

Missouri State University's Provost's Academic Advising Council Annual Report for 2016-2017

The purpose of this report is to document the actions, accomplishments, and efforts of the Provost's Academic Advising Council (PAAC) for the fall 2016-spring 2017 academic year.

PAAC Website: <http://www.missouristate.edu/advising/83845.htm>

The website is housed under the Academic Advisement Center website. Updates to the PAAC website can be coordinated through Christina Bowles in the Academic Advisement Center.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAAC Charge
PAAC Membership
PAAC Primary Actions, Accomplishments, and Efforts
PAAC Unfinished Business and Future Opportunities
PAAC Chair Outgoing Wrap-Up
Appendix

PAAC CHARGE

Charge 1

The purpose of the Provost's Academic Advising Council (PAAC) is to evaluate the administration and delivery of advising services to all students at Missouri State University and to make recommendations for improvements.

Charge 2

The PAAC will identify current advising practices that are successful and encourage those practices among more advisors.

Charge 3

The PAAC will work to enhance consistency and quality within the advising system and support student development initiatives.

Charge 4

The PAAC is available for consultation as policy decisions are made that affect academic advising practice at Missouri State University.

PAAC MEMBERSHIP

Membership is made up of standing members and rotating members. Rotating members represent different colleges, advisor types, or related areas and serve two year terms. The chart below contains a membership list for 2016-2017 that contains the member's name, area of representation, and term expiration information. Nominations of new PAAC members are typically coordinated by Kathy Davis and the incoming PAAC chair. Upon selection of candidates, the potential member's names are forwarded to Dr. Chris Craig in the Office of the Provost for recommendation.

Fall 2016-Spring 2017 Provost's Academic Advising Council Membership		
Standing Members	Represents	Term Expiration
Damon Bassett	Geography, Geology, and Planning (CNAS representative)	May 2017
Ken Brown	Economics (CHPA representative)	May 2017
Sandy Culver	Director, Business Advisement Center	Standing
Rachelle Darabi	Associate Provost for Student Development & Public Affairs	Standing
Kathy Davis	Director, Academic Advisement Center	Standing
Catherine English	English (Secondary Education representative)	May 2018
Tracey Glaessgen	First Year Programs (SDPA representative)	May 2017
Nathan Hoff	Associate Registrar for Degree Programs and Advisement Support (Chair)	Standing
Jerri Lynn Kyle	Communication (COAL representative)	May 2017
Susan Martindale	Academic Advisement Center (Professional advisor representative) <i>Christina Bowles served as proxy in fall 2016</i>	May 2017
Juli Panza	Education Advisement Center (COE representative)	May 2017
Dan Raines	Director, Dr. Mary Jo Wynn Academic Achievement Center	Standing
Melissa Remley	School of Agriculture (Agriculture representative)	May 2017
Kim Roam	Childhood Education and Family Studies (Faculty representative)	May 2018
David Rohall	Sociology and Anthropology (Faculty representative)	May 2018
Jaime Ross	Interim Director, Adult Student Services <i>John Hall served as proxy during maternity leave.</i>	Standing
Tom Tomasi	Associate Dean, Graduate College	Standing
Mike Wood	Career Resource Specialist, Career Center (Career advisement representative)	Standing
Adena Young-Jones	Psychology (CHHS representative)	May 2017

PAAC PRIMARY ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, EFFORTS, AND GUESTS

The following page contains highlights of the actions, accomplishments, and efforts of the PAAC for the 2016-2017 academic year. Administrative actions are defined as specific actions completed by the PAAC. Accomplishments are defined as initiatives introduced by the PAAC that led (or could lead) to the introduction of a related action by the University. Efforts are defined as items where the PAAC attempted to measure, initiate, or improve a process or ideas that may be yet incomplete or not able to be measured.

PAAC Administrative Actions

- Establishment of two new standing members of PAAC. One standing member is to represent our adult student advisee population and is currently filled by the Interim Director of Adult Student Services. The other standing member is intended to add a career perspective and is currently filled by one of the Career Resource Specialists from the Career Center.
- Changes in the PAAC meeting structure
 - For 2016-2017, we eliminated standing sub-committees and went to ad-hoc sub-committees. This decision was made in an effort to more fully involve all PAAC members and to eliminate standing sub-committees that may no longer be needed. Instead, we formed temporary sub-committees with membership opportunities by topic interest. Example committees for the 2016-2017 academic year included:
 - University Exit Exam (UEE) question sub-committee
 - Post-75 Credit recommendation draft sub-committee
 - PAAC awards selection sub-committee
 - Group advising questionnaire sub-committee
 - Group advising best practices statement sub-committee
 - In lieu of standing sub-committee reporting, which covered a significant portion of the agenda in previous years, each meeting was devoted to 1-3 topics per meeting.
 - Topic preparation documents were sent out in advance of PAAC meetings. These documents were designed to allow the member to come to the meeting prepared to discuss the agenda topic. It also gave the PAAC member the opportunity to gather input from the constituents they represent or further research topics to be better prepared for our discussions.
- Increased meetings in fall 2017 from four per semester to five per semester. This was introduced to establish the initial meeting as an opportunity to brainstorm on topics and activities and to begin setting the agenda for the year's remaining meetings. Scheduling did not permit us to do this for spring 2017.
- Selected the Dr. Mary Jo Wynn Academic Achievement Center staff (A'dja Jones, Michelle Martin, Carla Morton) for the Excellence in Advisement Support Award and W. Taylor Shaw-Hamp for the Excellence in Advisement: Graduate Student Contribution award.

