year, to discover and fill gaps in their knowledge
- Advisors noted the need for more support in teaching the Survey course (help in becoming better teachers, along with creative, effective ways to deliver content); the University Committee on Student Success and Retention has set funding aside to support this and plans, with support from the University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT), to offer a Course Design Institute and a teaching workshop in autumn 2016
- Requesting funding—and priority focus by HR—to address equitable salaries, consistent job classifications, and opportunities for career progression.

Goal #3: Define and assess the student learning outcomes for academic advising

- *Completed*
 - Designed and administered a Qualtrics survey to learn what advising units at Ohio State have LOs in place and what assessment strategies are being used
 - Benchmarked LO practices at 15 peer institutions
- *In Progress*
 - Vetted student learning outcomes for academic advising and began mapping those to data for assessment (See <http://u.osu.edu/advisortraining/student-learning-outcomes/> for details)
 - Working with a group of advisors who teach the Survey courses, UCAT, through its Course Design Institute, will help map the learning outcomes for advising to those courses

Goal #4: Improve access to information needed to guide and support students

- *Completed*
 - Moved our Advising Encyclopedia to a new platform and re-organized content to be more intuitive (this online document houses descriptions and complex details about university policies and processes); based on feedback from advising focus groups, we made significant changes to content related to the SIS
 - Redesigned our bi-monthly advising newsletter—using a new tool—to streamline content and reduce the number of emails advisors receive from Undergraduate Education (both directly and on behalf of other university offices)
 - Revamped centrally convened meetings of advising representatives to broaden representation and refine goals
 - Provided detailed organizational charts for advising offices, to improve communication channels between offices
 - Re-established “iShare” meetings on focused topics of common interest, hosted by advisors, who benefit from an opportunity for professional development in meeting facilitation, content development, and presentation

- Convened meetings of advising administrators in distributed units, to share concerns and best practices
- Identified advising websites that should have analytics behind them for use in analysis/assessment
- *In-Progress*
 - Researching a platform to host a central storage place for the dates and deadlines advisors regularly use

Goal #5: Enhance collaboration among advising staff, and between advising offices and other university offices

- *Completed*
 - Changed the language and varied membership levels in the bylaws of ACADAOS to allow staff other than academic advisors to become members
 - Made a deliberate effort, over the past year, to offer more ACADAOS events open to all advisors, not just ACADAOS members (all webinars, webinar discussions, and social events, for example, are now open to non-members as well as members)
- *In Progress*
 - Expanding participation in Undergraduate Education’s annual advising conference by working with ACADAOS, which is planning to establish a formal conference planning committee
 - Designing an annual evaluation for the Office of Undergraduate Education, to ensure we are meeting the needs of the advising community; we expect to administer the evaluation in spring 2017 for the first time; we are currently working with Institutional Research and Planning to fine-tune goals and edit questions (see pages 19-20 for additional information)
 - Submitting a proposal to Vice Provost Randy Smith, to recommend the following:
 - Include at least one advisor, in the capacity of a consultant, on each department’s or college’s curriculum committee
 - Include an advisor as a non-voting *ex officio* member on the Council of Academic Affairs (CAA) (this advisor, in consultation with Undergraduate Education’s Assistant Vice Provost, would disseminate curricular information to the advising community)
 - Offer a workshop (through the Office of Undergraduate Education) in which advisors can learn how new courses are created and curriculum changes are reviewed

Additional Activities

Implementation of **EAB’s Student Success Collaborative**, a student analytics software platform, will provide advisors with data to support more proactive outreach to students, a major

goal of the Quality Initiative. The functionality available through this system connects with Goals 1, 4, and 5. (The project started in October 2015. We are “branding” the product as “OnCourse.”)

The President’s Summit on Academic Advising: This event convened 121 stakeholders from across Ohio State—advisors, administrators, and students. Dr. Jayne Drake, Vice Dean of Academic Affairs at Temple University and a past President of NACADA, gave the keynote address. Breakout sessions facilitated discussion among participants and gathered ideas on the following topics: Perspectives on Academic Advising; Positioning Academic Advisors for Success; Advising Diverse Student Populations; and Leveraging Best Practices for Change. Follow-up recommendations and budgetary requests have been presented to the President and Provost and are currently under review, including, long range, realignment of advising positions, for consistency, equity, retention, and career progression. (The recent changes to the Fair Labor Standards Act lends impetus to a number of these concerns, since most advisors’ salaries fall well below the new threshold.) This event—and the recommendations coming out of it—relate to Goals 1, 3, and 5. See appendix C, “Observations from the Summit.”

