

A Report of Findings and Recommendations of the Academic Advising Task Force

Table of Contents

Findings and Recommendations

- I. Introduction
- II. Recommendations to Strengthen Academic Advising Services
 - A. Advising Within a College or Department
 - B. An Assured Minimum Level of Service
 - 1. Mandatory Advising
 - 2. Orientation Program
 - 3. Training and Support for the Advising Community
 - 4. Evaluation, Recognition, and Reward for Advisors
 - 5. Other Support
 - 6. Student Information Accuracy
 - 7. Adhering to Academic Standards and Policies
 - C. A Common Resource to Support Academic Advising
 - D. Populations Requiring Specialized Advising Services
 - 1. Transfer Students
 - 2. Supplemental Academic Advising
 - E. The Advising Community and Service to the Institution
 - F. System Accountability
 - G. Financial Requirements
 - H. Phase-in of the Recommendations
- III. Summary

Compilation of Recommendations

Appendix A

Appendix B

Appendix C

Appendix D

Appendix E

Appendix F

Appendix G

Appendix H

Appendix I

Appendix J

Appendix K

Findings and Recommendations

I. Introduction

The Academic Advising Task Force (AATF) was established in January of 2001 by the Vice President for Undergraduate Education, Randy Richardson. The AATF is composed of academic advisors, undergraduate students, counselors, administrators, and faculty from across campus. Its general charge is to examine the academic advising system to identify the problems that exist that undermine the success of the system for undergraduate students and to propose solutions to these problems so as to create a strong, stable, and effective advising system. ([Appendix A: Charge Statement](#))

The AATF has met continuously since its inception. In addition, it has gathered data from a broad array of sources including meetings with interested parties, documentation and studies from the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), institutional data, existing surveys of the satisfaction of University of Arizona students with the academic advising they receive, and the AATF's own surveys of students, faculty, departments, and colleges. The AATF has benefited from the contribution of more than 2,000 individuals, including input from every college and virtually every academic unit that serves undergraduate students.

The AATF defines academic advising as the delivery of advice and assistance to students concerning their academic and personal development by advisors who have authority to sign off on their academic degree program ([Appendix B: Definition of Academic Advising](#)). Academic advising involves a close collaboration among units of the institution, knowledgeable academic advisors, and students. ([Appendix C: Academic Advising Mission Statement](#)).

The AATF spent approximately six months in its effort to identify strengths and weaknesses that exist in the present academic advising system. The Task Force described the problems it identified with the academic advising system in its [Preliminary Report](#), issued by the Task Force in May 2001. The most significant problems described in the [Preliminary Report](#) are summarized below:

- For approximately half of all students, general education and major academic advising are split between the Office for Academic Services (OAS), the Freshmen Year Center (FYC), and their department or college. Many students find this system difficult and highly confusing, not to mention time consuming. Students would like general education and major advising to occur with **one** advisor as much as possible. Resolving the problem of split advising is among the highest priorities of students.
- Many students feel that they cannot obtain timely access to their advisors. Many academic advisors themselves are overwhelmed by the large numbers of students for whom they are responsible. More than half of all undergraduate students at the University are served by academic advising processes that are overloaded, sometimes substantially so, according to standards that can be defended as good practice ([Appendix D: Recommended Ratios](#)).
- Both students and academic advisors say they don't have any place to turn when they have questions that they don't know how to answer. Students also find the help they receive from advisors to be highly inconsistent.

The AATF then turned to the development of recommendations to address these and other concerns that had been identified. The recommendations of the AATF follow as does a statement about the financial requirements and phasing in of the recommendations. Our recommendations are in bold italics. The AATF adopted each of the recommendations by unanimity or near unanimity. Evidentiary sources of support for the recommendations are contained in the appendices of this report. These appendices also contain suggestions we believe may be helpful in implementing the recommendations as well as a statement of areas or topics the AATF has determined require further investigation and evaluation.

The overall purpose of the recommendations herein is to establish an academic advising system for undergraduate students that is coherent; that delivers effective, timely, and accurate advising services to all students; that is accountable for achieving results; and that is supported at the level necessary to attain these results.

II. Recommendations to Strengthen Academic Advising Services

A. Advising Within a College or Department

The AATF believes that academic advising for each individual student should be carried out within a single administrative unit, or college. The majority of colleges provide both general education and major advising within the college unit. However, those colleges that do not (Science, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, and University College) serve nearly half of all undergraduates. Students in the first three colleges are advised with regard to general education and University requirements by the OAS and FYC, and by department advisors for their major and minor requirements. The disadvantages of the present OAS/FYC structure are many - students become unsure about who can provide permission for what parts of their degree; the ability to advise a student in a holistic manner is diminished; students face the additional stress of needing to travel across campus for advising and deal with different appointment systems for multiple offices; and, there is a lack of consistent communication between OAS/FYC and department advisors. In addition, the division of both advising and the making of decisions about students dilutes the development of students' sense of identity with their college.

The AATF recommends that the general education advising functions currently provided by OAS/FYC should move into the colleges of the students they serve. To retain a consistent model for advising, all undergraduate students with no major selected should be advised by University College until they have selected a major.

Students with no major selected, as a result, will be a part of University College until they have selected a major. Implementing this recommendation will mean that all students will receive their academic advising for general education and the major within their college - rather than from split units. [Note: Students with a second major or a minor in a *different* college, and other similar situations, will by necessity have advisors outside of their primary college for those specified purposes.] The result will not only be that advising for all students for the major and general education will occur within the college, but most students will be able to receive their advising from a **single** academic advisor within their college. Responses that the AATF received from advisors indicate that at least half of all students now served through two units by two different advisors will end up with a single advisor within their college for both university requirements and their major. For the reasons indicated earlier, achieving this goal is a priority for students.

It is further recommended that University College accept responsibility for advising two additional groups of students: those who have been disqualified from their college and have not gained entry into another, and those students who have been excluded from future enrollment in their present college due to failure to qualify for advanced standing and are also undecided about their academic options. Often these students in transition have nowhere to turn in the short-term for their academic advising. However, it is important for these students to understand that access to advising from University College under these circumstances does not imply any guarantee of future admission either to University College or another UA college.

Decentralization raises issues of consistency across colleges. To address these issues, ***the AATF recommends that a representative working group of the colleges and other appropriate units should meet regularly to discuss questions relevant to academic advising and review how University-wide requirements are interpreted, adjusted, and upheld.*** This working group could be similar in function to the existing committee that links the Colleges of Science, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and University College.

The AATF notes that the present OAS/FYC model does have a number of advantages. One is that it provides a central location for both students and department advisors to gain information about the general education curriculum and University policies and procedures. Although it is not an expected function of the office, OAS/FYC has also taken on the ad hoc role of providing training to new advisors in the colleges served by this office. The AATF addresses these advantages through its recommendation to develop a common resource ([section C](#)).

B. An Assured Minimum Level of Service

Developing a coherent advising model throughout the University is one goal. A second goal is to attain a reasonable level of advising for each undergraduate student, what the AATF calls an assured minimum level of service.

1. Mandatory Advising

The AATF recommends that all new students, including transfer students, keep mandatory advising appointments during each of their first two semesters. Such advising should take place in individual meetings that occur between students and their academic advisors. To assure that students are prepared for graduation, ***the AATF recommends that each student keep a mandatory advising appointment upon reaching 90 units (or some other identifier for nearing program completion).*** ***Once again, such advising should take place in individual meetings that occur between the student and the academic advisor.***

The academic advising system should have sufficient capacity and resources to both carry out mandatory advising and to enable the large majority of all other continuing students to discuss their academic progress with their advisors in individual sessions once a semester, if so desired. ***The AATF recommends that tuition revenue earmarked to improve undergraduate advising be targeted to create this capacity. Considering that the present system is substantially overburdened, the projected cost to attain an assured minimum level of service for all students amounts to approximately \$1.3 million annually in continuing funds.*** ([Appendix D: Recommended Ratios](#))

2. Orientation Program

The Summer Orientation Program provides the first academic advising experience for all new freshmen and for most transfer students. The program needs to describe clearly and carefully how academic advising works, what students can expect from their academic advisors, and the responsibilities expected of each student. Also, evaluating advising during these programs is paramount in understanding the student response to this critical first step towards becoming a UA student. The experience of students in these programs influences how students utilize advising services throughout their academic career. Knowledge about the system and a solid first impression of academic advising services benefit future student use of and satisfaction with the advising system.

Two of the AATF co-chairs attended a freshman orientation program in June 2001. Their comments are included in [Appendix E: Orientation Program](#). ***The AATF recommends that, through the Vice President for Undergraduate Education working with Admissions and consulting with the Co-Chairs of the AATF, further investigation of the summer orientation program be conducted during the 2002-2003 academic year specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of how the advising system is presented to students and the effectiveness of the advising experience itself during orientation.***

Further, the AATF observes that when application deadlines are extended well into the summer (or January, for the spring term), students generally cannot be well served through the advising process in orientation or other advising venues, and access to classes is dramatically diminished.

3. Training and Support for the Advising Community

Part of providing an assured minimum level of service is that advisors be of high quality and that they also be knowledgeable, accurate, and personable, the combination of which requires training, effective evaluation, and proper compensation. The next five sets of recommendations below (sections 3, [4](#), [5](#), [6](#) and [7](#)) relate to the ways in which this foundation for academic advising interaction can be developed at the University.

The results of the AATF's May 2001 survey of the advising community and a focus group session with the University Professional Advising Council (UPAC) in October 2001 point to the fact that there is a great unevenness in training material available for advisors across the colleges, which results in considerable variation of knowledge that advisors possess when meeting with students. This unevenness of knowledge leads to variations in advising accuracy throughout campus.

The AATF recommends that advisors engage in training, respectful of their time, enabling them to have the appropriate information needed to be effective advisors and ensure that a basic foundation of knowledge about University and college policies, procedures, and program requirements exists for all advising appointments.

Training, then, refers to gaining command of a set of information and does not refer to the specifics of an advisor's degree or level of education. Instead, it involves gaining the procedural, technical, and professional foundation needed to effectively assist undergraduate students. To be respectful of an advisor's time, ***the AATF recommends that training be provided on-line as much as possible. It should require time only in those areas where the advisor is not already sufficiently knowledgeable. The AATF encourages the University also to consider a time frame in which seasoned advisors should refresh their knowledge base (perhaps every three years).*** The training programs should vary according to whether the advisor has authority to sign off on general education courses, on the major and minor requirements, or both (for suggestions as to a process to be followed, see [Appendix K: Work to be Done During Year One](#). ***The AATF estimates that an on-line advising manual and a training program, together, would have a one-time cost of \$45,000 (Appendix F: Technology)***

4. Evaluation, Recognition, and Reward for Advisors

Another important piece in the puzzle when creating a coherent, consistent, and accurate advising experience for students is sending the message to advisors that their work is valuable and valued. The recommendations of this section relate to ways in which the University can construct a framework that reliably evaluates the work of advisors and compensates and recognizes them for excellence.

The investigative work of the AATF revealed that across campus, the evaluation of advisors' work is uneven, at best. We cannot begin to reshape advising services on campus if we do not provide advisors with clear expectations on the level of performance and feedback about the efficacy of their work. ***The AATF recommends that each academic advisor be evaluated in an in-depth manner on an annual basis by his or her supervisor on criteria having to do with accessibility, knowledge, skills (e.g., interpersonal communication), and professional attitude. (Appendix G: NACADA Standards and Student Assessment).*** ***For faculty advisors, evaluation of their work should be a part of the process used to consider individuals for merit-based salary increases and for release time. Evaluation of advising must take into account information from students.*** In Appendix G, the AATF suggests efficient means to gain information from students for evaluations. Errors of advisors, documented through the petition process should also be part of the evaluation. ***At the departmental level, the AATF also recommends that academic advising should be made a specific component of each unit's 7-year Academic Program Review.***

When the evaluation of advisors' work reveals exceptional achievement, the University should recognize it. Similarly, UA should honor departments or colleges that have made a special commitment to innovation and success in advising. ***The AATF recommends that the University should recognize the finest academic advisors of the year (one faculty member, one professional advisor).*** The award should carry a substantial monetary stipend. Nominee credentials should be reviewed by a committee established for such a purpose, and the committee should include student members. ***The AATF also recommends that the Provost's Office sponsor an annual award for the unit or college that has achieved either the highest level of advising practice or made the greatest contributions to innovation in academic advising.*** Again, the stipend of the award should be substantial. Finally, ***the AATF recommends that money be set aside for professional development grants for academic advisors. The total amount of the continuing money needed for individual awards, unit awards, and professional development grants is estimated at \$60,000 per year.***

Further work must be done with regard to compensation for advisors. The AATF already knows from the advising survey that academic advisors are concerned about compensation levels and their effect on the retention of professional advisors, and on the faculty side, whether or not release time is provided when a faculty member agrees to a substantial advising role. Salary compression is also an issue. ***The AATF recommends that to address issues related to salary compensation and compression, \$150,000 in continuing dollars be set aside. This is a preliminary estimate based on incomplete data. The University***

needs to conduct a more detailed investigation through Department of Human Resources to examine the salaries of advisors at the University, relative to other comparable personnel, in order to learn the precise extent of salary inequity and compression.