PAAC Accomplishments

- Developed a set of 10 questions aimed at accessing student satisfaction with their advisor. These questions were administered starting in spring 2017 as part of the University Exit Exam process.
- Developed a group advising questionnaire (https://missouristatechhs.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_bmhCCToSNRXpCGV) to better understand the types and volume of group advising occurring at Missouri State. The questionnaire was distributed in March 2017 through Qualtrics. The questionnaire had approximately 150 respondents. A response summary is included in the appendix to this report.
- Developed a Group Advising Standards and Best Practices Statement. The PAAC felt it was important to provide this to the advising community as more and more programs consider the applications of group advising as part of their advising model.

PAAC Efforts

- Recommendation memo submitted to the Office of the Provost related to a review of the undergraduate advising model. The PAAC made recommendations related to the advisement of undergraduate students past 75 credits. This was examined due to concerns related to graduation deficiencies, opportunities for career advisement, and minimal advising required for transfer students transferring in near 75 credits. The current status of this recommendation is on hold as the Office of the Provost is waiting on obtaining feedback from other campus committees so that all recommendations can be taken into consideration together.
- Working with Web and New Media to redesign the Advisor Certification page. Philip Bowles is the primary contact in Web and New Media and Kathy Davis for the AAC. This project is still under redesign at the time of this report. Improvements requested include:
 - Better printability of career hours completed.
 - Career hours completed searchable by date range.
 - Better Master Advisor eligibility tracking for the Academic Advisement Center.

PAAC Visitors

- **Dr. Frank Einhellig** (Provost)-Visited to discuss advising topics provided by PAAC. (*October 2016*)
- **Dr. Kelly Wood** (First Year Programs-Interim Director and Provost Fellow for Student Success)-Visited to discuss on-going initiatives being explored by the Student Success Committee and the Transfer Council. (*March 2017*)
- **Dr. Rabekah Stewart** (Executive Director, TRIO)-Visited to discuss TRIO eligibility and services questions from PAAC. (*May 2017*)

PAAC UNFINISHED BUSINESS AND FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES

- There was not a lot of time left in the year to thoroughly analyze the Group Advising Questionnaire. The PAAC may wish to have a discussion about the results and determine if any action is warranted (policy initiatives, advisor forums, and updates to the Best Practices Statement).
- Dr. Thomas Kane expressed interest in visiting with the PAAC during the next academic year to discuss the career planning/advisement preparation form that Psychology is piloting to talk about potential applications of this idea.
- Market the redesign of the Advisor Certification paper to bring awareness and to highlight the potential uses of this page (e.g. advising training “transcript”).
- Discussion and/or demonstration of Student Educational Planner (SEP) template tools.
- Exploration into technology that would allow advisors to text students without using their personal cell phones. Some institutions have technology of this nature.

PAAC CHAIR OUTGOING WRAP-UP

I have enjoyed the opportunity to serve as the Chair of the Provost’s Academic Advising Council this academic year. I feel like the PAAC made positive strides this year in moving forward in providing recommendation and direction in a variety of academic advising areas. I was particularly pleased to see some of these topics make it to the finish line as we have a lot of departing PAAC representatives this year due to term expiration. This will provide an opportunity for next year’s PAAC to bring new ideas forward to further improve the advising experience here at Missouri State. Kathy Davis, Director of the Academic Advisement Center, is a helpful historical reference for the PAAC chair. I would like to thank the PAAC representatives for the time they have dedicated this year, not only in meeting attendance but in reviewing materials, providing feedback, and serving on sub-committees outside of our standard meetings. As a standing member of the PAAC, I will return next year and will be glad to support the future chair in whatever ways I can.

Sincerely-

Nathan Hoff

Associate Registrar-Degree Programs and Advisement Support

Office of the Registrar

(417) 836-4302 or nathanhoff@missouristate.edu

APPENDIX

A: PAAC Meeting Agendas

B: Advisor Satisfaction Questions for Inclusion on the University Exit Exam

C: Post-75 Hour Advisor Discussion Background (Discussion Document)

D: Post-75 Hour Recommendation Memo to Office of the Provost

E: Group Advising Questionnaire Summary Report

F: Group Advising Standards and Best Practices

APPENDIX A: PAAC MEETING AGENDAS

September 1, 2016 Agenda

- 1) Council and Membership Introductions
- 2) Announcements
 - a. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - b. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)
 - i. Annual Meeting (September 7 @ 1 pm, September 8 @ 8 am-PSU 313)
 - ii. Student Educational Planner (SEP) Training
 - iii. Student Self-Service Profile
- 3) Primary Topic: 2016-2017 planning
 - a. Meeting format
 - b. Proposed committee structure changes
 - c. Topics to take on for 2016-2017
 - d. Surveys (formal or informal)
 - e. Initiatives we are interested in
 - f. Guests we would like to invite
- 4) Additional business from council membership