3. Impacts, Challenges, and Opportunities

Each goal includes multiple action items, and each action item, whether a single item or part of a combination, affects advising at Ohio State. More largely, however, spending two years on a project dedicated to enhancing advising at Ohio State represents a new level of institutional commitment to professional advising, which has existed, too often, in the shadows, understaffed and at times neglected. The QI project, along with the Summit, has increased awareness of the role of advising in students’ time to degree (and, therefore, the cost of a degree) and overall success.

We hope this attention—along with the changes that have occurred and will continue to occur as part of this project—will contribute to improved satisfaction, collaboration, and retention. A number of the recommendations from the Summit—a “ladder” for career progression, balanced student-to-advisor ratios, and a rational, equitable scheme of compensation, for example—have been perennial concerns among advisors, and have now been more formally, institutionally recognized and legitimized. The Summit also produced greater understanding among participants, a greater appreciation for each other’s work and challenges. It began dialogue about how to engage advising in university governance, and helped foster better understanding of the needs of advisors in effectively supporting students.

The implementation of OnCourse will provide advisors with additional data and tools to engage students proactively. The software platform includes functionality likely to change the way advisors and other university offices collaborate to support student success. The system will allow multiple people to engage in a business process that will not only keep engaged parties efficiently informed, but will also reduce the work students currently need to do (like walking

paperwork from one office to another for review). Effective use of the system, however, will require manageable student-to-advisor caseloads.

It will be a few years before we see impacts of these two efforts, but we expect them to change how we do advising at Ohio State.

Commitment and Engagement

- ***Dr. Randy Smith***, Vice Provost for Academic Programs: Institutional Contact. Formally signed off on our proposal and since has led a committee of Ohio State faculty and staff members dedicated to the re-affirmation of accreditation
- ***Dr. Wayne Carlson***, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education: Implementation lead for the QI
- ***Dr. John Wanzer***, Assistant Vice Provost, Office of Undergraduate Education: Implementation lead for the QI
- ***Jennifer Belisle***, Assistant Director of Academic Advising, Office of Undergraduate Education: Implementation lead for the QI
- ***Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP)***: Lead for the following assessment activities: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Academic Advising Module; OSU Culture Survey; and Advising Baseline Survey. Early in the project, members of this office dedicated many hours to designing and administering the Advising Baseline Survey and summarizing results for review and use in shaping our strategies. Additionally, IRP provided analytical reports for both the NSSE data on advising and advisor-related data from OSU's Culture Survey, both of which have supported our long-term goals and will continue to do so.
- ***Enrollment Services, Reporting and Analysis (OESAR)***: provided advising-related data; more specifically, provided data concerning advisor assignments, so we can better understand how many students either did not have an assigned advisor or had an incorrect assignment. OESAR, along with technical staff from the Office of the Chief Information Officer, has also provided untold hours of support in implementing OnCourse, particularly in ensuring proper alignment with data in the SIS.
- ***Committee on Undergraduate Advising (CUA)***: This committee, an advisory group to the Undergraduate Dean, played a central role in defining the scope, designing and implementing the project, and in identifying an ongoing quality-improvement plan; many CUA members also served as volunteers on our work/implementation teams
- ***Work/Implementation*** Team: Responsible for documentation of objectives/actions/assessments for each QI goal
- ***Undergraduate Degree-Seeking*** students: Sampled students participated in two surveys; 65 volunteers participated in nine focus groups

- ***Undergraduate Full-time Academic*** Advisors: Of the 230 full-time professional advisors, 25 (beyond those who were members of CUA) participated on work teams; 84 advisors participated in focus groups
- ***Advising Administrators Group***: Advising administrators meet regularly to discuss policies and procedures central to the business of advising, to understand each unit’s implementation practices, collaborate more effectively and, when appropriate, develop consistency on selected (and agreed-upon) processes/policies. We brought a number of our action items to this group for either feedback or decisions during this process.
- ***University*** Partners: Participated in a semi-structured focus group for one of the following training sessions: “The Art of Referring,” “Self-Reflection and Active Listening,” and “Policy and Student Populations.” The goal of these conversations was to make sure these offices were getting what they need out of this experience, to gather feedback on logistics, and to learn whether they felt their learning objectives were being met.