Finally, **to address confusion regarding the similarities and differences among the roles of professional academic advisor, faculty advisor, counselor, mentor, and others, the AATF recommends that an investigation be conducted through Department of Human Resources of the position titles currently used for professional advisors. A plan should then be developed that utilizes the definition of academic advising presented in this report.**

5. Other Support

The AATF realizes that in order to spend as much time as possible in face-to-face contact with students, advisors need resources in their local area which support their work. **The AATF recommends that each academic advisor have assistance available from a front-line staff member who can make appointments and screen phone calls. Additionally, each academic advisor should have a computer that is Cosmos capable and access to a printer, fax machine, photocopier, telephone with voice mail, and basic office supplies.** Resources for equipment and staffing are shown in [sections II-G and H](#) of this report as part of one-time funds and the general fund (see also [Table II](#), page 16). **In order to maintain confidentiality during appointments, the AATF also recommends that every academic advisor should have access to a private office with sufficient space outside of that office where students can wait comfortably for meetings.** The AATF suggests that the University's Space Committee assist in developing plans to free-up or create the needed space. **Finally, the AATF recommends the development of an on-line appointment scheduling system to serve academic advisors and students. The AATF estimates that such a facility will involve a one-time cost of \$125,000 ([Appendix F: Technology](#)).**

6. Student Information Accuracy

Academic advising cannot be accurate unless advisors have accurate information available to them in the advising process. Many questions exist about the accuracy of student information accessible to advisors through Advisor Link (transfer evaluations, SAPRs, and so forth). The AATF has heard reports from advisors that they spend an inordinate amount of time because of erroneous information contained in students' records. The Task Force is in no way commenting on Advisor Link, but instead on the information available through Advisor Link. **The AATF recommends that the Vice President for Undergraduate Education form a working group in 2002-2003 to investigate the magnitude of the problem by measuring the proportion of students' records accessible through Advisor Link in which errors exist as well as the overall proportion of data contained in students' records that is inaccurate. The working group should propose effective remedies if it considers the proportion of inaccurate data to be too great.** In [section II - E](#), below, the AATF also recommends that a measure of the accuracy of information accessible to advisors through Advisor Link be included as an outcome measure in the process of accountability of the advising system.

7. Adhering to Academic Standards and Policies

As part of an assured minimum level of service, students should be able to count on the information they receive regarding curricula and academic programs. The adequate preparation and updating of academic advisors through training programs that are as much as possible on-line should help attain this objective. Effective evaluation should promote it further as should improving the accuracy of information with which advisors work. The AATF understands that errors in advice about curricula and academic programs will occur in even the best of advising systems when advisors are trained, updated, and effectively evaluated; however, if students are to rely on their academic advisors, they need to know that their graduation will not be delayed because of an advising error unless the error in question will undermine the integrity of the degree. **The AATF recommends that the University alter its policies and petitions procedure in this manner once the assured minimum level of service has been implemented.**

C. A Common Resource to Support Academic Advising

Two goals are to develop a coherent advising system and an advising system able to deliver an assured minimum level of service to all students. A third need has to do with providing a place to turn for expert reference when students and advisors themselves are confused and have questions about advising - which is the case for nearly every student and every advisor at times - and also a place to gather and disseminate information about effective advising practices. The present system contains no such capabilities. ***The AATF recommends that a central resource, the Common Place, be established to assist both advisors and students. The Common Place should be both a physical space and a web space, in part serving to refer advisors and students to the appropriate sources of advice and information and to be a home for an on-line academic advising manual and training modules for advisors.***

Details regarding the Common Place follow. As conceptualized by the AATF, the Common Place has five main objectives:

1. to provide accurate and thorough referral services for students which enhance access to academic advising, counseling, and other student services they seek;
2. to assist advisors in developing a working knowledge of the range of counseling and student services available to students, and answer questions they may have in assisting individual students ([Appendix J: Academic Counseling](#));
3. to provide a program of coherent and timely training and professional development for advisors (and potentially other student service providers);
4. to collect and maintain data about advising practices nationally and at the University; and
5. to consult with colleges and departments about aspects of good advising practices, recognition and reward, and assessment.

The Common Place should have a central and conspicuous location, both physically and on UAWeb. Space has been allocated in the Student Union. It should be administratively housed under the umbrella of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education. Service delivery should be evaluated yearly to measure effectiveness. The Common Place will not deliver academic advising services to students. Rather, it will facilitate the advising process by referring students who desire assistance but are unsure where to turn. The Common Place will also serve as a communication vehicle for advisors, students, and administrators; facilitate solutions and/or refer questions to the office responsible for that information (e.g., academic policy issues would be referred to the Office of Curriculum and Registration). A comprehensive listserv of advisors and an on-line academic advising manual will be developed and maintained through the Common Place. In addition, the Common Place will serve as a repository for other information on academic advising and related student service programs. Finally, it will coordinate basic technical, procedural, and professional development for advisors.

Staffing the Common Place should be adequate, yet limited. During a transitional phase, staffing resources would be required to initially develop on-line tools, such as training modules, an on-line manual, home page, and inventory of advising and counseling services and personnel. Once development is complete, one FTE staff member with technical expertise will be able to maintain the systems and provide limited information technology services. A Director should manage the Common Place, with a title recognizing the visibility and importance of the center. Initially, staffing should include two FTE advising coordinators, one FTE administrative assistant, and funds for student assistants. One-time resources will be needed to purchase computer hardware and furniture. ***The AATF recommends an allocation of \$200,000 in continuing funds be made to adequately support the Common Place.***

D. Populations Requiring Specialized Advising Services

1. Transfer Students

The AATF Transfer Subcommittee described a set of transfer student issues and recommendations in its final report ([Appendix H: Transfer Students Subcommittee Advising Report](#)). The subcommittee developed its report based on the information collected from a number of sources, including the Transfer Student Advising Survey. In summary, its recommendations support/complement the AATF recommendations for:

1) a Common Place as a central location for advising referral and information, including web-based information; and 2) appropriate training for all advisors.

Additionally, the subcommittee members and the AATF encourage the rapid completion of DARS implementation to attain accurate information about transfer credits on students' transcripts. With the full implementation of DARS, the University will be able to participate more fully in the Arizona Course Applicability System (CAS). This will enable students to access information regarding the applicability of their Arizona community college courses toward their UA degree long before enrollment. This service is already available for students transferring to Arizona State University.

Further, while the AATF recommends that each college take responsibility for all of the advising needs of its students, the advising of prospective transfer students should be complemented and supported through the outreach efforts of the Transfer Academic Counselors. **The AATF recommends that these staff members have authority to evaluate transfer credit (in and out-of-state) and file any adjustments in the student record system upon the student's admission to the University.** This will enable transfer students to be better informed about how their transfer course work will apply toward their stated degree program once they are admitted and complete the transfer process. It should be noted that the Eller College of Business and Public Administration does not agree with this recommendation for their prospective students. Further details are included in [Appendix H](#) of this report.

2. Supplemental Academic Advising

The AATF also examined substantive areas that require supplemental academic advising, such as pre-law and pre-health. It found that a substantial need for assistance beyond present resources exists in the area of students pursuing the health professions.

A proposal titled "Arizona Health Sciences Center and Main Campus Partnership for Advising Undergraduates Interested in Health Professions" was developed by the Arizona Health Sciences Center Colleges (Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, and the School of Health Professions), working in cooperation with main campus personnel, to improve health professions advising for all current and prospective University of Arizona undergraduate students. The proposal is included in [Appendix I: Pre-Health Professions Advising Proposal](#).

The proposal describes the need for an expanded mission and additional advising personnel to staff a Pre-Health Professions Advising Center for undergraduate students on main campus. The present Pre-Health Professions Advising Office (which would constitute the nucleus of the Center) has only one full-time advisor and a part-time administrative assistant to serve an estimated 3,000+ students. Virtually all of these students interested in health professions will seek advice regarding the academic and admission requirements for various health careers. However, this office currently serves students interested in only six health careers, only one of which (Medicine) is offered at the University of Arizona. The May, 2001, "Progress Report" of the AATF noted that this office "is viewed by many of its constituents as understaffed and under-funded for its mission." The proposal to expand this office into a center has the goal of better serving UA undergraduate students interested in all health professions. **The AATF supports the principles of this proposal and recommends a level of funding according to the guidelines set forth in section II, G-1 of the Report, below, and in [Appendix D: Recommended Ratios](#). Further, the AATF recommends that the Pre-Health Professions Advising Center be located centrally on main campus and administratively within the University College.**

E. The Advising Community and Service to the Institution

Advisors' first-hand knowledge of students' experiences and problems as students navigate the college and University regulations and resources, provides a unique perspective of great use to the campus community. The University should expect advisors to dedicate a portion of their time for service to the institution. Advisors can bring extensive knowledge they possess regarding the implications of policy decisions concerning students and programs to those groups that need to understand how decisions they make will impact students. **The AATF recommends that representative academic advisors serve on University bodies concerned with these issues.** Examples of these bodies include but are not limited to, the Undergraduate Council, the General Education

Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the President's Advisory Council. Academic advisors should select their own representatives, potentially through a University Professional Advising Council expanded to involve faculty academic advisors.

F. System Accountability

The academic advising system should be accountable as a system. Accountability for the proper functioning of academic advising exists on many levels. At the most fundamental level, we are accountable to our students: we owe it to them to provide accurate and accessible services, rendered in a professional and respectful way, to guide their academic careers and personal development. At another level, we are accountable to the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR). Data about academic advising are included in the Undergraduate Consolidated Accountability Report (UCAR) presented annually to ABOR. Between these constituencies, each advising unit—be it at the department, college, or multi-college level—must be accountable for the efficient use of resources as well as its performance in providing accurate, accessible, and effective academic advising services to students.

System accountability implies agreement on desired outcomes, the measurement of those outcomes, and the evaluation of each unit as well as the institution as a whole with respect to positive change and ultimate attainment of those outcomes. There is also the necessity for individual units to have adequate resources to make progress toward the desired outcomes. An accountability system must thus assess both the adequacy of resources and the degree of success in attaining the stated outcomes.

The office responsible for carrying out an effective university-wide system of accountability for undergraduate academic advising should be the Vice President for Undergraduate Education. There must be assurance, however, that the Provost will follow through with the Deans of the Colleges regarding the findings about outcomes, since the Deans and their colleges are responsible directly to the Provost. Accountability is effective only if the assessments regarding outcomes and adequacy of resources are used to improve programs and levels of service.

The AATF recommends that a working group be established to determine the specific areas that should be measured as well as how to measure each area, the ultimate outcome desired in each area, and the annual progress toward the expected outcome in each area. These measures should also include assessments of resources that have been expended to determine if they are sufficient to meet the recommended ratios of students to advisors; training and updating of advisors; and funding necessary for institution-wide resources, such as the Common Place.

If the ratios are met and other AATF recommendations have been implemented, certain outcomes should result. There should be increased levels of overall student satisfaction with their academic advising (measured through an annual survey). Also, the great majority of students should have positive experiences in individual meetings with their advisors and should feel they have had sufficient time with their advisors (measured through requested student feedback electronically following these meetings). The accessibility of nearly all students to academic advising should be timely (again, measured through student feedback after the meetings). The advice coming from academic advisors should be accurate (measured by general petitions that involve advisor-related errors, the proportion of information on students accessible through Advisor Link that is inaccurate, and levels of student confidence). All of these are important outcomes that the University should attain for its students.

The AATF recognizes that good academic advising promotes student success. As a result, the AATF supports using retention and time to graduation as outcome measures provided that effective ways are devised to control for other key variables that also affect these outcomes, such as changes in the economy, the general student/faculty ratio, the students' evolving values and goals, course availability, and many other similar intervening variables. These intervening variables are so strong that they can overwhelm positive change that successful academic advising brings, making it wrongly appear as if advising has made little difference and had no effect. The AATF supports using variables such as retention as outcome measures only if suitable controls for intervening variables are devised and included.

Of the measurement areas suggested, the UCAR already includes measures of overall student satisfaction and student reports of accessibility. Students are surveyed in these regards at the end of their lower-division coursework and when they are graduating seniors, providing ABOR with measures each year. Results from these surveys are available at <http://aer.arizona.edu>. One difficulty with these measures is that students' answers are

probably not referring to academic advising alone but also to the wide variety of other advising and counseling services students experience on campus. In these surveys, it is impossible to determine the degree to which students are separating academic advising from the other services. To address this problem, some of the measures the AATF has suggested in the previous paragraph involve student feedback directly regarding (and following) services rendered by academic advisors.

The AATF also recommends that academic advisors be surveyed regularly about training and job effectiveness and satisfaction, using some of the results of the 2001 AATF advisor survey as benchmarks, to assist in the making of future recommendations.

G. Financial Requirements

Many recommendations of the AATF have financial implications. Taken together, the funding that the AATF estimates is required for the recommendations totals approximately \$440,000 in one-time expenditures and \$2.1 million in continuing funds by the fourth year, including inflation. The resources can channel through either professional or faculty academic advising ([Appendix D: Recommended Ratios](#)).