September 22, 2016 Agenda

- 1) Announcements
 - a. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - b. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)
- 2) Post 75 Hour/Senior Advising
 - a. Review reason for discussion
 - b. Discuss options-is there one we support?
 - c. Discuss "where we go from here"
- 3) Advisement Assessment Questions for Inclusion on the University Exit Exam
- 4) Additional business from council membership

October 20, 2016 Agenda

- 1) Announcements
 - a. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - b. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)
- 2) Finalize and approve the Senior Survey Questions
- 3) Creation of student resource on “what students should/could ask advisors” (if time permits)
- 4) Special Guest: Dr. Frank Einhellig, Provost (3:00 PM)
- 5) Additional business from council membership

November 17, 2016 Agenda

- 1) Announcements
 - c. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - d. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)
- 2) PAAC Updates
 - a. Advisor satisfaction questions for University Exit Exam
 - b. Advising Training Transcript for Master Advisor Participation
 - c. Discuss spring 2017 meeting time
- 3) Post-75 Credit Advising Recommendation Memo Vote
- 4) Group Advising
 - a. Hear from membership who do group advising
 - b. Discuss creation of a PAAC statement of group advising
 - c. Discuss group advising survey questions (use them? edit them?)
 - d. Discuss promotion opportunities for group advising
- 5) Additional business from council membership

December 8, 2016 Agenda

- 1) Announcements
 - e. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - f. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)

- 2) PAAC Updates/Discussion
 - a. Spring 2017 Meeting Times (Tuesday 10 am-11:30 am in UNVH 113)
 - i. Dates: January 24, February 28, March 28, April 25
 - ii. For future, should we establish a set time?
 - b. Advisor satisfaction questions for University Exit Exam-confirmed for spring 2017
 - c. Update on the response to the Post 75-Credit Advising Recommendation Memo
 - d. Advising award sub-committees

- 3) Advisee "Things To Know"/Advisor "Things To Know"
 - a. Advisee appointment planning form from Dr. Kane
 - b. Advisee "things to know" project planning
 - c. Advisor "what should I be doing" website-outline the content

February 7, 2017 Agenda

- 1) Announcements
 - g. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - h. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)

- 2) Group Advising
 - a. Questionnaire Sub-Committee (Christina Bowles, Juli Panza, Tom Tomasi, Adena Young-Jones) update if available. Would like to give survey in March to allow for tabulation and Group Advising Standards statement development finalization in April
 - b. Form Group Advising Standards subcommittee and have full group discussion on standards to start process
 - c. Would this be a good Advisor Forum or "Special Topics" session? If so, presenter ideas?
 - d. For next meeting-questionnaire finalized with distribution plan; Standards first draft

- 3) Upcoming Meetings or Topics
 - a. Guest: Denise Baumann (Chair, Student Affairs Bridge Building Committee)-to discuss topics based faculty assistance website
 - b. Guest: Kelly Wood (Chair, Student Success Committee and member of the Transfer Council)-to discuss retention initiatives and transfer-related issues
 - c. TreQ (Transfer Equivalency self-service audit) preview if interested
 - d. Others?

March 7, 2017 Agenda

- 1) Guest: Kelly Wood (Chair, Student Success Committee and member of the Transfer Council)-to discuss retention initiatives and transfer-related issues
- 2) Announcements
 - a. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - b. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)
- 3) Review of PAAC Excellence in Advising Support and Graduate Student Contribution Awards
- 4) Group Advising
 - a. Questionnaire Sub-Committee (Christina Bowles, Juli Panza, Tom Tomasi, Adena Young-Jones) will present questionnaire draft for final approval and discuss plan for distribution
 - b. Standards Sub-Committee (Tracy Glaessgen, Jerri Lynn Kyle, Cathy English, Kathy Davis) will provide any update on standards development
 - c. Plan for April meeting: Questionnaire sub-committee to provide survey results, Standards sub-committee to provide initial standards draft

April 4, 2017 Agenda

- 1) Announcements
 - i. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - j. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)
- 2) Invitation for Nominations (Self or Others) for next year's PAAC Chair
- 3) Group Advising
 - a. Questionnaire Sub-Committee (Christina Bowles, Juli Panza, Tom Tomasi, Adena Young-Jones) will present questionnaire results
 - b. Standards Sub-Committee (Tracy Glaessgen, Jerri Lynn Kyle, Cathy English, Kathy Davis) will present first-draft of standards document
 - c. Plan for April meeting: Standards sub-committee review questionnaire results for impact on standards statement, incorporate PAAC feedback and questionnaire results into final standards document for May meeting
- 4) Review of Student Affairs Bridge Building Faculty Resources Website
 - a. Topic list-advising questions, alcoholism, behavioral concerns, depression, dropping classes, financial issues, first-generation students, food options and assistance, family/home issues, fraternity/sorority, hate speech/micro-aggression, health issues, homesickness, international students, internships and study abroad, LGBT identity questions, major declaration, roommate issues, sexual assault, student-athletes, student employment, student organizations, technology assistance, veterans/military issues, withdrawing from classes
- 5) Advising Notes System Update-***Switch to mobile friendly with document upload (expected SU 2017)***