Plans for the Future

We began with the understanding that we would continue work on this project beyond the due date for the report and beyond the date of the university’s accreditation visit. The action items listed below, in no particular order, are those we consider to extend beyond July 2016. Items indicated with (**) are those we began work on and plan to complete by the end of autumn 2016. The other items do not have a formal completion date but will be formally tracked.

Goal #1: Improve students’ engagement with advising resources (academic advisors, Degree Audit, and AdvisingConnect)

- Finalize a communication strategy before the end of summer 2017, to be implemented for new autumn 2017 students (new first-year and transfer students); although we did not complete our plan to communicate with students about the value of advising, we do have prototypes and plan to continue discussions and planning during the 2016-17 academic year
- Consult with advising units to understand their data needs, to document guidelines, and provide resources to help each arrive at the student-to-advisor ratio best suited to its program
- Move our student-facing advising website (<http://advising.osu.edu>) to another platform by the end of spring 2017—a platform with responsive design and a flexible content management system
- Continue to move toward implementing a central scheduling tool for academic advising across the Ohio State University advising community using our new Student Success Platform (OnCourse); encourage units to measure student contact annually

- Assess student use of the Degree Audit and Transfer Credit Report during peak times for autumn 2016 and spring 2017, to ensure our number remains acceptable
- Determine whether to continue the Advising Student Baseline survey on an annual basis

Goal #2: Train and provide professional development for advisors

- ****Review the completed draft and post a final version of a self-assessment for advisors to complete each year, to discover and fill gaps in their knowledge; going forward, we plan to do this each year**
- **** Review assessment trends through NACADA and other professional organizations**
- Promote membership in ACADAOS and active involvement in professional development
 - ****ACADAOS will meet with advising staff in the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education and Human Ecology to promote both active membership in ACADAOS and professional development**
 - Over the next several years (until they have met with all advising units, including regional campuses), ACADAOS will meet with other advising areas
- Develop an annual evaluation for advisors who attended central training, to help in revising the program to meet advisors' needs (expected to be ready for distribution by the end of spring 2017)
- Develop a strategy to evaluate Undergraduate Education's advisor training program: currently, each session we offer is mapped to learning outcomes, and all of our session evaluations include questions to ensure LOs are met; we also include questions related to satisfaction with delivery and structure. We will draw on what we have learned from the 2014-2016 session evaluations as we reorganize our training by the end of summer 2017

Goal #3: Define and assess the student learning outcomes for academic advising

- ****Continue to review assessment trends through NACADA and other professional organizations**
- ****Create an awareness campaign for academic advisors**
- Design, in consultation with advising administrators, a course of action based on our survey findings
- Map LOs to assessment data; begin assessing specific student learning outcomes; plan and make changes that respond to the findings
- Collaborate with university offices involved in analysis and assessment (*i.e.*, the Center for the Study of Student Life, Career Services, Institutional Research and Planning, and the Office of Enrollment Analysis and Reporting) to learn what data and assessments currently exist to support our efforts to assess advising

Goal #4: Improve access to information needed to guide and support students

- ** Decide on a platform to host a central storage place for the dates and deadlines advisors regularly use
- Continue to work with the Office of Enrollment Analysis and Reporting (OESAR) and begin working with the University Committee on Student Success and Retention to collect data needs for advising and its assessment
- Design strategic business processes and enhance online content to facilitate smooth “handoffs” for students changing programs and/or changing campuses

Goal #5: Enhance collaboration among advising staff, and between advising offices and other university offices

- **Consult with advising offices to improve website maintenance and accuracy
- Decide on a dynamic directory where advisors can find each other using multiple keywords based on “specialty”; currently, this content resides, in static form, on a web site, which makes it laborious to keep accurate
- Coordinate an annual advisor “update day,” for university offices that do not participate in our training program and generally rely on email to update advisors; this event will enable offices with which advisors have frequent contact (business transactions or student referrals) to provide content to advisors, whether through in-person conversations, webinars, or conference calls
- Work with Vice Provost Smith, to recommend the following:
 1. Include at least one advisor, in the capacity of a consultant, on each department’s or college’s curriculum committee
 2. Include an advisor as a non-voting *ex officio* member on CAA; to disseminate curricular information to the advising community
 3. Offer an annual workshop (through the Office of Undergraduate Education) in which advisors can better understand the process by which new courses are created and curricular changes are approved

In addition to the appendices, the items listed below are available by request to other institutions for informational purposes and/or collaborative efforts.