1. The most significant need for funding concerns the recommendations having to do with attaining the appropriate ratio of faculty and professional academic advisors to undergraduate students in the colleges and departments. The details are found in Appendix D. The need for funding here arises from the substantial overloads on the advising system that currently exist when compared to the recommended ratios of students per advisor. For reasons set forth in Appendix D, **these recommended ratios are 20-25 majors or fewer per faculty member, or 400 majors per professional advisor, 300 undecided students per professional advisor, 750 students in need of general education advising per professional advisor, and 1000 students in need of supplemental academic advising (such as in the case of the health professions) per professional advisor..** The ratios are higher than those proposed by the Auditor General of the State of Arizona (see [Appendix D](#)).

Table I: Recommended Ratios of Advisors to Undergraduate Student Advisees

Faculty Advisors	20 – 25 or fewer advisees/faculty member
	400 major advisees/professional advisor, or
	300 undecided advisees/professional advisor, or
Professional Advisors	750 advisees for general education advising only/ professional advisor, or
	1000 advisees for supplemental advising only/ professional advisor

*For reasons also outlined in Appendix D, the AATF can only estimate the gap that exists between the number of students and present advising resources because of inconsistencies in the data. There is a need to make decisions and develop a database that fairly and equitably represents the number of advisees per department and college. **The AATF recommends that a representative group be established to decide upon and develop the necessary database for making decisions about this issue, and to check on the accuracy of all data upon which resource decisions are being made.** Based upon the preliminary data available to the Task Force, the AATF estimates that attaining the recommended ratios across the University will require approximately \$1.3 million in continuing funds. The AATF proposes a plan to phase in this recommendation in the next section of the Report.*

2. *Personnel for the Common Place, as described in [section II-C](#), will require approximately \$200,000 in continuing funds.*
3. *Based on admittedly incomplete data, the preliminary estimate of the AATF is that salary adjustments for academic advisors will call for approximately \$150,000 in continuing funds to bring professional academic advisors' salaries up to those of other comparable personnel at the University and peer institutions in terms of qualifications and responsibilities, and to address problems of compression.*

4. Recognition, reward, and professional development, as described in [section II-B, 4](#), requires approximately \$60,000 annually.
5. **The AATF recommends, finally, that a general fund be established with \$400,000 in continuing dollars needed to finance a variety of areas. These areas include (a) one-time expenditures (for examples, to create an on-line scheduling system for advisors, to assure that academic advisors have appropriate, updated equipment, and so forth); (b) additional academic advisors called for under the recommended ratios that re-analysis of the data discovers are necessary; (c) additional academic advisors required for colleges and departments able to demonstrate that the recommended ratios are clearly inappropriate in their cases; (d) units with a heavy service burden in terms of testing for placement, such as English and Math, that demonstrate they are stretched beyond their means; (e) additional staff support to serve academic advisors where the case is shown that present staff resources are clearly inadequate; and, (f) the carrying out of innovative unit, college, and university-wide proposals that have promise to improve academic advising above and beyond the assured minimum level of service.** Since this general fund is needed to finance continuing as well as one-time expenses, the total amount of the fund for each year will not remain at its original level, but rather the original level minus continuing commitments that have been funded from it. The amount needed for this fund is, and can only be, an estimate. It might need to be greater than \$400,000. The amount proposed for the fund is the equivalent of ten positions plus a continuing yearly fund of \$50,000 to support innovation in advising and updated equipment. The ten positions amount to less than one-third of the 36 needed new positions called for in this report. The AATF believes that this number of positions, or possibly more, will be necessary once the data are agreed upon and checked and the other areas of need described above (such as staff support) have been investigated.

There are two other crucial issues surrounding financial requirements. One has to do with changes in student demand over time. **The AATF recommends that the Provost establish a system to assure that the resources for academic advising can move from college to college as needed over time to reflect changes in student enrollments so that the appropriate student/advisor ratios can be maintained.** A second issue has to do with periods of time that call for budget cuts. In future years, colleges and departments may decide to cut expenditures of funds that have come to them from the University, through the students' tuition, for the purposes of enhancing academic advising. **The AATF recommends that the Provost along with the cabinet and SPBAC, with the support of representatives of the students, develop a system for determining how academic advising expenditures-especially those funded on student tuition raised for this purpose-should be treated in future department, college, and University budgetary cuts.**

H. Phase-in of the Recommendations

The recommendations of the AATF are intended to be phased-in over a three year period (see [Table II](#)). Several reasons create the need for a staged implementation of the recommendations. First, many questions exist about the data used to determine each college's and unit's ratio. [Appendix D](#) describes these questions. Nevertheless, it is possible in the first year (2002-03) to go ahead with commitments for positions where it can be certain that the data, no matter how they are interpreted, will support such a commitment. Using existing data, the AATF has identified commitments of this order amounting to about \$310,000 in continuing expenditures that are appropriate to fund in the first year.

Second, it is neither practical nor feasible to carry out some of the recommendations during the first year. For example, it is not advisable to reorganize the OAS and the FYC and devolve their responsibilities to the colleges in the first year. Planning must take place in order for this reorganization to succeed. To support planning for the reorganization, the AATF proposes that the phase-in start by creating 3.5 coordinator positions (one, each, for Humanities, Science, and SBS, and a half position for University College, the last of which would be temporary). In the first year, these positions would require \$120,000 in continuing expenditures and \$20,000 in one-time expenses. With the help of the individuals in these positions, the four colleges will be able to plan for the reorganization during the first year. Similarly, the recommendation for the establishment of awards and professional development grants requires time both to define them and then develop a process for awarding and granting them. As a result, expenditures for this purpose would not begin until the second year, as [Table II](#) suggests.

Third, there are some areas that need study in order to learn the dimensions of the problem. This is the case for salary adjustments. The AATF proposes that new academic advisors be hired at \$28,000 annually plus ERE. This means that during the first year all current academic advisors now paid beneath \$28,000 annually should be raised to that amount, or slightly higher. Using preliminary and incomplete data, once again, the AATF estimates that this will require approximately \$50,000 in continuing funds. During the first year, a study will determine any further equity and compression needs that exist, needs that can then be addressed during the second year. The AATF estimates that about \$100,000 in continuing funds will be needed, in addition to the \$50,000 from the first year, for this purpose.

Other items on Table II deserve explanation. The Table refers in the first year to "miscalculations." These are cases where units or colleges can show that the AATF has erred, against the unit or college, in its identification of commitments that should be funded in the first year. Table II contains enough funds to support one-to-two positions in this category in the first year. As a result, since these positions will be funded in the first year instead of waiting until the second or third year, the continuing funding needed for new positions would presumably go down by the same amount in the second and third year, which is why Table II categorizes this spending as a one-year expenditure. Another item on Table II that will likely raise questions is the funding for "lost positions." These are academic advisor positions that the colleges eliminated in the latest round of budget cuts. The AATF believes that these positions should have been looked upon as strategic saves in the budget cuts, and therefore that the positions should not have been eliminated. The funding for lost positions shown in Table II is meant to support any such positions that were eliminated in the latest budget cuts and to do so for two years, giving the University time to restore them in the third year (2004-05).

Table II contains totals for spending for each year of the proposed phase in. This includes how much of each total involves continuing expenditures and how much is a one-time expense.

Table II: Funding Requirements for Three-Year Phase-In of the Recommendations

Year 1 (2002-2003)	
9 unquestionable positions @ \$34,500 (rounded out)	\$310,000
3 reorganization positions @\$40,000	120,000
Common Place	200,000
One-time	
› Equipment>	60,000-95,000
› On-line training, (Cosmos capable) for advisors, training, manual, scheduling, etc.	70,000
› >9 positions due to miscalculations	35,000-70,000
› ½ reorganization position	20,000
Lost positions (one-time for two years)	70,000
Compression/equity ≤\$28,000	50,000
Total	\$970,000
One-time dollars	290,000
Continuing dollars	680,000

Year 2 (2003-2004)

7 positions @ \$36,000	\$576,000
9 reorganization positions *	
Compression/Equity	100,000

Awards/development	20,000
One Time-	
Lost Positions (second year)	70,000
Equipment, other	80,000
Total	\$846,000
One-time dollars	150,000
Continuing dollars	696,000

Year 3 (2004-2005) **

8 positions @ \$37,000	\$296,000
Awards/development	40,000
General Fund (see Report, section II, H- 5)	400,000
Total	\$736,000
One-time dollars	-----
Continuing dollars	736,000

Total (2002-2005)

Continuing Funds	\$2,112,000
One-time Funds	440,000

* General education advising moves to the colleges.

<** Mandatory advising becomes effective.

As Table II suggests, the phase-in involves numerous steps. To prepare for the second and third years, many different tasks need to be carried out during the first year ([Appendix K: Work to be Done During Year One](#)). Most of these tasks involve the need for further study before decisions can be made. Because of these considerations, **the AATF recommends that the administration appoint a phase-in team for assistance and advice.** Part of the membership of the phase-in team should include members of the AATF.

III. Summary

By the year 2001, undergraduate students were sufficiently upset about the operation of the academic advising system that they agreed to an increase in tuition with the proviso that funds be directed toward strengthening the advising system in order to make it effective. Surveys of students, faculty, administrators, and professional academic advisors all show the existence of many concerns having to do with the delivery of academic advising services. Indeed, the Vice President for Undergraduate Education established the AATF because of the many issues brought forward by students, by Deans, by faculty, and by professional academic advisors.

The goal is to attain a coherent and accountable academic advising system able to assure effective, timely, and accurate academic advising services to all students. The recommendations of the AATF form an integrated whole. Each of the recommendations builds upon and adds to the positive effects of the others and each in turn depends upon the others. Carrying out these recommendations together, phased in as proposed, will build the academic advising system that the University community is calling for and needs to fulfill its mission as a student centered research university.

The recommendations in this report represent a first step toward fixing a fractured system. The next step is to begin the phase-in process of deciding upon and implementing the recommendations designed to build an effective academic advising system. Additionally, there is a need to continue addressing areas requiring further analysis as itemized and described in [Appendix K](#). Creating the coherent, consistent, and accurate academic advising system we need cannot come about in a single year, but will take a continuing and on-going commitment over a number of years.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Compilation of Recommendations

This compilation of recommendations is intended solely as a reference. The format is chronological based upon the page number with no intended priority in the listing. The page number where the recommendation can be found in the report is listed after each of the recommendation. Please see the page citation to get the context and other related information relevant to the recommendation, and the remainder of the report for the interconnection among the recommendations. All financial implications, whether mentioned or not in the recommendation, are contained in sections [G](#) and [H](#) and [Table II](#). The recommendations are exactly as worded in the report except where considerations of context made some change necessary.

1. The AATF recommends that the general education advising functions currently provided by the Office of Academic Services and the Freshman Year Center should move into the colleges of the students they serve. To retain a consistent model for advising, all undergraduate students with no major selected should be advised by University College until they have selected a major. ([section II-A](#))
2. The AATF recommends that University College accept responsibility for advising two additional groups of students: those who have been disqualified from their college and have not gained entry into another, and those students who have been excluded from future enrollment in their present college due to failure to qualify for advanced standing and are also undecided about their academic options. Often these students in transition have nowhere to turn in the short-term for their academic advising. However, it important for these students to understand that access to advising from University College under these circumstances does not imply any guarantee of future admission either to University College or another UA college. ([section II-A](#))
3. To address issues of consistency, the AATF recommends that a representative working group of the colleges and other appropriate units should meet regularly to discuss questions relevant to academic advising and review how University-wide requirements are interpreted, adjusted, and upheld. ([section II-A](#))
4. The AATF recommends that all new students, including transfer students, keep mandatory advising appointments in individual meetings with their academic advisors during each of their first two semesters. ([section II-B, 1](#))
5. To assure that students are prepared for graduation, the AATF recommends that each student keep a mandatory advising appointment upon reaching 90 units (or some other identifier for nearing program completion). Such advising should take place in individual meetings that occur between the student and the academic advisor. ([section II-B, 1](#))
6. The AATF recommends that tuition revenue earmarked to improve undergraduate advising be targeted to create an assured minimum level of academic advising service. Considering that the present system is substantially overburdened, the projected cost to attain an assured minimum level of service for all students amounts to approximately \$1.3 million annually in continuing funds. ([section II-B, 1](#))
7. The AATF recommends that, through the Vice President for Undergraduate Education working with Admissions and consulting with the Co-Chairs of the AATF, further investigation of the summer orientation program be conducted during the 2002-2003 academic year specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of how the advising system is presented to students and the effectiveness of the advising experience itself during orientation. ([section II-B, 2](#))
8. The AATF recommends that advisors engage in training, respectful of their time, enabling them to have the appropriate information needed to be effective advisors and ensure that a basic foundation of knowledge about University and college policies, procedures, and program requirements exists for all advising appointments. ([section II-B, 3](#))
9. The AATF recommends that training for advisors be provided on-line as much as possible. It should require time only in those areas where the advisor is not already sufficiently knowledgeable. The AATF encourages the University also to consider a time frame in which seasoned advisors should refresh their knowledge base (perhaps every three years). ([section II-B, 3](#))