May 9, 2017 Agenda

- 1) Announcements
 - k. Kathy Davis (Master Advisor Updates)
 - l. Nathan Hoff (Office of the Registrar Updates)
- 2) Guest: Rabekah Stewart (Executive Director, TRIO)-to provide information and answer questions of TRIO services
- 3) Vote for next year's PAAC Chair and suggestions from PAAC members on replacements for expiring representatives
 - a. Chair candidates who have expressed interest: Jaime Ross
- 4) Group Advising-Vote on finalized Standards and Best Practices document
- 5) Feedback and Ideas for topics to pass on to next year's PAAC
 - a. Feedback items
 - i. Degree Works Advisory Council
 - ii. Payment Plan and Registration Sequence
 - b. Topics for next year's PAAC

APPENDIX B: ADVISOR SATISFACTION QUESTIONS FOR INCLUSION ON THE UNIVERSITY EXIT EXAM

1. My advisor shows me how and what to do in order to be successful (i.e., provides options for academic assistance).
2. My advisor notifies me of campus and community opportunities that support my goals.
3. My advisor listens closely to my concerns and questions.
4. My advisor helps me understand academic rules and policies.
5. My advisor uses available technology to facilitate the advising process.
6. My advisor is knowledgeable about my degree (i.e., major including general education requirements).
7. My advisor treats me with respect.
8. My advisor responded to any phone/email correspondence within a reasonable period of time (usually by the next working day).
9. My advisor discussed my career interests and post-graduation plans.
10. When my advisor does not know something, he/she finds the answer or refers me to the appropriate office(s).

APPENDIX C: POST-75 HOUR ADVISOR DISCUSSION BACKGROUND (DISCUSSION DOCUMENT)

Background

In two previous visits to the Academic Advising Council, Dr. Einhellig brought up the idea of if there was more we could be doing with our juniors and seniors as a previous study showed we were losing a surprising number of juniors and seniors prior to graduation.

In corresponding conversations within the Academic Advising Council, Student Success Committee, and within the Office of the Registrar staff who processed graduation applications, this issue also came up.

In these conversations, some of the following points were brought up:

- Advising is required each semester for undergraduate students up to 75 credits and for all graduate students. Undergraduate students with 75+ credits are not required to seek advisement. Could this lack of advisement contribute in any way to losing these students?
- MSU gets an increasing number of transfer students (more than any institution within the state as of this year). Many of these students are coming in with an AA degree and 60+ credit hours. For many of these students, advising is no longer required after attending MSU for one semester.
- How are departments helping their students ensure all graduation deficiencies are resolved if no advising appointments are required? The Office of the Registrar sees a significant number of deficiencies on the degree audits of graduation candidates each semester.
- Is career advising occurring regularly with MSU advisees? While some students are ready for this early on, there are some students who may not be ready for this until they have reached the 75 credit mark.

At the end of last year's Academic Advising Council, we began discussing the idea of if the Academic Advising Council wanted to make a recommendation related to this topic. The council does not have the authority to implement a change, but could recommend something for consideration. Any recommendation would need to be considered by the Provost's Office and we would want feedback from the Faculty Senate even if the policy this is part of is not formally one that goes through the Senate for approval.

As part of that meeting, we developed a list of potential recommendations that the Academic Advising Council could make. During our last meeting, we did a quick "top 3" ranking of these ideas. As to date, it appears those rankings either were never tabulated or are not documented anywhere. Additionally, another idea was presented after this occurred. On the next page, a list of potential recommendations are listed.

Call to Action

1. Please read the background and recommendation options.
2. Consider collateral effects of any recommendations (e.g. advisor load, student burden, technology feasibility, advising effectiveness)
3. Be prepared to discuss at our September 22, 2016 meeting.

Recommendation Options

1. No change from the current process.

2. No formal change from the current process, but do some sort of campaign to departments and/or students to voluntarily seek out additional advising even if not required.
3. Change the current advisor release model (which affects registration). Example ideas include:
 - a. Require advisor release to 60 credits, once between 60-89 credits, once after 90+ credits
 - b. Required advisor release to 60 credits, once per academic year thereafter
 - c. Current model with additional release after 100+ credits
 - d. Advisor release every semester
 - e. Advisor release but with the option of an advisor providing multiple releases in advance or apply a multiple semester release
 - f. Advisor release required in credit intervals (e.g. 0-24, 25-49, 50-74, 75-99, 100-124, 125+)
 - g. Require one advisor release per academic year
 - h. Require one advisor release per calendar year
 - i. Advisor release good for designated amount of time ("X" months) versus a specified credit range or semester
 - j. Advisor release where advisor has options in designating the amount of time until the next release with a minimum amount of time required
 - k. Current model with additional appointments required for transfer students over 75 hours

A concern would be that a registration roadblock could cause a student to have a delay and missing the opportunity to register in a needed graduation course.

4. Institute a graduation release (would not affect registration, would prevent access to graduation application instead). Similar to an advisor release in that a check-off would be required with a note verifying it appeared the student was eligible or with instructions on what the student needed to do to become eligible. Would go into effect once a student had a designated number of credits (90, 100, etc).

A concern would be that a graduation application roadblock could slow down graduation application processing and lead to students being omitted from the Commencement program.

5. Add a manual "graduation review" check-off to the degree audit as a graduation item to be reviewed. Departments or advisors would have to go in and waive this indicating that they met with the student regarding their graduation eligibility.