Title	Contact
Office of Undergraduate Education – Effort to Restructure Committees	John Wanzer (wanzer.1@osu.edu)
Online Advising Encyclopedia	Jennifer Belisle (belisle.9@osu.edu)
Office of Undergraduate Admission – Advisor Overview for Prospective student visits.	Jennifer Belisle (belisle.9@osu.edu)
Introduction to Academic Advising session outline and content	Jennifer Belisle (belisle.9@osu.edu)
Benchmarking Student Learning Outcomes – An Overview	John Wanzer.1@osu.edu
NSSE, Academic Advising Module Summary	Julie Carpenter-Hubin.1@osu.edu
Advising Baseline Survey Results Summary	Julie Carpenter-Hubin.1@osu.edu
OSU Culture Survey Results Summary	Julie Carpenter-Hubin.1@osu.edu
Student and Advisor Focus group questions	Jennifer Belisle.9@osu.edu
Office of Undergraduate Education, Annual Evaluation for Academic Advising	Jennifer Belisle.9@osu.edu

Appendix A – Project Phases

1. **Analyses of Current State** – We have used a variety of methods to assess the current state of advising at Ohio State.
 - a. *Advising Baseline survey*: This survey was designed to provide us with a high-level understanding of students’ engagement with the following resources: academic advisors, Degree Audit, and AdvisingConnect. It will be used as a starting point for the more extensive survey we plan to conduct with a larger undergraduate student sample in autumn 2016. (See Appendix B)
 - b. *Undergraduate Student Focus Groups*: we used our focus groups to better understand engagement with academic advisors.
 - c. *2103 NSSE Advising Module*: Data from NSSE has provided us with historical information on engagement with academic advising for first-year and fourth-year students.
 - d. *2014 OSU Culture Survey*: From these data, we were able to learn how satisfied advisors are with the work they do compared to employees in roughly analogous positions. (From other university data, we hope to learn more about the various career paths that advisors have, historically, followed in seeking advancement.)
 - e. *Advising Focus Groups*: A total of ten sessions with 84 advisors focused on three topics: New Advisor Training, Managing New and Changing Information, and Professional Development.
 - f. *Focus Groups with Collaborating University Offices*: These sessions aimed to determine the effectiveness of our current training from the perspective of other student support units.
 - *Data Requests*: Student/Advisor use of AdvisingConnect and the Degree Audit.
2. **Work/Implementation Teams** (*i.e.*, outcomes/action/assessment) – For each goal of the QI, a team composed of members of CUA, as well as advisors outside of this group, determined appropriate outcomes/actions/assessment. Essentially, the framework they decided on set the scope for our project and determined what will be included in our ongoing quality improvement. Below are the following teams and associated goal(s):
 - a. *Student Communication*: Improve students’ engagement with advising resources
 - b. *Student Learning Outcomes*: Define and assess the learning outcomes for academic advising
 - c. *Support for Advisors*: Train and provide professional development for advisors AND improve access to information needed to guide and support students
 - d. *Advising Collaborations and Partnerships* - Enhance collaboration among advising staff, and between advising offices and other university offices
3. **Planning**: Based on the objectives/outcomes/action/assessment recommendations from the teams, CUA determined scope and ongoing recommendations.

4. **Implementation:** Based on CUA's recommendation, an implementation plan was (and will continue to be) executed.
5. **Report on Project Progress:** due in August 2016

Appendix B - Assessment Details for surveys and data requests

B.1 Advising Baseline Survey - This survey was designed to provide us with a high-level understanding of students' engagement with the following resources: academic advisors, Degree Audit, and AdvisingConnect. It will be used as a starting point for the more extensive survey, and we plan to discuss whether this will continue as an annual practice. Below are the questions we asked.

Please think about your experience with academic advising when responding to the following questions.