10. The AATF recommends that an on-line advising manual and training modules be developed which, together, would have a one-time cost of \$45,000. ([section II-B, 3](#))
11. The AATF recommends that each academic advisor be evaluated in an in-depth manner on an annual basis by his or her supervisor on criteria having to do with accessibility, knowledge, skills (e.g., interpersonal communication), and professional attitude. For faculty advisors, evaluation of their work should be a part of the process used to consider individuals for merit-based salary increases and for release time. Evaluation of advising must take into account information from students. ([section II-B, 4](#))
12. At the departmental level, the AATF recommends that academic advising should be made a specific component of each unit's 7-year Academic Program Review. ([section II-B, 4](#))
13. The AATF recommends that the University should recognize the finest academic advisors of the year (one faculty member, one professional advisor). ([section II-B, 4](#))
14. The AATF recommends that the Provost's Office sponsor an annual award for the unit or college that has achieved either the highest level of advising practice or made the greatest contributions to innovation in academic advising. ([section II-B, 4](#))
15. The AATF recommends that money be set aside for professional development grants for academic advisors. The total amount of the continuing money needed for individual awards (recommendation 13), unit awards (recommendation 14), and professional development grants is estimated at \$60,000 per year. ([section II-B, 4](#))
16. The AATF recommends that to address issues related to salary compensation and compression, \$150,000 in continuing dollars be set aside. This is a preliminary estimate based on incomplete data. The University needs to conduct a more detailed investigation through Human Resources to examine the salaries of advisors at the University, relative to other comparable personnel, in order to learn the precise extent of salary inequity and compression. ([section II-B, 4](#))
17. To address confusion regarding the similarities and differences among the roles of professional academic advisor, faculty advisor, counselor, mentor, and others, the AATF recommends that an investigation be conducted through the Department of Human Resources of the position titles currently used for professional advisors. A plan should then be developed that utilizes the definition of academic advising presented in this Report. ([section II-B, 4](#))
18. The AATF recommends that each academic advisor have assistance available from a front-line staff member who can make appointments and screen phone calls. Additionally, each academic advisor should have a computer that is Cosmos capable and access to a printer, fax machine, photocopier, telephone with voice mail, and basic office supplies. ([section II-B, 5](#))
19. In order to maintain confidentiality during appointments, the AATF recommends that every academic advisor should have access to a private office with sufficient space outside of that office where students can wait comfortably for meetings. ([section II-B, 5](#))
20. The AATF recommends the development of an on-line appointment scheduling system to serve academic advisors and students. The AATF estimates that such a facility will involve a one-time cost of \$125,000. ([section II-B, 5](#))
21. The AATF recommends that the Office of Vice President for Undergraduate Education form a working group in 2002-2003 to investigate the magnitude of the problem of information accuracy in students' electronic records by measuring the proportion of students' records accessible through Advisor Link in which errors exist as well as the overall proportion of data contained in students' records that is inaccurate. The working group should propose effective remedies if it considers the proportion of inaccurate data to be too great. ([section II-B, 6](#))
22. The AATF recommends that the University alter its policies and petitions procedure (for the purposes described in section II-B, 7) once the assured minimum level of service has been implemented. ([section II-B, 7](#))
23. The AATF recommends that a central resource, the Common Place, be established to assist both advisors and students. The Common Place should be both a physical space and a web space, in part serving to refer

advisors and students to the appropriate sources of advice and information and to be a home for an on-line academic advising manual and training modules for advisors. ([section II-C](#))

24. The AATF recommends an allocation of \$200,000 in continuing funds be made to adequately support the Common Place. ([section II-C](#))
25. The AATF encourages the rapid completion of DARS implementation to attain accurate information about transfer credits on students' transcripts. ([section II-D, 1](#))
26. The AATF recommends that Transfer Academic Counselor staff members have authority to evaluate transfer credit (in and out-of-state) and file any adjustments in the student record system upon the student's admission to the University. ([section II-D, 1](#))
27. The AATF supports the principles of the **Arizona Health Sciences Center and Main Campus Partnership for Advising Undergraduates Interested in Health Professions** proposal ([Appendix I](#)) and recommends a level of funding according to the guidelines set forth in [section II-G, 1](#) of the Report, and in [Appendix D: Recommended Ratios](#). Further, the AATF recommends that the Pre-Health Professions Advising Center be located centrally on main campus and administratively within the University College. ([section II-D, 2](#))
28. The AATF recommends that representative academic advisors serve on University bodies concerned with policy issues related to students. ([section II-E](#))
29. To develop a system of accountability, the AATF recommends that a working group be established to determine the specific outcome areas that should be measured, how to measure each area, and the progress expected to take place annually toward the outcome in each area. These measures should also include annual assessments of resources that have been expended to determine if they are sufficient to meet the recommended ratios of students to advisors; training and updating of advisors; and, funding necessary for institution-wide resources, such as the Common Place. ([section II-F](#))
30. The AATF recommends that academic advisors be surveyed regularly about training and job effectiveness and satisfaction, using some of the results of the 2001 AATF advisor survey as benchmarks, to assist in the making of future recommendations. ([section II-F](#))
31. For reasons outlined in [Appendix D](#), recommended ratios to create an assured minimum level of service are 20-25 majors or fewer per faculty member, or 400 majors per professional advisor, 300 undecided students per professional advisor, 750 students in need of general education advising per professional advisor, and 1000 students in need of supplemental academic advising (such as in the case of the health professions) per professional advisor. ([section II-G, 1](#))
32. To address questions about institutional data, the AATF recommends that a representative group be established to decide upon and develop the necessary database for making decisions about the distribution of resources (based upon the recommended ratios) and to check on the accuracy of all such data. ([section II-G, 1](#))
33. The AATF recommends that a general fund be established with \$400,000 in continuing dollars needed to finance a variety of areas. These areas include (a) one-time expenditures (for examples, to create an on-line scheduling system for advisors, to assure that academic advisors have appropriate, updated equipment, and so forth); (b) additional academic advisors called for under the recommended ratios that re-analysis of the data discovers are necessary; (c) additional academic advisors required for colleges and departments able to demonstrate that the recommended ratios are clearly inappropriate in their cases; (d) units with a heavy service burden in terms of testing for placement, such as English and Math, that demonstrate they are stretched beyond their means; (e) additional staff support to serve academic advisors where the case is shown that present staff resources are clearly inadequate; and, (f) the carrying out of innovative unit, college, and university-wide proposals that have promise to improve academic advising above and beyond the assured minimum level of service. ([section II-G, 5](#))
34. The AATF recommends that the Provost establish a system to assure that the resources for academic advising can move from college to college as needed over time to reflect changes in student enrollments so that the appropriate student/advisor ratios can be maintained. ([section II-G](#))
35. The AATF recommends that the Provost along with the cabinet and SPBAC, with the support of representatives of the students, develop a system for determining how academic advising expenditures-

especially those funded on student tuition raised for this purpose-should be treated in future department, college, and University budgetary cuts. ([section II-G](#))

36. Many of the above tasks involve the need for further study before decisions can be made. Because of this consideration, the AATF recommends that the administration appoint a phase-in team for assistance and advice. ([section II-H](#))

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix A: Charge Statement

Academic Advising Task Force December 2000

The overarching goal of the Academic Advising Task Force is to improve student success. With the goal of student success as a focus, the task force will consider the following issues related to academic advising and provide a preliminary report to Randall Richardson, Interim Vice President of Undergraduate Education, at the end of the 2001 spring semester. A final white paper on academic advising along with actionable recommendations/items is due at the end of fall semester 2001.

1. Define academic advising. Determine what resources are currently allocated to academic advising. Review how the institution interfaces with academic advisors. Identify examples of best practices regardless of structure in and outside the UA. Needed both to define expectations and more easily reward outstanding performance.
2. Examine the role of academic advising in student retention. What is the current relationship? What should/could it be? The University loses about 23% of the freshman class at the end of its first year, at significant cost to the individuals and the institution.
3. Evaluate how academic advising works with the significant population of undecided students and how that affects the integration of new students into the UA community. Consider that recruitment and new student class sizes will increase.
4. Evaluate how academic advising works with the significant population of transfer students and how that affects the integration of transfer students into the UA community.
5. Review the current practices for serving students requiring specialized advising (i.e. pre-health, pre-law, transfer, athletes).
6. Determine how we can more effectively integrate the services provided by professional, faculty, and peer advisors.
7. Evaluate current advising models and delivery systems (i.e. centralized, decentralized, dual, etc.) In this context, consider the role of OAS from a university-wide perspective.
8. Identify how academic advising inter-relates with academic counseling provided for special populations (i.e. DRC, SALT, student athletes).
9. Explore ways of using technology to improve advising on campus.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix B: Academic Advising Definition

Academic advising is a collaborative relationship between a student and an academic advisor. The intent of this collaboration is to assist the student in the development of meaningful educational goals that are consistent with personal interests, values and abilities. Although many individuals on campus, including academic advisors, may assist the student in making decisions and accomplishing goals, the academic advisor is granted formal authority by an academic unit (college, school, department) to approve the student's academic program of study and assist the student in progressing toward the appropriate degree. Effective academic advising also helps the student utilize the extensive network of academic support services available on campus, and empowers the student to realize the full undergraduate experience at the University of Arizona. To achieve this end requires the ongoing

involvement of the student, one or more academic advisors, and the institution. Each of these has unique roles and responsibilities.

The provision of distinguished educational programs and support services is central to the mission of the University of Arizona. Essential to this objective is the availability and delivery of quality academic advising that enhances the undergraduate experience for all students at the University. Regarding academic advising, the University's role is to:

- foster a campus community that promotes student success,
- provides the resources and professional development necessary for exemplary academic advising,
- seek input from advisors and students when considering and implementing policy and curricular changes, and
- recognize the value of excellence in academic advising.

Academic advisors provide academic assistance and individualized attention to promote each student's success at the University of Arizona. An academic advisor can share knowledge, experience and insight that is beneficial to the student. The advisor's role is to help the student evaluate and realize educational and career options. This requires the advisor to:

- approve the student's academic program of study,
- provide accurate and consistent information,
- clarify program requirements, policies and procedures,
- assist the student in identifying appropriate institutional resources,
- facilitate relationships between the student and other individuals on campus who may provide assistance, and
- uphold the academic standards of the institution.

A key tenet of academic advising is that student is responsible for his or her own decisions. Academic advisors exist because students require information and assistance to navigate the University system and to make appropriate decisions. The student's role is to explore academic, career and personal goals. This requires the student to:

- seek advising from appropriate advisors at appropriate times,
- learn academic program requirements,
- utilize available resources, including those that are web-based, to monitor academic progress, and
- take responsibility for actions and decisions that affect academic progress.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix C: Academic Advising Mission Statement

The University of Arizona recognizes academic advising to be a critical component of the educational experience of its undergraduate students. Through individual, collaborative relationships with academic advisors, students are best able to define and implement coherent educational plans that are consistent with their personal values, goals and career plans. While academic advising occurs most visibly in these individual relationships, a broad network of professionals, faculty, staff and students exists in support of the Institution's overall advising mission. The University acknowledges its obligation to provide students with accurate and timely academic advising, delivered through its academic departments and colleges, as well as through additional units and colleges devoted to specific student populations such as undecided, transfer, and pre-professional students, freshmen, and those with disabilities.

Goals:

As an institution, the goals of academic advising include helping students:

- clarify their life and career goals,
- develop suitable educational plans,
- select appropriate courses and complementary educational experiences,
- interpret institutional requirements,
- enhance their awareness of available educational resources (such as internship opportunities, honors, and tutoring programs),
- evaluate their progress toward established goals,
- assist them in completing degree requirements in a timely manner,
- develop decision-making skills,
- reinforce their self direction,
- seek out and use support services in the institution and the community,
- collect and distribute data regarding student needs, preferences and performance for use in making institutional decisions and policy.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix D: Recommended Ratios

Personnel Needs for Effective Academic Advising

To meet the advising needs of students satisfactorily, colleges/units cannot be so oversubscribed with student demand that it exceeds the capacities of their tenure, tenure-track faculty and professional academic advising personnel. According to the Dean of Students Spring 2001 Campus Climate Survey, the colleges with the heaviest student advising demand relative to the size of the tenure, tenure-track faculty and professional advisors now tend to receive poorer student satisfaction scores for their advising services. The reverse is the case for colleges with lower student demand relative to the size of their tenure, tenure-track faculty and professional academic advisors. The following two considerations are essential. The first point deals with the available faculty to serve as advisors and the second with the availability of professional academic advisors.

1. Some colleges with centralized advising, or units where advising is decentralized within the college, have excessive student advisee/faculty ratios. Within these colleges and units the student advisee/faculty ratio is sufficiently high as to make it difficult for faculty to meet appropriate advising needs of students as part of the *regular* activities of individual faculty (without additional compensation or release time). When does a student advisee/faculty ratio become excessive? The ratio would seem excessive when there are greater than 20 or 25 advisees per faculty member. This would then constitute more than about 5 percent of the faculty member's time during the academic year, especially if students not only utilize the advising system regularly, as the reforms hope to achieve, but also receive assistance from their faculty advisors for mentoring as well as for course selection. According to University data, the median unit (department) at the University contains about 11 student advisees per faculty member. There are some units, however, with far larger numbers of student advisees relative to faculty.