A concern would be that there would be not be a block (e.g. registration, graduation application) to force the student to address this, and that the Office of the Registrar could end up with audits where the only deficiency is failure to get a graduation review check-off. Additionally, for students with multiple majors and/or minors, only one person could check off the graduation review section.

6. Do not add a release but supply colleges and/or departments with graduation status reports and ask the college/department to investigate discrepancies.

This would require guidance on expected action and assignment of review responsibilities. Concern could be lack of ability to keep colleges and/or departments accountable for doing this. One option would be that each college had a retention/graduation specialist who could be charged with graduation monitoring, SEP monitoring, and other retention initiatives as charged by the department.

APPENDIX D: POST-75 HOUR RECOMMENDATION MEMO TO THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

TO: Dr. Frank Einhellig, Provost

FROM: Provost's Academic Advising Council (PAAC)

DATE: November 21, 2016

SUBJECT: PAAC Recommendations for Post-75 Credit Undergraduate Advising

As you know from our meeting on September 13, the PAAC recently discussed the current undergraduate advising model that does not require advising appointments past 75 credits. This discussion took place in consideration of three primary issues:

- 1) Concern about retaining and graduating seniors close to graduation. This includes students who stop working on their degree or do not graduate due to graduation deficiencies.
- 2) The potential to miss career advising opportunities as many students may still be making career decisions past 75 credits and might not be ready during their required advising sessions.
- 3) Transfer students coming in with a high number of credits (such as students with an AA degree) who only receive advising one time (initial entry) prior to reaching 75 credits.

We have agreed that the following factors are important in considering any changes to current practice:

- 1) Any policy changes considered should be easy for students to understand, both in terms of what is required and why any changes are being recommended.
- 2) Actions should be minimized that delay a student's ability to register for final semester classes or impede on the student's ability to apply for graduation.
- 3) Focusing any action on a graduation application trigger may be too late to help with retention issues and/or solve graduation deficiencies.
- 4) We should recognize that many different advising models exist and consider the advising load effect that any potential policy changes could have across all advising models.
- 5) We do not want to reduce the number of pre-75 credit advising appointments to balance out an increase in post-75 credit advising appointments as the PAAC feels early advising is important.

With those factors considered, we were able to reduce the number of options that the PAAC thought should be considered at this time. The two options we recommend for combined implementation are listed below.

- 1) Keep the current 75 credit undergraduate advising model but add additional criteria to require advisor release until a minimum number of fall/spring advisor releases (e.g. 3) has been obtained. Students who start here would reach this naturally within 75 credits and transfer students who transfer in with a high number of credits would be reached in multiple advisement appointments.
- 2) Develop a "Post 75-Credit At-Risk" dashboard that would be available to advisors, academic departments, and deans. This dashboard would include various GPA information, academic standing, degree audit completion percentage, SEP on-track status (if available), ability to search for key course benchmarks, and other risk factors that could influence the likelihood of retention and/or graduation. We are currently researching the best possible model for such a dashboard (e.g. ARGOS report, revamped Advising List feature). Departments would be encouraged to create a plan for analyzing this report and reaching out to students at risk. Office of the Provost support would be critical in encouraging this review to occur.

This recommendation has been voted on and approved by majority vote of the PAAC. We would be glad to participate in further discussions related to this topic and participate in the process of implementing these changes through the appropriate curricular and policy channels.

E: Group Advising Questionnaire Summary Report

Majors Advised by Respondents

Which Majors do you Advise?	
Agricultural Business x1	General Studies x1
Agriculture x2	Geography x3
Animal Science x2	Geospatial Science x1
Anthropology x2	Gerontology x1
Art & Design x3	Global Studies x1
Art Education x2	Health - Pre x1
Athletic Training x1	History BA, BS, BSEd. x1
Biology x3	Honors Students x2
Biology - Cell and Molecular x1	Hospitality Leadership x1
Biology - Wildlife x1	Journalism x2
Biology - Education x1	Kinesiology x1
BME, BM, BA x1	Literacy MEd. x1
BSAT x2	Math - Actuarial x1
Chemistry x1	Media and Film x3
Chemistry Education x1	MSAT x1
Child & Fam. Development x1	Museum Studies minor x1
Child Life Studies x1	Music x1
College of Business x9	Natural Resources x1
College of Business Grad. Programs x1	Nursing x2
Communication x4	Nursing - Pre x1
Communication Sciences and Disorders x2	Philosophy x1
Computer Science x1	Physical Therapy x1
Cyber Security MS, MBA x1	Plant Science x2
Digital Film x1	Political Science x2
DPT x1	Professional Writing x2
Economics x1	Psychology x2
Education x1	Religious Studies x2
Education Grad. Students x1	Social Work x4
Educational Technology x1	Sociology x1
Electronic Arts x3	Special Education x1
Elementary Education x2	Special Education MEd., SEACT track x1
Elementary Education MEd. x1	Sustainability minor x1
English x2	Teacher Certification - Post Bac x1
English - Creative Writing x1	Theatre and Dance x1
English Education x1	Undecided x6
English Literature BA x1	Wildlife Conservation & Management x1
GBL x1	Writing MA x1