1. Do you know who are your assigned academic advisor is?
 - a. If yes, did you meet in person with your assigned academic advisor during the fall and/or current semester?
 - i. If no, what prevented you from meeting in person with your assigned academic advisor during the fall and/or spring semester? Check all that apply.
 1. I did not need to see an academic advisor.
 2. My assigned academic advisor was not available.
 3. My assigned academic advisor has a different job.
 4. I have not found my assigned academic advisor helpful.
 5. All of my questions were answered over email.
 6. I don't know how to contact my academic advisor.
 7. I don't know how to schedule an appointment with my assigned academic advisor.
 8. I found what I needed online.
 9. I talked with someone else (e.g. family, friend, faculty, other OSU staff...).
 10. Other reasons.
 - b. If no, what prevented you from knowing who your assigned advisor is? Check all that apply.
 - i. I don't really care.
 - ii. I haven't yet had a reason to talk to an academic advisor.
 - iii. I don't know if I have an academic advisor assigned to me.
 - iv. I don't know how to find out who my assigned advisor is.
 - v. I receive my academic advice from someone else (e.g. family, friend, faculty, other OSU staff...).
 - vi. I knew at one time, but I no longer know.

2. Other reasons.

Did you run your degree audit during the fall and/or current semester?

- a. If no, please tell us why you didn't run your degree audit during the fall and/or current semester.
 - i. I don't know what a degree audit is.
 - ii. I don't need a degree audit.
 - iii. I was told that my academic program does not use the degree audit.
 - iv. I was told about the degree audit, but not how to access it.
 - v. I was told about the degree audit, but is hard to locate it.
 - vi. I don't know how to use the degree audit.
 - vii. I use a different resource for course planning.
 - viii. Other reasons.
3. Have you ever used AdvisingConnect?
- a. If no, please tell us why you didn't use AdvisingConnect
 - i. I don't know what Advising Connect is. (1)
 - ii. I don't need Advising Connect. (2)
 - iii. I was told that my academic program does not use Advising Connect. (3)
 - iv. I was told about Advising Connect, but not how to access it. (4)
 - v. I was told about Advising Connect, but is hard to locate it. (5)
 - vi. I don't know how to use Advising Connect. (6)
 - vii. I use a different resource for keeping track of my advising notes. Please specify!
 - viii. Other reasons.

The Advising Baseline Survey (total response rate for all Ohio State campuses = 19.8%) told us that 96.4% know who their assigned advisor is; of those who knew their assigned advisor, 84.5% had met with their assigned advisor during autumn 2014 and spring 2015 semesters.

Additionally, our student focus groups indicated that having an assigned advisor was important to building trust, and if desired, to establishing a closer, more beneficial, long-term relationship. Of those who did not know who their assigned advisor was, over 50% stated "other" as the reason and further indicated that advisor turnover was the main reason for not knowing their current assigned advisor. This survey also helped us better understand awareness and use of both Advising Connect and the Degree Audit.

B.2 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement's Academic Advising Module – Data from NSSE provided us with historical information on engagement with academic advising for first-year and fourth-year students.

The 2013 National Survey of Student Engagement's Academic Advising Module (total response rate for first year students = 11% and fourth year students = 14%) provided these initial takeaways in support of our Year-One goals: we need to engage differently with our first-year students, to ensure that the needs of concurrently enrolled second-, third-, and fourth-year students are being met. Additionally, NSSE findings indicate that first-year, first generation and male students, as well as those who transferred to Ohio State, did not seek advice as consistently as other students. These groups will be considered for proactive outreach efforts. Additional

analysis is necessary to determine recommended actions beyond July 2016. The full report is available upon request (see page 17 for contact information).

B.3 2014 OSU Culture Survey (see pp. 8-9)

Advisor Job Titles = Academic Advisor, Academic Advisor and Staff Ast

Comparison Group Job Titles = Admissions Counselor, Admissions Counselor and Staff Ast, Career Advisor, and Career Counselor