In order to ensure the proposed assured minimum level of academic advising services are able to occur and be effective, colleges/units with higher ratios than 20 or 25 student advisees per faculty member (what the Task Force calls an 'oversubscribed' college or unit) need assistance. Many of these oversubscribed colleges/units have 35, 40, or 50 advisees per faculty member. The top unit serves 116 undergraduate advisees per faculty member. Together, these colleges and units account for more than half of all undergraduate students at the University.

2. Some oversubscribed colleges/units already contain professional advisors, enabling their faculty to concentrate more on the mentoring aspect of advising. Given the high student demand, though, a number of these colleges/units continue to be oversubscribed. A college/unit that is oversubscribed with respect to students per faculty *remains oversubscribed* if the ratio of student advisees per professional

academic advisor is greater than 400/1 for declared students (students who have decided their majors) and 300/1 for undeclared students. Students who have double majors, pre-majors, and minors must also be considered where their situations create additional academic advising needs.

Because of the multiplicity of other demands on their time, professional academic advisors will be unable to meet individually with students in order to deliver the appropriate level of advising service if they face higher ratios than the ones just stated. Information gathered by the Task Force suggests that about 40 percent of the time of academic advisors of majors is spent in formally scheduled individual meetings with students. The remaining time goes to a variety of essential functions. These functions include preparing for the individual meetings with advisees; follow-up and trouble-shooting; e-mail correspondence with students; walk-in time allowing for non-scheduled meetings with students; meeting with prospective majors and parents, and recruiting new students; record-keeping; advising during orientation; working out transfer articulation; writing letters of recommendation; and, up-dating themselves on information and skills. Interviews with advisors suggest that while an average major needs about an hour per year in formally scheduled meeting time, about 30-40 percent of students need up to two hours, and a small minority (about 5 percent) need far more extensive time.

With this level of need, an advisor responsible for 400 students (that is, a 400/1 ratio) will spend about 750 hours a year in scheduled individual meetings with students including brief respites, or about 40 percent of the work hours of a full-time position. It should be noted that in 1994, in a report on the three state universities, the Auditor General of Arizona concluded that a ratio of 300 students to one professional advisor was appropriate (Auditor General, The Universities: The Student Experience, Performance Audit, October, 1994, p. 36). The AATF concludes, however, that effective and timely academic advising can occur with a ratio of 400/1.

With the above considerations in mind, the AATF has made the following recommendation for reforming the advising system: oversubscribed colleges/units should receive sufficient personnel resources such that, coupled with professional advising resources presently available to the college/unit, each is able to meet the appropriate 400/1 ratio for majors or, in the cases of undeclared students who have greater needs, a 300/1 ratio. Some units that are not now oversubscribed nevertheless have professional academic advisors. These advisors should remain with the unit, and not be reassigned, on the principle that the reform of the academic advising system should not result in a diminution of academic advising services for any student.

Data having to do with the numbers of majors of the various colleges and departments, and the presence of professional academic advisors, are not completely agreed upon. The University's data, for example, suggest that Computer Sciences has 170 majors whereas the unit reports that it serves 730 majors. The School of Art reports that it has 950 majors whereas University data report 767 majors. Many differences are small, but as these examples suggest, there are some situations where substantial differences exist between University data and what the units report. There are also issues about how double majors, pre-majors, and minors with substantial advising needs fit into the data and how they should be counted (a double major and a single major require different levels of advising assistance). Questions also face the data on the present numbers of professional academic advisors. These data come from a Task Force survey of all colleges and units. Responses to the survey were near but not entirely complete, and there may be some errors because of how the questions were interpreted. Given the many questions that exist, the Task Force provides an estimated cost based upon what must be understood as preliminary data. There is a need to decide upon and develop a database with which everyone feels comfortable. The Task Force recommends that a representative group be gathered during the summer and first semester of 2002-03 to decide upon and develop the necessary data base for making decisions on these matters.

Based upon the preliminary data available to the AATF (2001 institutional data for data on majors and faculty and the 2001 AATF administrative study for data on professional academic advisors) *oversubscribed* colleges and departments with more than 400 students need the equivalent of approximately 22 professional academic advisors beyond the assistance presently available to them. In addition, colleges becoming responsible for general education for their students and programs with substantial supplemental advising needs, such as the health professions, require the equivalent of approximately 14 professional academic advisors, using a ratio of 750 students per academic advisor for general education advising (three of these positions would need to be

coordinating positions at least on an interim basis) and 1000 students per academic advisor for supplemental advising needs. The financial cost for this total of 33 professional academic advisors (at \$34,500 for salary and ERE per academic advisor) and three coordinator positions (at \$40,000 for salary and ERE) comes to approximately \$1.3 million in continuing dollars, including adjustments for inflation during the three year phase-in.

Colleges and units may choose to use additional personnel resources that become available in order to hire new professional academic advisors. *Equally*, they may use the resources as additional compensation or released time for faculty advisors with a plan showing that the academic advising needs of their students will be effectively met.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix E: Orientation Program

In an attempt to learn about the new student orientation program from the student perspective, John Schwarz and Roxie Catts of the Academic Advising Task Force attended the June 16 and 17 orientation program as undecided freshmen.

While far from a 'scientific' study, attending orientation as a student was an enjoyable if exhausting experience. Everyone involved made us feel welcome. The Orientation Office even provided us with aliases and waived the registration fee.

Impressions

- Our overall impression of the orientation program was positive. In reflection, however, we feel two important elements of a general nature were missing. These have to do with the essence of a college education and why the UA is a special place. There was little discussion about what it means to join this community of higher education, the responsibilities associated with that experience, and how education enables students to grow as human beings apart from occupational goals. Furthermore, there is no discussion of what makes UA extraordinary and why one should be proud to attend this institution. We are thinking beyond the concept of Bear Down. The UA has much to be proud of in terms of people, academic programs and contributions to society. Now, orientation is virtually entirely mechanical and directed to occupational goals. One prospective student we know who attended a campus tour last spring made a similar comment; no message about what makes both a college education and the UA special.
- Also, there was hardly any discussion in the sessions we attended about how the advising system works, what students can expect from their advisors, and what the responsibilities of the students are.
- Because placement exams for English, math, and second language now occur during orientation, and because nearly all students need to take at least two placement exams, orientation in turn must be structured around the administration of these exams.
- While the student orientation leaders were friendly, outgoing, and energetic we question the consistency and quality of information they impart to incoming students especially when students meet in small groups with their student orientation leader. We saw a considerable range in abilities of student orientation leaders. We believe a stronger and more consistent arrangement would be to team up a UA staff member with the student orientation leader. This is obviously a resource issue but might provide opportunity for partnering with various campus units.
- We were impressed by the presentation for students undecided about their major conducted by the staff from the Freshman Year Center. The information was positive, upbeat, and useful. The presentation could have been even better if we could have been broken into smaller groups thereafter and met in a room with tables and chairs as opposed to an auditorium. With further discussion and exploration some students might find that they are leaning towards a group of similar majors in one college. With the AATF proposed staffing of 300 students undecided about their major per professional advisor and the ability to further explore interests in small groups, there may be additional students who realize they are leaning towards a particular cluster of majors within a college. It would be useful for those students who have a general sense of their major to attend the appropriate college meeting later in the day. The colleges would in turn need

to be prepared to appropriately advise students undecided about a major in their college. We realize that to some extent this already occurs.

- All of the student assistants were courteous and welcoming. However, they need to remember that not all freshmen are 18. Throughout the event we were consistently ushered to the 'parent' line. While amusing to us, non-traditional students could take offense at the honest mistake.
- The two-day event was absolutely exhausting with running from one placement exam to the next, and one meeting to the next. We are obviously quite familiar with campus, yet we found it challenging to find some of the more obscure rooms scattered across campus. Day one began at 7:00 a.m., and if we had taken our Spanish placement exam, it would have been after 5:30 p.m. before we finished day one. It is no wonder that students have difficulty absorbing the vast amount of mechanical information they receive during orientation.

Related Issues

- **Math Readiness Test (MRT):** Quite often students arrive with either AP credit or community college transfer credit for one, or more, semesters of calculus. They do not need to take the MRT. However, these students face countless registration difficulties both at orientation and in subsequent semesters when they register for introductory courses in science because these courses are programmed to look for an MRT. The system should recognize equivalent transfer credit and allow these students to register on-line for courses currently programmed to only look for the MRT (Chem 103a, 105a, MCB 181R, 181L, etc.). A similar registration difficulty exists for PHIL 110. This problem is not specific to the Orientation Program, however, it is one that begins there and can haunt students for several semesters.
- Each year we happen across students who registered without having attended their college advising meetings or having met with an academic advisor. Apparently this is accomplished by having a 'friend' who works as a student leader. For them an unfortunate pattern is established at orientation.

Conclusion

Based on our experience we believe the focus of the orientation program should emphasize the meaning of higher education, why the UA is special alongside the other needed information and should shift away from its current structure around placement exams. In addition, an in-depth discussion of student services and the value and importance of academic advising should take place. Exploration of orientation programs of peer institutions to learn how they handle placement in math, English, and foreign language courses should be a priority. Is the MRT, for example, a better indicator of placement in math than the students' entrance exam scores? A review of historical data should shed light on the validity of the MRT as compared to other placement data. Another placement option might be an on-line MRT. We understand that there will be more opportunities for students within Arizona to take the MRT prior to attending orientation in the summer of 2002. While helpful, however, it alone will not eliminate the current need to structure the entire orientation program around the placement exams.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix F: Technology

In the Task Force's Progress Report, over one third of the identified concerns were technology related. Of these concerns all can be addressed within the following four important areas of technical support to promote successful academic advising.

1. Advisor PCs that meet minimum requirements to run all necessary student service programs.
2. An On-line academic advising manual.
3. Training modules.
4. On-line advising scheduling system.

The most basic need is a desktop computer that is compatible with Cosmos and meets the minimum requirements for all student-related services. All advisors who work with students and their academic records will need to be

inventoried. This would necessitate a one-time investment by The University of Arizona to upgrade or replace the computers for current academic advisors and the appropriation of funds for all new hires thereafter. To determine the one-time cost, each college would need to inventory the current equipment and compare it to the minimum requirements and submit their request. For example, the College of Fine Arts inventoried their advisor computers and found that nearly all the computers will need to be replaced to run Cosmos. This may be common across campus. At \$1500 per replacement, the cost to do so for all professional academic advisors would be about \$110,000 in one-time funding with faculty advisors' needs adding to that.

An essential key to good academic advising is communication. The task force has found that the lack of a centralized accurate resource for information, procedures and policies is extremely problematic for students and advisors across campus. The on-line advising handbook would be an online referral resource for students looking for accurate information about the available advising across campus in the colleges, schools and departments. It will also serve as the central resource for advisors on campus for the policies and procedures that affect student academic advising and the interpretation of the policies for implementation. The on-line advising handbook will require an initial development period and then ongoing support to maintain and update as needed. To develop this advising handbook requires first the gathering (student workers can assist with this process) and assessment of existing paper and online advising manuals from the main university resources across campus. Once these are reviewed, they must be compiled into one central manual (the Director of the Common Place). The manual must then be evaluated by the Office of Curriculum and Registration and other applicable units for accuracy. Web development by CCIT's UAWeb team would then need to develop the overall format of the on-line manual with ongoing upkeep and support being provided by a technical support Systems Analyst. Initial cost to develop the manual will be approximately \$5,000.

All academic advisors need training. Student concerns about the lack of consistent and accurate information from advisors across campus can be heard in all corners of the university. Finding the information and time to complete necessary training is an obstacle faculty and professional advisors find equally difficult and frustrating. Besides initial training, advisors also require supplemental on-going training to keep up with the evolving university policies and procedures. To provide consistent and accurate information across campus, and to develop a training program that is easy for advisors to utilize, on-line advising training modules will be developed. These modules will have tracking that will verify the completion of essential modules. This will allow sequential training for areas such as FERPA and SIS, which require successful completion in a specific order. Once the university wide modules are developed, college specific modules can be done on a consulting basis. The initial cost for the development will be \$40,000 in one-time funds.

The fourth and final aspect responds to the need for more advanced technological support for students and advisors in scheduling appointments, notifying students automatically of upcoming requirements and developing a mode for automated student responses to advisor appointments to track outcomes. This is already available in colleges on our campus and can be developed for campus wide use. Making available these technological advances to all our students and advisors in all colleges will upgrade the advising across campus. Initial development will cost approximately a one-time \$125,000 with ongoing maintenance through the technical support provided by the Common Place.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix G: Student Assessment

Whatever criteria and standards are selected for annual reviews, it is essential that the reviews of the performance of academic advisors be informed by feedback from undergraduate advisees. An example of a method for gathering student feedback (apart from some form of periodic sample survey) comes from the Eller College of Business and Public Administration. In that College, students schedule appointments with their academic advisors, using *Student Link* as the entry point to an electronic appointment scheduling system. Through this system, an e-mail reminder is sent to each student the day before the appointment. The e-mail also offers suggestions about how the student should prepare for the appointment. In addition, it automatically generates a SAPR (Student

Academic Progress Report) the day of the appointment. Then, following the appointment, a second e-mail is sent to each student requesting that the student evaluate his or her recent appointment (the e-mail assures the student of complete anonymity). The e-mail asks the student three questions and also provides a comment field for the student to assess his or her advising experience and to make recommendations for improvement.