Advising Question Statistics

Respondent Statistics:			
Are you:			
Answer	%	Count	
Staff	23.33%	35	
Faculty	76.67%	115	
Total	100.00%	150	
Do you advise:			
Answer	%	Count	
Undergrad	51.33%	77	
Graduate	13.33%	20	
Both	35.33%	53	
Total	100.00%	150	
Scenarios in which you present advisement information:			
Answer	%	Count	
One on One	97.99%	146	
2-5 Students	22.15%	33	
>5 Students in class	22.82%	34	
>5 Students out of class	17.45%	26	Prof & Tech Writing Bb Site
Online One on One	22.15%	33	SOAR
Telephone	65.10%	97	Conferences
Email One on One	85.91%	128	Recruiting Events
Online w/>1 Student	5.37%	8	Advising Syllabus
Email w/>1 Student	35.57%	53	Facebook Group
Other	4.70%	7	----> Explanations GEP 101 Classes
Total	100.00%	149	for "Other": Caught in the Hall/Barn

Do you ever present advisement info. to more than one student at a time?			
Answer	%	Count	
Yes	55.56%	85	
No	44.44%	68	
Total	100.00%	153	
Which of the following topics do you address with >1 student at a time?			
Answer	%	Count	
Course Registration	73.68%	56	Class success/study skills
Course Prerequisites	69.74%	53	Program Application Process
Career/Post-Grad. Issues	47.37%	36	Program Specific Reqs
Other	19.74%	15	Financial Aid/Grants
Total	100.00%	76	Admission Information
			Academic Integrity
			SOAR and Transfers
			Salary increases with a Master's Degree
			Prereqs, Gen Eds, Transfer Equivalencies
			Honors College course requirements
			Papers, Theses, Oral/Written Comps
			Good Student Behavior
			Degree Audit
			How to use MyMissouriState account
Which type of students do you address with >1 student at a time?			
Answer	%	Count	
Prospective incom. Fresh.	28.95%	22	
Prospective Incom. Trans.	26.32%	20	
SOAR	28.95%	22	
Transfer	27.63%	21	
Current FR & SO only	28.95%	22	
Current JR & SR only	23.68%	18	
Any FR, SO, JR or SR	36.84%	28	
Current Grad Student	30.26%	23	
Total	100.00%	76	

Which type of students do you address with >1 student at a time?		
Answer	%	Count
Prospective incom. Fresh.	28.95%	22
Prospective Incom. Trans.	26.32%	20
SOAR	28.95%	22
Transfer	27.63%	21
Current FR & SO only	28.95%	22
Current JR & SR only	23.68%	18
Any FR, SO, JR or SR	36.84%	28
Current Grad Student	30.26%	23
Total	100.00%	76

Which of the following are intended outcomes when advising more than one student at a time?		
Answer	%	Count
More time efficient for faculty/staff	65.79%	50
Save student time	30.53%	46
Same info presented to students individ. can be performed in grps	72.37%	55
Registration release	19.74%	15
Other	23.68%	18
Total	100.00%	76

Explanations for "Other":	
Pre-professional information	When another dept/campus makes requests
Comfortable Atmosphere	So students understand expectations
Information Consistency	Other students questions beneficial
Reinforce face-to-face advising	Encourage students to make early appts.
Builds Student Community	To encourage students to be proactive
Study Advisement	Develop better student/faculty relationships
Prog admission criteria	Explain registration process / Degree Audits

Identify times when you perform advising with >1 student at a time:		
Answer	%	Count
Pre-admission to program	42.11%	32
Course Registration period	57.89%	44
Specific time within the program	31.58%	24
Other	25.00%	19
Total	100.00%	76

Explanations for "Other":	
SOAR / Campus Info Tours	Students beginning a thesis
Degree Audit Instruction	Pre-professional info meetings
Grad Research Methods Course	Study advisement meetings
When Needed	Seminar courses
Special Groups of Students	GEP 101
Orientation Classes	Entry into Major
Students preparing to teach	Prior to registration period

Would you be willing to serve on a panel organized to share your "group-advising" practices?		
Answer	%	Count
Yes	23.68%	18
Maybe	23.68%	18
No	52.63%	40
Total	100.00%	76

Group Advising Benefits

Please identify the benefits you have experienced advising more than one student at a time:

**	When students need to be reminded of deadlines and common options
**	It's more efficient and saves time for everyone involved
**	It reduces misinformation or missed information delivered by more people
**	Don't experience any benefit, it is the structure of SOAR that demands this
**	Puts students at ease especially when it's their first visit
**	Students tend to be more open/involved in group settings
**	Students think together and generate questions they didn't know they had
**	Questions often provide info others had not considered asking
**	Students are more prepared to meet with their advisor in one-on-one sessions
**	Consistency of information provided to more students
**	Better prepared students interact and it can inspire students to do better and be more competitive
**	Hard to get new transfer students from Dalian registered in a short period of time
**	Generally students ask more questions in a group
**	Can cover the basics of upcoming schedules and career-relevant info relatively quickly
**	It makes me more aware that many grad students are not actually receiving the info about our program we assume they are. Ironically, when we recently set up a group advising session, more faculty than students attended
**	I am not an advocate of group advisement, but I anticipate that we will see more of it as ranked faculty lines are replaced by per course and instructors
**	Allows more time for scholarship
**	Students feel less alone in the process and they recognize others have similar challenges
**	Student networking