Significant Differences Highlighted in YELLOW	Positive Responses	
	Academic Advisors	Comparison Group
Overall, how satisfied are you being an employee of The Ohio State University	77.6%	89.3%
Senior Leadership are committed to the mission of Ohio State.	77.6%	89.3%
Senior Leadership provide a definite sense of direction and purpose.	65.3%	85.7%
Senior Leadership make decisions for the greater good of the university.	57.1%	64.3%
I have a clear understanding of the direction -- vision, mission, and goals -- of Ohio State.	62.5%	85.7%
I am satisfied with the information I receive from the administration regarding what is going on at Ohio State.	52.1%	64.3%
I would recommend Ohio State to a friend seeking employment.	81.6%	92.9%
Given the opportunity, I tell other people great things about working at Ohio State.	75.5%	92.9%
If I had it to do over, I would work at Ohio State again.	83.7%	96.4%
I am committed to Ohio State's progress and success.	87.5%	96.4%
I am proud to work at Ohio State.	81.3%	96.4%
Ohio State helps people progress in their careers.	30.6%	35.7%
In my unit, we receive the training and professional development necessary to do our jobs effectively.	41.7%	78.6%
In my unit, the reward system is clear and fair.	18.8%	39.3%
In my unit, I receive high levels of feedback and coaching.	33.3%	82.1%
There are clear career paths and opportunities for promotion.	10.4%	3.6%
I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills at Ohio State.	56.3%	85.7%
I have a real opportunity to move up at Ohio State.	16.7%	17.9%
My supervisor encourages and empowers me.	63.3%	89.3%
My supervisor has positively affected my decision to remain working here.	53.1%	75.0%
My supervisor provides me with clear work directions and expectations.	49.0%	85.7%
My supervisor says what he/she means and means what he/she says.	63.3%	82.1%
My supervisor shows concern for my well-being.	73.5%	89.3%
My supervisor treats me with respect.	83.7%	96.4%
My supervisor values the work that I do.	55.1%	92.9%
My supervisor provides regular feedback.	65.3%	89.3%
My supervisor addresses poor performance.	51.0%	82.1%
My supervisor holds my peers highly accountable for achieving results in their work.	46.9%	67.9%
In my unit, rewards and recognition are based on work performance.	22.9%	67.9%
The reward system is clear and fair.	18.8%	39.3%
My unit does a good job of measuring results.	31.9%	85.7%
My unit values productivity.	62.5%	96.4%
My unit reviews past performance to make improvements.	48.9%	88.9%
My performance is measured against goals and objectives.	43.8%	92.6%
My unit is a good fit for me.	60.4%	75.0%
My unit is an emotionally healthy place to work.	56.3%	78.6%
In my unit the environment is positive/optimistic.	56.3%	82.1%
In my unit people have fun -- they enjoy themselves.	62.5%	78.6%
In my unit people are open -- communicate candidly and openly.	58.3%	57.1%
In my unit people are trustworthy.	58.3%	75.0%
In my unit people look for opportunities to learn new things.	58.3%	85.7%
My coworkers generally treat each other with respect.	89.6%	89.3%
My coworkers say what they mean and mean what they say.	66.7%	75.0%

B.4 AdvisingConnect and Degree Audit (student usage)

The two main degree planning tools, used by both students and advisors, are the Degree Audit and AdvisingConnect. The Degree Audit provides both sets of users a report on degree progress, while AdvisingConnect is a tool for advisors (and some other university offices) to write and/or view notes on advising-related student interactions. Additionally, students are able to log in and view their notes when they find it helpful. The Advising Baseline Survey told us that 88.49% of the students surveyed know what a Degree Audit is; only 27.70% know what AdvisingConnect is. For autumn 2014 when 50,585 undergraduate students were enrolled (all campuses), 14,449 unique students (28.6%) logged in to AdvisingConnect to access their notes.

<i>Campus*</i>	<i>Enrolled for Autumn 2014</i>	<i>AdvisingConnect Unique Logins</i>	<i>%</i>
Columbus	44,741	12,969	28.99%
Lima	1,056	186	17.61%
Mansfield	1,188	339	28.54%
Marion	1,204	442	36.71%
Newark	2,396	468	19.53%

*N=50 for Wooster

Appendix C

OBSERVATIONS FROM THE SUMMIT

A review of the session summaries, the keynote address, and the comment cards from attendees resulted in a number of observations related to academic advising at Ohio State.

1. All stakeholders acknowledge the importance and criticality of academic advising and the role it plays in student success
2. Academic advising is often ignored, or at least downplayed and minimally supported, in the University, College, and support unit strategic planning process
3. With the exception of a few units, faculty members have by and large moved away from academic advising responsibilities. They need to be more engaged, as partners with professional advisors or in standalone advising assignments – both groups will benefit from this symbiotic relationship
4. While in-person advisor–student meetings are important, some transactional activities can be made more straightforward, perhaps with an online or software system application component
5. We have made great progress with a centralized Notes system (AdvisingConnect). We need to be sure that the deployment of EAB-SSC or other enterprise level systems don't compromise our existing Advisor Notes processes. We need to expand the use of our Notes system to all advising and support units
6. There is disparity in advising load and delegated responsibilities across units. Some advisors have student loads as great as 600:1, and some as low as 100:1