The first question on the evaluation gauges if the student accomplished what he or she wanted accomplish in and following the appointment. The second question gauges if the student had confidence in the advice he or she received. The third question gauges whether the advisor attempted to get to know the student and whether the advisor conveyed interest in the student during the appointment. Each question is measured by the following ratings: Strongly agree, agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, strongly disagree. A sample copy of the questionnaire can be found and reviewed at (<http://survey.eller.arizona.edu/survey.asp?SurveyID=3>). Other questions can be asked, of course, depending upon the criteria and standards used in the evaluation.

With respect to feedback, all academic advisors have access to the evaluation results of their own appointments. The "Advisor Scheduling System" provides the data and percentiles on the three evaluation questions and a summary of comments that students submitted. Advisors can review the feedback by day, week, month, or year. Supervisors, in turn, can view the results for all advisors and can also view the number and length of appointments for each advisor over a day, week, month, or year as well as the number of web hits by students indicating successful and unsuccessful attempts to make appointments in the advising system.

The results provide needed feedback so that advisors can learn their strengths and areas of weakness, enabling them to improve. In addition, the results serve as a foundation to introduce student experiences on an ongoing basis and during yearly reviews of academic advisors.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix H: Summary of the Transfer Subcommittee's Activities

The Transfer Subcommittee was comprised of the following representatives: Thomas Willard, Undergraduate Education; William Fee, Transfer Curriculum and Articulation; Matthew Mars, Eller College of Business and Public Administration; Julie Newman, Office of Academic Services; Karen Weaver-Sommers, Psychology Department; William Matter, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; Bryan Tinlin, Curriculum and Registration; Laura Kenbeek, student; Alyssa Forceheimes, student; and Ann Huber, Transfer Center (Chair)

We began to meet in January of 2001. The original charge of the subcommittee was to:

"Evaluate how academic advising works with the significant population of transfer students and how that affects the integration of transfer student into the UA community."

We divided the charge into two components: 1) evaluate how advising works with transfer students at the UA; and 2) how does that advising affect the integration of transfer students into the UA community.

In the fall semester we interviewed our academic colleagues to determine how each college works with transfer students. The information collected addressed some of the mechanics regarding how advising occurs on campus for transfer students and/or students with transfer credit. Additionally, we learned that some colleges/departments prefer to see prospective transfer students earlier in the transfer process than others.

What was not addressed is how students with transfer credit are actually utilizing the advising community on campus, and at what stage of the transfer process they contact our academic advisors. Further, it did not address the level of transfer student satisfaction with advising at the UA or how the process contributed to their

integration into the campus community. Focus groups and student surveys were anticipated for the spring semester.

Additionally in the fall we identified peer institutions and collected information from them regarding transfer student issues. Much of this information was collected from the Internet. In the spring, we requested that a current UA (transfer) student reviewed the web sites. Her review demonstrated that the UA web sites for transfer students fell short. The Transfer Subcommittee has recommended a list of links that should be easily located and accessed for the prospective transfer student population. Much of this information is already available, but some difficult to find. That list of easily accessible links can be found in this appendix.

We developed questions for the various surveys that were coordinated through the subcommittees of the Task Force. Additionally, we developed, with significant assistance from Elena Berman, Teri Nelson and Brett Bendickson, a Transfer Student Advising Survey that was distributed via e-mail to 1200 transfer students who first enrolled at the UA in the fall of 2001. Approximately 300 students responded. The results of the survey and a review of the results can be found in this appendix.

Further, the history and job description of the Transfer Academic Counselor was presented to the Task Force. This position is housed in the Transfer Center, which is a component of the Office of Admissions and New Student Enrollment. These staff members currently provide admission and academic counseling to prospective student in the Arizona community colleges that they visit, as well as to prospective students (from in and out-of-state) who visit the office or contact them via phone and e-mail. The prospective students with whom they work could be transferring to the UA in the near or distant future.

Transfer Academic Counselors train with UA college representatives to provide academic counseling across colleges. They do not currently have "signature authority." It was recommended by the Task Force that a job description of their responsibilities be submitted, and include "signature authority" for UA general education courses from both in- and out-of-state institutions, for all UA colleges. This proposal can be found in this appendix.

Finally, based on the results of the Transfer Student Advising Survey, the ASUA Student Survey and the results of the New Transfer Student Survey conducted during Express Orientations, the Transfer Subcommittee has developed a set of recommendations that they believe will facilitate the transfer student's ability to better integrate into the university community. These recommendations are included in this appendix.

Transfer Student Issues and Recommendations

Issue: Students seek clear and consistent advising information from both Arizona community college advisors and UA advisors.

Recommendations:

1. Provide ongoing training to UA advisors through:
 - a. web information from UA links;
 - b. web information from statewide CAS links;
 - c. develop an advising certificate program at the UA;
 - d. provide training for all new advisors, staff and faculty who accept advising responsibilities;
 - e. develop an easily identifiable resource (Common Place) for advisors and students to utilize when clarification of policy is required.
2. Provide ongoing training to advisors in the Arizona community colleges in the following ways:
 - a. develop clear web links for the state wide website;
 - b. continue to enhance the Transfer Guides for easy functionality for community college students, advisors and UA staff and faculty;

- c. provide on going training as Transfer Academic Counselors visit those community college locations for pre-transfer advising sessions;
- d. develop excellent web training for use by UA and other academic advisors.
- 3. Provide funding annually for a Community College Advisors Training Program on the UA campus.
- 4. Support the statewide Arizona Academic Advising Task Force.

Issue: Students use the web to find a UA academic advising resources.

Recommendations:

- 1. Develop a common page on each UA college web page that will direct students to appropriate advisors within each college; or
- 2. Develop an advisors web page that will direct prospective students to appropriate advisors.

Issue: Prospective transfer students use the web to access information regarding the applicability of their transfer courses and to help plan what courses to take prior to enrollment.

Recommendations:

- 1. Develop a comprehensive web site that explains the Arizona Course Applicability System ([AzCAS](#)) and how to use it. Include appropriate links.
- 2. Develop a comprehensive web site that explains the UA general education structure, and how out-of-state courses, and courses for Arizona four year universities can be applied toward it.

Issues: Accurate transcript evaluations.

Recommendations:

- 1. Encourage the rapid completion of DARS implementation. This will minimize the number of errors in transcript evaluations.
- 2. Investigate the utility of SPEEDE/Express which will allow the electronic submission of transcripts. This, too, will minimize the number of transcript evaluation errors. Consider a pilot program with Pima Community College

Issue: Enhanced communication between Transfer Academic Counselors and UA departmental academic advisors.

Recommendations:

- 1. Develop a communication vehicle in COSMOS that allows the storing of advising information for students in the prospect phase;
- 2. Develop, through COSMOS, the ability to move stored information on prospects to the applicant record;
- 3. Ensure ongoing training of the Transfer Academic Counselor by each UA college.

Responsibilities for the Transfer Academic Counselor

Transfer Academic Counselors will be formally trained, on a regular basis, by appropriate UA undergraduate college representatives, on how to most effectively apply transfer credit toward UA general education. They will be able to advise prospective (pre-enrolled) students in-state, who are planning to complete the AGECE, as well as those who are not. They will also advise students from out-of-state institutions. Major and minor advising will be done by UA college/departmental advisors, except where information is available on transfer guides.

It is recommended (with the exception of the Eller College of Business) that Transfer Academic Counselors have the authority to decide how transfer courses will apply toward a student's general education curriculum, whether the course work was completed at an in or out-of-state institution. A consistent system for recording this information must be developed (perhaps through Cosmos) so UA college advisors know what agreements have been made

between the Transfer Academic Counselor and the student. This system would facilitate the sharing of similar information between UA departments and colleges as continuing students change majors.

Additionally, Transfer Academic Counselors will continue to be trained admission officers, understanding and applying appropriate policies and practices during the review of admission applications, in order to make appropriate admission decisions for transfer students, as well as freshmen. These responsibilities also include time scheduled in the Office of Admissions to address the questions and concerns of prospective students, counselors and other constituents.

Ideally, prospective transfer students will be referred to the UA college/department one full semester prior to enrolling at the UA and/or upon completion of their general education requirements, to ensure that there are no additional courses needed to make a smooth academic transition. Students will be referred earlier to those UA colleges that request early referral.

Because many students transfer with many more than 36 units, it is paramount that UA colleges and departments must have adequate advising resources to accommodate prospective students. Other categories of students to be served by their UA college advisor include concurrently enrolled students, students who wish to re-enroll, and students admitted as non-degree seeking.

The value of Transfer Academic Counselors includes, the ability to provide accurate and consistent general education and admission information to students prior to enrolling at the UA. They assist students in effectively negotiating all aspects of the transfer process. They provide UA visibility, and serve the students and staff at the Arizona community colleges. Additionally, because of their cross-college training in general education, they can provide some direction in the selection of appropriate majors, to students uncertain about career choices, particularly when math, second language and science requirements are in question.

Members of the Academic Advising Task Force agreed that Transfer Academic Counselors are not the required first stop for prospective transfer students. Students who contact an academic department prior to the Office of Admissions and New Student Enrollment, should not be turned away. UA departments/colleges must have the resources to serve prospective students. Transfer Academic Counselors compliment the work of departmental/college advisors in so far as having a broader "reach" by visiting the community colleges statewide. Additionally, their admission training enhances their ability to serve prospective students as they develop transfer timelines.

Recommended Transfer Students Web Links

Transfer Application Process

- When to apply [develop]
- How to apply [already exists - enhance]
- Admission Criteria [already exists - enhance]
- On-line application [already exists]
- Campus visitation opportunities [already exists]

Requesting UA materials [already exists]

Transfer Center [already exists but dress it up]

Role:

- Pre-transfer advising (also, what student can expect)
- Admission counseling

Visiting Arizona community colleges:

Visitation schedule for Pima Community College
Visitation schedule for other Arizona community colleges

College/Departmental Advising for transfer students [develop - include link(s) to college advisors]

Transferring from an Arizona Community College [link to CAS - outline what it can do for the student]

Course Applicability System

Transfer Guides
Course Equivalency Guide
Planning Guides

Transferring from another Arizona four year school (e.g.: Arizona State University; Northern Arizona University; Grand Canyon University; etc.) or an out-of-state (2 or 4 year) college or university.

Evaluation of transcripts

Admission Office role
Advisor role

Explanation of UA General Education Structure [translated into traditional general education curricula]

Planning Guides by college [or APRR's that are more clear]

Transfer of Credit Policy [already exists]

Where to send transcripts [already exists]

Errors in transcript evaluation
Transfer Credit Appeals

Transfer Checklist [develop]

Transfer Orientation [enhance]

Role
Which colleges require it
Types of Orientation
Signing up on line

Registering for Classes [develop - include that new students are generally the last to register and tips on how to deal with registration for the first term.]

Transfer FAQs [develop - include AGECE questions]

Selecting the correct catalog year

Related Links

UA General Catalog
UA Colleges
UA Services

Career Services
Financial Aid
On Campus Housing
Off campus housing

Summary of the Transfer Student Advising Survey

Introduction

The Transfer Student Advising Survey was developed as a web based survey. An e-mail was sent, the evening of October 25, 2001, to approximately 1200 first year transfer students who enrolled at the University of Arizona in the fall of 2001. Approximately 300 students responded. The complete survey results are included in this appendix.

The limitations of the survey include the fact that the "Comments" section (question 19) truncated answers exceeding 250 characters. This was discovered the first day of the survey. Although that could not be corrected, a message was sent to appropriate students indicating their comments would not be completely submitted, so they had the opportunity to shorten them.

A review of the survey follows. It is important to note two things. First, there is great room for improvement in the transfer process and the transfer advising experience. However, we would be remiss not to recognize that many aspects of advising, and those providing this service, are successful.

Review of data

Questions 1-3. Students were asked if they attempted to talk with a UA academic advisor prior to being admitted (n=303): 51 % attempted to do so. 55% of those spoke with a college and/or departmental advisors at the UA campus; 39% spoke with advisors in the Office of Admissions or a UA advisor at an Arizona community college. Eighty percent of those students who spoke with someone, thought the information provided was useful or very useful.

Questions 4-6. They were then asked if they attempted to learn how many courses would transfer to the UA prior to being admitted (n=295): 68% attempted to learn how many of their courses would transfer; 76% were able to receive that information; 24% of those received it from the web; 41% from advisors; and 21% from the admission office. Fifteen percent were uncertain of the source of their information.