Group Advising Challenges

Please identify the challenges you have experienced advising more than one student at a time:	
**	Cannot always be certain that everybody acted upon the information given
**	Getting more students to take the course
**	Getting more faculty to participate
**	Less personalized advisement
**	Not everyone is at the same place academically and it's important to give care when addressing individuals who don't feel as academic achievers.
**	Some students don't comprehend the overall student responsibility/process and require more in-depth personalized discussions.
**	Keeping everyones attention
**	None
**	Students don't always show up
**	Having to maintain FERPA
**	Logistics and organizing registration
**	Answering individual questions
**	Difficult to determine how well each student understands the information
**	If some students are talking then it can be hard for other students to hear
**	Each student is unique and has taken different classes or have different needs.
**	Sometimes students ask questions that stump me
**	No challenges with grad students
**	Not all students are interested
**	Advising a large group is a very stressful form of advising and doesn't build a relationship
**	Mostly, it's an ineffective way to communicate
**	Can spiral out of control (time wise) when questions of a specific nature arise
**	Some students want to get in and get out and do not appreciate the value of the group session learning tools they can acquire. They may miss key points.
**	Students don't read mass email messages as carefully. If I send the exact same information with their name at the top, they are more likely to read it.
**	Someone is always unavoidably left out
**	Getting off topic
**	Can't get too specific
**	Getting more than one person
**	Keeping their emphases separate if they are in different areas
**	Space availability
**	Takes away from class time
**	Finding a time for everyone to meet
**	Backlog of advising notes

Group Advising Student Feedback

What specific feedback have you received from students regarding advising >1 student at a time?

**	None
**	Helpful
**	Students have mentioned a stronger feeling of "belonging" when with like/similar students
**	Stress relief
**	Clearer goals
**	They hate the extra effort but love the attention and socialization with peers
**	Neither positive or negative
**	Students overwhelmingly prefer our shift to hybrid advising
**	They like to hear other students concerns they may also be experiencing
**	Other students ask questions or bring up issues they may not have thought of
**	Positive
**	They all say they like the option of not having to meet with their advisor individually
**	Gratefulness for making them aware of the program
**	They appreciate not having to wait for an appointment
**	They like to get information - the best situation is when I visit classes
**	They say it helps them think about what they need to do before advising and registration.
**	Incoming freshmen seem to be OK with it
**	The upper division event advising like it better even though I know the lower level benefit from it. I have decreased the low level group events.
**	They like having the general guidelines to prepare them for their future advisement appointments
**	Mostly positive, many follow-up with individual mtgs.
**	Anecdotal
**	Lots of "likes" on Facebook
**	They appreciate the information being released as quickly as possible
**	Students LOVE getting to hear tips, tricks, and strategies from upper-classmen
**	Students prefer individual advising
**	I don't consider what I do to be group advising and students do not receive release
**	Several students have requested that I advise them because they like the "philosophy" shared.
**	They appreciate the quick turn around
**	Generally like the intro to the process and help from peer leaders who have been there, done that.

Group Advising FERPA Issues

What specific methods to you use to manage confidentiality issues when advising >1 student at a time?
** Use BCC
** Only do it when non-personal information has to be included
** Avoid all reference to names, cases, etc
** Only meet one-on-one when discussing personal issues/cases
** I don't talk about INDIVIDUAL concerns, only program-wide issues
** On Bb we only post information appropriate for public sharing
** This is not an issue because the general advising I dispense is not student-specific
** Make a statement at the beginning of the meeting
** Haven't had this situation
** Physically spacing students apart
** Allowing students to lead the conversation
** Working to include privacy statements and agreements
** Confidential information is not addressed in group advising
** To show an audit of another student, I request written approval before showing it to other students
** I only offer general information during group advising
** Discuss only program information, not individual situations
** I set ground rules and let them know confidential issues will be discussed by appointment
** Double-check picture on student's record
** I ask them to see me privately, email me, or make an appointment with specific questions
** Clementine
** Encourage students to make an appointment for specific challenges
** Most personal information is in written format

GROUP ADVISING CONCERNS AND COMMENTS

What concerns/comments do you have with advising more than one student at a time?	
**	It's difficult to give students individual attention, it wastes other students time, can be difficult to protect confidentiality.
**	Group advising can provide great benefits to students (and staff time), it is vitally important that the students know they are viewed as unique individuals. They must be treated with care and concern and not as "a number".
**	I think group advising is effective as PART of the advising process and does not preclude individual appointments. Group advising for me is more like an information session.
**	Each student case is different. Sometimes students are not happy or do not get enough attention.
**	I don't believe in group advising as an alternative to face-to-face advising. Group advising can be a supplement but not a substitute.
**	Attendance and tracking who has received what information.
**	Just never thought about it; don't know how to do it!
**	I believe that students like the one-on-one advisement. We can discuss personal issues and develop a strategy for them. They like personal service. I get very busy during preregistration and registration. It can be difficult to get all my students in for an advising appointment.
**	Getting students to show up at a specific day and time to make it worth my time as a faculty member to offer it on a regular basis.
**	MSU is known for treating our students as people rather than numbers. This comes from individual person-to-person contact. I feel that group advising can take away from that individualized feel and cause students to feel less valued as individuals - treated more like a number.
**	Just not effective with DPT students
**	I see my job as an advisor as giving students personalized advice about their academic careers
**	I only advise COM minors in group sessions.
**	First, I want to be able to focus on the concerns of each student. Second, I want students to be able to express concerns that they do not want to share with others.
**	Most students are different and have different needs
**	Organizing a schedule for more than two people is difficult and takes too much time
**	Only certain types of advising info can be shared en masse
**	Works well in our Cohort based program
**	Some cultures like to do things together at all times, so explaining privacy of the individual is necessary.
**	Advisement needs to focus on one person's needs