7. There is a disparate pay schedule across units
 - a. Starting salaries are relatively low, with few (if any) levels of advancement
 - b. Salaries across units (for similar skills and job expectations) vary by as much as \$20,000
 - c. Advisors often “follow the salaries” and move to other units, often with the same responsibilities, leaving the source unit at a disadvantage
8. Advising “scope creep” has put pressure on advising resources in many units, in the form of expanding expectations for academic advisor responsibilities. Academic advisors in some units have been asked to participate in:
 - a. increasing involvement in recruitment and orientation activities
 - b. data capture and analysis, often not related to advising or student success
 - c. support for faculty administrative and classroom activities
 - d. college and department program administration and staffing, often not related to advising
 - e. course management, including recruitment and placement
 - f. career and life-skills counseling
 - g. facilitation of emerging unit initiatives
9. Appropriate staffing levels have not kept pace with increasing enrollment, particularly impacted by selective majors
10. Parental involvement has increased dramatically over the past decade, putting pressure on student-advisor relationships, and adding extra time to some sessions and parent communications, sometimes on weekends
11. Students benefit from the University Survey courses, required of all students, which are taught by advising staff. This has a particular impact on Autumn semester schedules, as that is when the majority of these courses are taught. Similarly, the participation in orientation has a major impact on summer session schedules, given the involvement of advising personnel
12. Advising units have responded to pressures for advising appointments by adding short (15 minute) sessions, walk-in sessions, and allocating someone to accommodate transfer and unscheduled student and family demands. These sessions don’t often allow for the in-depth discussions that are often necessary
13. While the decentralized structure of advising is important for adequate advising in the major, a centralized oversight structure is necessary for the overall integrity of the advising process. The current group in Undergraduate Education is 2 FTE, but only a portion of their time is allocated to advising, as each has significant additional responsibilities.
14. Recent actions in Arts and Sciences to move advisors into departments have isolated some advisors as the lone support for large groups of students, making collegial relationships and professional interactions more difficult
15. Advising resources have not kept pace with changing student expectations

- a. Dual and double majors
- b. Increased numbers of minors and specialized study areas
- c. High impact practices, such as study abroad, service learning, and UG research
- d. Impact of College Credit Plus, or dual enrollment, on general education requirements
- e. Online enrollments

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on feedback from the attendees, and interviews with the session moderators, and considering the observations described above, the following are recommendations that our summit planning team is bringing forward for consideration. We feel strongly that these recommendations will have a positive impact on student success. It is important to note that the recommendations are linked: for example, more involvement in curriculum governance requires that some other delegated responsibilities be reduced.

1. Develop an instrument for advisor assessment, providing for student evaluation
2. Work with Human Resources to define clear and consistent job classifications for each advising position
3. Work with Human Resources to define clear and consistent compensation guidelines, including common pay bands with minimum salary expectations. Bring all existing staff to compensation levels that are defined through this effort
4. Organize an adequately staffed central support team to provide oversight of policy guidelines, training, technology development and deployment, and data analysis and reporting.
5. Investigate structures and policies that can involve academic advising staff in curriculum governance, and strategic planning efforts across all departments and colleges.
6. Work with advisor employing units to provide more time for career professional development opportunities and ongoing training activities
7. Develop and use a pre-appointment survey instrument to prepare students for an advising session.
8. More, and more consistent, web presence, on the University's main page, and on each department web page
9. Provide resources to develop software tool for "transactional" advising actions, and move these actions to this online tool, freeing the advisor and student to have more in-depth conversations during an appointment
10. Require all units to participate in the use of a common enterprise-level Notes system in order to provide records of each session and to convey essential information across advising units
11. Provide clarity of focus with regards to communications, including roles and responsibilities of all parties – students, advisors, and support units. For example, develop an "Advising Pledge to Students" with input from all engaged parties

12. Involve academic advisors in the Teaching and Learning Institute agenda and activities
13. Invest in adequate advising resources for online enrolled students and students who are taking their initial year or two elsewhere, such as those in pathway programs
14. Focus on making technology solutions as integrated as possible, so that advising personnel aren't subjected to a multitude of different software systems with different interfaces
15. Provide adequate budgets for staff support and resource needs. Many advising units have no funds allocated for advising activities, such as professional development, travel, conference or workshop attendance, or supplies and services.