Questions 7-8. Regarding participation in Orientation (n=295): 79% indicated that they participated in Orientation. Of those who did not: 58% had an individual appointment with a UA advisor and 26% participated in the Pima Community College Transfer Strategies course (STU 210).

Question 9. Regarding the acceptance of credit into the UA **general education structure** (n=294): 80% indicated that "Most or all of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted"; 17% indicated that "Some of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted"; and 3.4% indicated that "Few to none of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted."

Question 10. Regarding transferring courses into the UA **major** (n=292): 67% indicated that "Most or all of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted"; 22% indicated that "Some of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted"; and 11% indicated that "Few to none of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted".

Question 11. When asked if the web was used to access information about the transfer process (n=293): 68% indicated that they used the web to access information about the transfer process.

Question 12. Regarding the utility of the web to find the appropriate academic advisor (n=236): 66% indicated that the information was useful or very useful.

Question 13. When asked how useful the web was in answering specific questions regarding how courses transferred (n=235): 52% indicated that it was useful or very useful.

Question 14. Students were asked from what type of school or schools they transferred. (They were asked to check all that applied: n=381): 44% of the responses indicated out-of-state schools; 34% of the responses indicated Pima Community College; 6% another 4 year Arizona school; 6% a Maricopa Community College District campus; and 9% other Arizona community colleges.

Question 15. Regarding the use of tools for Arizona community college transfer students, (They could check all that applied: n=262): 37% used the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC); 27% used the transfer guides; 15% used none of the tools and 15% did not attend an Arizona Community College.

Question 17-18. Regarding the number of units completed before transferring (n=330): 42% had more than 64 units; 35% had 46-64 units; 19% had 24-45 units and .9% less than 24 units. (Note: this survey was sent to students with 24 or more units.) The number of units that transferred: 20% had more that 64 units transfer; 40.6% had 46-64 units transfer; 28% had 24-45 units transfer; 4.2% had less than 24 units transfer and 7% did not know how many of their units transferred.

Review of student comments

The comments, of which there were 101, have been divided into several categories. The categories, and number of comments for each category, follows. If a student had comments in more than one category, one comment per category was recognized. If the student had multiple comments in one category, it was only counted once.

Neutral (no real evaluation of the transfer advising process)	3
Positive comments about advisors and/or the process	26
Critical (unfavorable comments about advisors and/or the process)	55
Recommendations for the University	21

Some of notable themes:

- A number of advisors are doing a fine job. Some students named names!
- Orientation was mentioned a number of times, most comments being critical. Orientation for 2001 was perceived, overall, as not providing useful information. [Summer 2001 Orientation or Express Service programs were coordinated through individual colleges, not the Orientation Office. Some colleges required Orientation or Express Service while others do not.] One did indicate: "Great orientation."
- Some students felt that their advisors were not interested in their academic goals or even interested in spending time advising them.
- Regrettably, seven students implied that they were going to leave the UA or wish they didn't transfer here.
- A couple indicated that their time at the UA would be longer than expected.
- Many indicated that they received too many conflicting answers to the same question or were given the run around.
- There were some critical comments of a couple administrative offices as well as some academic offices regarding service, availability of staff and friendliness.
- Better web information was requested.

- AGECE was mentioned several times. There was concern regarding when it should be certified. One student wanted to transfer UA classes to a Maricopa Community College to complete AGECE, but neither the UA advisor nor the CC advisor could provide good direction.
- Concern was expressed by several students that there should be better communication between the community colleges and four year schools in Arizona regarding AGECE, and the transferability of classes from other four year schools.
- Several believe there should be more advisors.
- Consider advisors specifically for general education, or all advisors should be in one place.
- One advisor for all four years unless the major is changed was recommended.
- Several expressed concern about transferring from out-of-state, that it was not an easy process.
- A couple were concerned about the accuracy of the transcript evaluation.

In summary, the students have indicated that communication, training, and better dissemination of information (via web and staff/advisors) are critical. Additionally, they expect a customer service attitude, accuracy and accessibility. They want consistent information regardless of who provides it. Further, students need a better understanding of the tools to facilitate the transfer process, and those tools available once they enroll, for a better understanding of how they reach their academic goals.

Finally, for a better understanding of the type of experience students had by college, it is recommended that the Office of Assessment and Enrollment Research be commissioned/enlisted to evaluate the survey responses based on student majors.

**Transfer Student Advising Survey
Fall 2001**

1. Before being admitted to the UA, did you attempt to talk with a UA academic advisor?

Yes	156	51%
No (if no, skip to 4)	147	49%

2. If yes, with whom did you *first* speak?

UA advisor in a UA College advising office (e.g. Engineering and Mines; Eller College of Business and Public Administration; Nursing; etc.)	52	34%
UA advisor in the Office of Admissions	35	23%
UA advisor in an academic department office (e.g. Psychology, Political Science, Computer Science, etc.)	31	20%
UA advisor visiting an AZ community college	24	16%
Not Sure	10	7%

3. How useful was the information provided during that conversation?

Very useful	49	29%
-------------	----	-----

Useful	87	52%
Not very Useful	24	5%
Not Usefully at all	9	5%

4. Did you attempt to learn how many of your courses would transfer to the UA before you were admitted?

Yes	201	68%
No (if no, skip to 7)	94	32%

5. Were you able to obtain this information?

Yes	160	77%
No	49	23%

6. From what source did you receive that information?

Advisor	73	40%
Web	43	23%
Admissions Office	37	21%
Other	24	14%
PCC	10	
All of the above	3	
Previous school	3	
AGEC	1	
Letter of acceptance	1	
Looked it up/research	1	
Orientation packet	1	
Track Coach	1	
UA Extended University	1	
HDE 105	1	
Two of the above and sister	1	

7. Did you participate at Orientation at the UA?

Yes (if yes, skip to 9)	233	79%
No	62	21%

8. If you did not participate in Orientation, how did you receive advising?

Individual appointment with a UA academic advisor.	38	58%
Pima Community College's HDE 105 (STU 210) course	17	26%
Other	8	12%
Advanced Standing Orient.	1	
College of Pharmacy	2	
Engineering & Mines	1	
Phone/e-mail advising	2	
Walk-in advising	1	
PCC advisor		
Did not speak with a UA academic advisor prior to registering	3	4%

9. Which one of the following statements best describes your experience transferring courses into the UA's general education structure?

Most or all of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted	235	80%
Some of the courses I expected to Transfer were accepted	49	17%
Few to none of the courses I expected To transfer were accepted	10	3%

10. Which one of the following statements best describes your experience transferring courses into you UA major?

Most or all of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted	196	67%
Some of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted	64	22%
Few to none of the courses I expected to transfer were accepted	32	11%

11. Did you use the web to access information about the transfer process?

Yes	200	68%
No	93	23%

12. How useful was the web in guiding you toward finding the appropriate academic advisor at the UA?

Very useful	43	18%
Useful	121	51%
Not very useful	56	24%
Not useful at all	16	7%

13. How useful was the web in answering specific questions regarding how courses transferred?

Very useful	18	8%
Useful	104	44%
Not very useful	86	37%
Not useful at all	27	11%

14. From which school(s), or type(s) of school(s) did you transfer?

Pima Community College	128	34%
Out-of-state 4-year school	93	24%
Out-of-state comm. college	75	20%
Other Az. comm. college	36	9%
MCCCD (Glendale CC, Mesa CC, etc.)	25	7%
Arizona 4-year school	24	6%

15. Students transferring from an Arizona community college have many tools available. If you transferred from an Arizona community college, which, if any of the following did you use: (*Check all that apply.*)

Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC)	97	37%
Transfer Guides	72	27%
Did not transfer from an Arizona comm. College	45	17%
Did not use any of the above	40	15%
Arizona Course Applicability System (AzCAS)	4	2%
Academic Pathways	4	2%

16. What is your major at the UA?

Agriculture	15	Architecture	5	Business	81
Education	37	Engineering	25	Fine Arts	21
Health Prof.	9	Humanities	18	Nursing	6
Pharmacy	10	Science	37	SBS	53
University	9	Unknown	3		

17. How many units did you complete before transferring to the UA?

More than 64	134	42%
46-64	116	35%
24-45	63	19%
Less than 24	3	1%
Don't know	9	3%

18. How many units transferred to UA?

More than 64	66	20%
46-64	134	41%
24-45	93	28%
Less than 24	14	4%
Don't know	23	7%

19. Do you have any other comments regarding your advising experience that have not been addressed in this survey?

- no (6)
- No, thank you. (2)
- Advise when the best time is to send AGEC to allow for sufficient time for registration
- Advising in [dept] rushed and not indepth, could have been given lists of courses needed or explanations better to plan more than a semester in advance and figure out time to finish.
- Advisor was not interested in what courses I was planning on taking. Well, they gave me advice about the first course that I mentiaoned I was going to try to register for and then they said "good! welcome to the department!" and then ended th [truncated]
- Advisor was not very interested in knowing what courses I was planning on taking, did not seem interested in giving advice about courses, more fufilling requirements.
- Advisors at the UofA are really helpful in giving students a good insight into their majors and help focus us on acheiving our goals. From my personal experience, i think all the advisors do a great job especially Bridget and Mark, the Pre-Busi [truncated]
- Advisors need to help students pick the classes they will need when transferring to the UofA. I had a hard time and took classes that I did not have to take.
- ADVISORS WERE VERY HELPFUL
- Amy Chandler was extremely helpful.
- At orientation I was advised to take classes that would require me to be at the UofA longer. These where classes that where only offered during fall. This will prevent me from taking upper division courses until 2003.
- At orientation I was advised to take classes that would require me to be at the UofA longer. These where classes that where only offered during fall. This will prevent me from taking upper division courses until 2003. THAT SUCKS!!!!

- Be more prepared with transfer students, I lost a semester due to lack of knowledge with the advisor. And it is hurting me so now i will be here for longer amount of time. I am not to proud of the advising system here.
- Because I transferred credits from an out-of-state college, I was automatically classified as a non-resident, although I had been employed by the University for almost two years at that point. Out-of-state credits do not necessarily mean out-o [truncated]
- Being a transfer student I was placed with an advisor at random. The one I received was not helpful with transferring my credits to the appropriate classes here. I had to meet with 2 other advisors before everything was straightened out.
- Considering i was a trasfer from Pima East which I attended for 2 years, I was counted as an out of state person for some odd reason which made my enrollment a very slow and confusing process.
- Continue to follow-up with incoming transfer students, in that, they will continue to pursue their college goals.
- Didn't have a very pleasant transition. Many clerical errors throughout my first semester. It took nearly the whole semester for it to get straightened out. Too many advisors giving different answers to the same questions was another prom [truncated]
- Elaine Marcello(sp) has been excellent, almost everyone else has been non helpful and my suggetion is that you get people who want to work at the UofA to do so. I am very disappointed with the U so far.
- Great orientation.
- I am a student of the Arizona International College, and i believe that there should be priority advising for us. It is a huge dissapointment that I transferred to AIC, only to have to tranfer again. More advising would be appreciated.
- I am not sure whether it is the responsibility of Pima or the UA to notify students, but it is not abundantly clear to transfer students that they must get their AGEC certified for it to transfer to UA.
- I attend the UA South Campus and found that your survey did not specify which campus I did or did not have problems or successes when transferring to the UA. The transfer experience from a community college to the UA South went very smooth.
- I could use computer sabe and it would make information a lot easier to access.
- I do not fit your definition of transfer student. I completed a four year degree (BS Biology). My goal is to earn an RN degree in addition to my BS and MPH.
- I don't think the SAPR and other tools that are supposed to help you were explained very well. There are still a lot of things about classes I can take etc. that I am still learning about on my own.
- I felt when I met with an advisor the first time that he was trying to get me out of his office. I had a bunch of questions, but by his responses and fidgiting I didn't get all of them answered, and I felt that was negative.
- I found that during the transfer process, I was given different information regarding the process from every advisor I met with, including the transfer adivisor. Also, a better orientation should be planned for advanced standing students.
- I got transfered here from Kurushetra University, Haryana, India.
- I have been extremely frustrated by the entire experience; to the point where had I not had a grant, I'm not sure that I would have perservered through the process.
- I have been slightly frustrated at having to go to so many places to speak to people. All advisors should be in one building or closeby. When I first arrived I was going all over the place.
- I have been transfered a few times in this country. It seems like the transferring process in this school is the most complicated I have ever had. I don't think the orientation meeting is very important for me. I perfer personal advisor.