**	I suspect this is a cost-saving strategy, and as such I advise you to limit group advising to SOAR only
**	Protecting student privacy; FERPA
**	Making sure that what I say/intend is what they hear - in group settings they may be too shy to say they haven't understood (or to ask questions) - especially when they are unfamiliar with other members of the group.
**	Sometimes I don't receive adequate notice for group advising. When I only receive the date, I have to block off my entire schedule for the day.
**	You need to be in a computer lab and limit the number to about five students, unless you allow more than a 30-45 min per session.
**	Personal contact with the advisor
**	Efficiently communicating in a timely manner; organization
**	Concise and sensitive
**	It may not work for all programs in which individual students have different needs
**	Shy student who doesn't/can't speak up feels left out
**	Scheduling
**	I want them to feel valued as an individual and not feel like I am trying to "herd" them through the process, I want them to enter the conversation and be able to ask questions and personalize the information.
**	This has been a very rewarding practice! Students know that Group Advising is not meant to replace one-on-one/individual advising, rather it is meant to supplement regular advising. We create a 4-year/graduation plan so they have more time to talk about personal/professional issues when they meet with their advisor for regular advisement. It is most beneficial for the whole department to be involved and I would not suggest one person running the session alone. I would love to talk about this further!
**	It works for general orientation, but not for helping individual students develop customized plans. Group advising is less fun for advisors and staff.
**	Not efficient
**	Challenges of finding a time./venue that's mutually convenient for faculty and the students who need the information
**	Mentorship requires the building of relationships. Group advisement saves faculty time, but at the expense of good quality interaction and the building of relationships. It is impersonal, and I'd imagine students would focus less on career issues and more on course selection and meeting requirements. In my view this is the least positive benefit of advisement as our degree audit system does a pretty good job at helping students understand their requirements.
**	That someone's questions may not be offered nor answered
**	I don't ever want to lose the personal contact that comes with meeting one on one
**	Not sure why we would trade off the quality of personal advisement for the "efficiency" of advising multiple students. Seems like a truly awful suggestion.
**	More efficient videos/step by step handouts would make group instruction on degree audit more effective.
**	I have never had more than one student have the same concern at the same time.
**	I don't want the students to think that meeting as a group indicates students should not meet privately with their advisor. They need to understand the goals of why I am doing advising in a large group and that I still encourage one on one sessions when appropriate. Degree requirements; periodicity; studying away for a semester in relation to periodicity of some required courses; Study Away programs.

F: Group Advising Standards and Best Practices

Best Practices in Group/Hybrid Advising at Missouri State University

Excellent academic advising helps create positive experiences for students, shares information about academic rules, regulations, and programs, and helps students develop meaningful educational plans to help them pursue their life goals. As enrollment increases and numbers of faculty and staff advisors stay relatively constant, many advisors find themselves looking for creative ways to provide advising information. Some departments are turning to group or hybrid advising models to help provide timely and effective advice to their declared majors. Information dissemination to groups of students may free up time, resulting in more meaningful conversations with individual students about their academic concerns and plans.

Departments who wish to consider group/hybrid advising should consider these best practices, as well as the mission of advising at Missouri State University and the overall Best Practices for Academic Advisors and Best Practices for Advising in Departments/Advisement Centers available at <http://www.missouristate.edu/advising/83845.htm>.

1. Group/hybrid advising sessions provide effective opportunities to share information that all majors in a particular program need.
 - Invite student groups by hours earned or by milestones in the major that have been achieved.
 - Advisors conducting group/hybrid advising sessions should use care to cover all necessary information with each group and all participants. Checklists for individual students with space for notes from advisors may be useful.
 - Information covered in the advising session may be reinforced with advising handouts, information posted on departmental websites, or Blackboard pages.
2. All group/hybrid advising sessions must be conducted with utmost sensitivity to FERPA regulations and student privacy concerns.
 - Students participating in group advising sessions should receive instruction about what confidential information may and may not be shared in these sessions. Students may need to sign releases or statements of understanding.
 - Students in computer labs pulling up academic records should be seated so that others may not view their screens.
3. All students must be offered an opportunity to speak individually with an academic advisor in addition to participating in a group/hybrid advising session.
4. Two or more advisors are strongly recommended at each group/hybrid advising session in order to address individual concerns.
5. Students should have sufficient notice to arrange to attend a group/hybrid advising session and should be able to choose a session that fits into their academic schedule.
6. Follow up with student participants should include exit survey/evaluation opportunities. Advisors should also follow up with students who seemed troubled or confused as well as students who did not attend.
7. Notations of participation in group/hybrid advising sessions should be properly documented in Advising Notes.