- I have had extreme difficulties with residency situations and will no longer be attending the University as of Spring 2002.
- I have previous U of A credits that do not show up on my transcripts. Where are they? I have a record of their existence from the registrar, and wonder why they don't apply to my credits.
- I have tried to meet with an advisor twice in[college], but both times the meeting was canceled. Now it's three days before I have to register and I still do not know which courses I should take. My advising experience has not been good.
- I really need a better advisor and quick smooth response.
- I received many different answers to a question, and it was hard to know which advisor was giving the right one and what to follow.
- I sometimes wish I had never transferred to UA. The help and education is not what I had hoped it would be.
- I think it would help if the advisors would make it mandatory that all students transferring in from a community college see an advisor. I had a lot of problems with trying to follow the AGEC & was told the wrong things from the cc advisors
- I think major improvements are needed. I strongly recommend having only one advisor for each student who follows that student through the 4 years--unless the student changes majors.
- I think that although I was lucky to have had a positive experience thus far, the U of A does not try to extend any extra services for transfer students. I think the 3 state schools should try harder to accommodate transfer students.
- I think there should be longer and more informative advising sessions for transfer students.
- I thought that the process could have been much better. I am born and raised south of Tucson and I already knew my way around school. Also my mother is alumni for the U and she helped me more than anyone there. Didn't know who to talk to!
- I thought the transfer orientation was a little bit too brief, and also that it was difficult to register for classes because there were none left, that was really a pain.
- I was nervous to transfer; I'd heard so many horror stories about the UA process, but I was glad to find that I relatively few "problems." I am so happy to be at UA.
- I was treated very well at the Eller College of Business. The advisors there were very helpful, and recommended classes I could take this fall. Otherwise, I would have had difficulties figuring out my schedule at the UA.
- I went to orientation at the [college], the "Advisor" was in fact a teacher and had never registered students before. She had very little knowledge about how to do so. This created many problems. It was a very difficult process.
- I worked in academic advising at the University of Utah for over a year while I was a student there, and we had a single office set up to handle all undergraduate gen ed questions and problems. This was helpful and could be tried here.
- I would like to know which classes @ the UofA would fulfill the rest of my AGEC, seeing how neither UofA advisors nor the ones at GCC know. I am missing 1 or 2 required classes to complete it, but no one seems to know which ones I can take.
- I'm not going to come back here next year.
- In general I have found advising to be of some use. I would like to see some more correlation between the different colleges. Especially in general ed requirements.
- It seemed hard to actually get to the right person to show you where to go and who to talk to. But other than that it was okay.
- It seemed to me as though the advisors find looking at your current transcript and 'translating' it into U of A classes is a major chore. The advisors I have had couldn't be bothered to make the translation while I was with them.

- It seems like advisors know exactly how things go and what needs to be done. But no one made me feel assured I knew what was going on and what I needed to do.
- It was a really smooth transfer, and I was helped every step of the way. Thanks!
- It was by far the easiest process I have experienced. The orientation and registration were both particularly smooth processes.
- It was horrible I was not able to register until 2 weeks into the semester and had to hold the hand of the advisor in order to get anything done.
- It was ok not what I truly expected
- It was the biggest pain in the ass of my life. I was on the phone every day this summer with someone from UA. Can't you simplify the process?
- Judy Seger, academic advisor for the evening/weekend program was absolutely wonderful to deal with. Of the MANY advisors I have met with throughout my college career, she was by far the most helpful.
- More advisors need to be available to meet with students immediately prior to registration to facilitate the process and answer questions.
- My academic advisor was very good at responding all my questions and fast too. Her name is Jeniffer Sainz-Bauer.
- My advising experience here at the UA has been terrible. I have different advisors giving me different information on which classes to take and I am not able to see an advisor who seems to know what they are talking about.
- My advising experience was good. Roxie Catts was an excellent advisor, answered all my questions, and has helped me in every way possible. But, I do not like this school as a whole, and I am leaving for the spring semester.
- My advisor, Jennifer Bowers in Nutritional Sciences has been very helpful in guiding my course selections at Pima and getting me set up at the U.
- My experience at U of A has been excellent. The staff is well informative and well organized. The resources are excellent and have made the transfer process go as easily as possible.
- My first impression of the school as a transfer student has been very discouraging, although I intend to continue here and am more aware that I need to double check classes and decisions I make academically.
- My transfer here was pretty easy.
- My upper division credits were all transferred as lower level credits. It was difficult finding the correct person on campus to make that change. Even when I discovered the Adm. Of. did not know its their job.
- No I did not.
- No!
- None at this time thank you.
- On the internet, inside the student's link, we could have a look at classes we've completed, but it didn't say much about what general education we've completed, I'd like for them to be specific in what areas in general education have [truncated]
- Once I got in to see an advisor, I had a good experience. However, the website was very confusing and made it difficult to find information.
- Orientation was not very useful to me. All the questions I had were deferred to my advisor. This may be because I had already decided on a major. It would have been nice if I could have skipped this step.
- Other than all of the credits that did not transfer, my experience transferring to the U of A was a pleasant one.

- Overall the transfer process has suited me nicely. Others I have come in contact with have not been so pleased. Some felt information was difficult to obtain, or not easy to understand for degree applicability.
- People at advising are not very helpful for general academic and major
- Regarding my answers to questions 12 and 13, the lowest grade was marked simply because i used the information as another resource. "If the answer given is not the one desired, ask a different question."
- Since [department] is one of the most popular major at U of A, I recommended more [department] advisors serving the students. By doing this, it will cut the waiting list and of course, more flexibility on setting up advising appointment.
- Some transfer students should be able to register for classes via the web without going to orientation. For older students, we already understand what we need to take and should be given the opportunity to register for certain courses.
- specifically, it is very difficult to get in to see an advisor in the [department]. i realize budgets are low but it is incredibly frustrating that there are only "1 1/2" advisors in the office.
- The \$35 that was spent by me for the mandatory orientation was NOT worth it. I got no additional information that I didn't already know from that orientation. Everything the speaker said I could have found out by simply placing phone calls and [truncated]
- The advising program here at the U of A is awful. Not all of my credits were accepted, even though UA offers the same course. This has put me behind an ENTIRE semester. I am very disappointed in this school.
- The advising service is wonderful, but the orientation processes are complicated and useless.
- The advsing here is ok. My Biology advisor is wonderful, she is always helpful and full of encouragement, however, the [department] advisor isn't great. She wasn't very interested in answering my questions and didn't seem educated.
- The Art Advising Center has been very accessible and helpful during my transfer.
- The BAd 101 course offered by BPA is a very good way to learn about the majors available, and the fact that an advisor teaches it is great. As a student transferring into a completely different major, it has helped me a great deal. It should [truncated]
- The College of Education sets the example of effective advising.
- The general education requirements are useful I'm sure if one starts his or her schooling here. However, I spent a whole year at UC Santa Barbara and I am already a Junior. Now I am having to take freshmen level classes to complete GEs.
- The most helpful thing in me transferring was the detail that the hdp 105 course from pcc,provided.
- The only hang-up I experienced was that my college had changed its name, and no one had bothered to update UA on that change, so at first none of my credits transferred. Once I got all of that cleared up, all but six credits out of 79 transferred!
- The only thing that I could have used during the advisement "Orientation" was to find out programs for non-traditional students. I am a wife and mother returning to school and I am still not fully aware of what is available to me.
- The orientation day was very confusing and mostly a waste of time. A little more direction during orientation as to what we were supposed to accomplish and how would've been useful. Instead, we were let loose to kind of wander around like ca [truncated]
- The orientation for transfer students was not very helpful. I left there more confused than when I went in. I was able, on my own, to find someone in the Sociology Department to explain the procedures to me and put me on the right path.

- The Pima course I took was very helpful in transferring, but the advisors in the [department] at UA did not help very much. It seemed like they didn't know what they were talking about, sending me to 3 other depts. before I found out info [truncated]
- The staff at the [department] where inconsistent in their answers, and continuously post-poned my registration date. Information on the web stated that transfer students from the [college] were capable of bypassing Orientat [truncated]
- The staff in the [department] building could be a little more helpful/ friendly. It would be nice to know that certain things needed to be completed in different buildings and then returned; instead, I had to guess what would happen next.
- The transfer guide to allow me to figure out what course transferred was not easily accessible. When I first started to look at the U of A, I found it on the web, but after that I was told it was no longer on the web.
- The transferring process should be made easier for those transferring for another in-state 4 year university. The advisors were somewhat helpful, but I had to ask too many people what class transferred as what, the advisors need to know more.
- The University of Arizona does provide adequate advising to students transferring from out of state. I had already rented an apartment in Tucson and spent the money to fly down here, rent a car, a hotel, etc. My advisor told me it would proba [truncated]
- This school need to be more accepting of outside transfer credits. Also the time it takes this university to process documents is appalling. The transfer process was not enjoyable and still is haunting me.
- Too few advisors, too many students. Should have told me when accepting me that i would need 3 extra semesters for classes that i would have otherwise not needed in my previous University.
- When a person can finally find and speak with an advisor, the information given usually conflicts from person to person and day to day. Two people advising the entire [department] is not enough.
- When I attended the orientation session, I was almost tempted to not go to school here. I was given wrong information about 3 times and wasn't able to register for the classes that I wanted as a result.
- When, where, who, and how do I get advising for the next semester? How do I sign up for next semesters' classes? Please tell me how in an e-mail. Thanks!
- Without Linda Erasmus my experience would have been far more stressful.
- Yes please help me to determine when I can register for next semester. I have no idea You can reach me at [student e-mail]. And by the way where do I make an appt? When is the best time to register for someone who is classified as [truncated]
- Yes, the advising is poor at the U of A, and [staff] is extremely hard to get ahold of. Not to mention that just trying to speak to someone in the [department] is hard, no one is ever there, I had to speak to a regular advisor.
- Yes. I'm now battling to get 2 Afro American classes transferred as humanities. It's really hard being a transfer student here. None of the advisors or on the same track. Therefore they give me wrong information or the run around.
- You should talk to AZ comm. colleges-make sure students thinking about transferring understand that assessing out of a course is good now, but no help when they transfer. I assessed reading/writing-now need fr.comp.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix I:

**Arizona Health Sciences Center and Main Campus PARTNERSHIP
For Advising Undergraduates Interested in HEALTH PROFESSIONS Careers**

A Proposal for the Expansion of Advising Services

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Proposal: This proposal represents a unified plan and collaboration on the part of all Arizona Health Sciences Center colleges (Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, and the School of Health Professions), working in cooperation with main campus personnel, to improve health professions advising for all current and prospective University of Arizona undergraduate students.

PROPOSAL GOAL: *All undergraduate students currently attending the UA, as well as those planning to attend the UA, should be assured of easy access to correct information, resources, and advising regarding careers in health professions and the academic requirements for these careers.*

Current Situation: The Pre-Health Professions Advising Office on main campus, with a staff of 1.0 FTE, currently serves students interested in only six health careers, five of which are not offered at the University of Arizona. In May, 2001, the "Progress Report" of the Academic Advising Task Force acknowledged that this office "is viewed by many of its constituents as under-staffed and under-funded for its mission." Our investigations show that more than 3,000 UA undergraduate students wish to pursue health-related careers. These students deserve academic and career advising services that include **all** health professions offered at the UA as well as the many health careers for which their educational background prepares them to pursue.

Unmet Needs: Among the unmet needs that exist in UA pre-health professions advising are the following:

- a. The mission of the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office should be broadened to serve more health careers.
- b. Students need a central source of accurate and comprehensive pre-health academic information.
- c. Student progress in a pre-health profession academic program requires closer monitoring and guidance.
- d. Advising and encouragement of diverse students in health professions deserves higher priority.
- e. Students not among the 5-10% admitted to a health profession program need more intensive advising.
- f. Community college advisors and students need more detailed information on academic requirements for health professions and greater assistance to facilitate a smooth transfer to the UA to pursue a health profession.
- g. Better coordination is needed in presenting health professions information to prospective UA students.
- h. Admission materials should be more informative about health professions academic programs.
- i. Resource materials on many different health professions should be more readily available to students.

Proposal for a Pre-Health Professions Advising CENTER

This proposal recommends that the mission of the current Pre-Health Professions Advising Office be expanded to serve students interested in **all** health professions, rather than just the six health careers currently served. Academic advising for the 3,000+ UA students interested in pursuing a career in health professions is a vital and integral part of the academic advising these students receive to pursue a university degree and a major. Academic prerequisites and requirements for a health profession must be carefully planned, reviewed frequently, and modified as warranted by a student's changing interests or lack of success in gaining admission to a desired health career. Such services constitute at least a "minimum level of advising service" that students interested in health professions deserve at the UA.

To accomplish this goal, this proposal recommends the creation of a **Pre-Health Professions Advising Center**, located centrally on main campus, and staffed by a director and several advisors. The proposal identifies the need

for, and responsibilities of, the following personnel: 1 Center Director, 4 Academic Advisors, 1 Outreach Advisor, 1 Administrative Assistant. An important feature of this proposal is the commitment of increased collaboration and partnership between the AHSC colleges and the personnel staffing the new Pre-Health Professions Advising Center.

A unique characteristic of this proposal is that it represents a "model" for inter-college collaboration. All AHSC academic units are unified in their support of the proposal, and worked closely in its preparation. Student input also was sought and incorporated in the proposal. Considerable assistance and support were provided by the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office on main campus, and this office seeks to work in close partnership with the AHSC academic units to assure improved advising services for all UA students interested in health professions.

Support of this proposal will signify that the UA Pre-Health Professions Advising Center can become an integral component in continuing to develop the UA and AHSC as a national exemplar in health professions education and student support.

Proposal Outline

Outline and Committee Memberships

I. Purpose of Proposal

II. Background

1. Academic Advising Task Force (AATF) Initial Findings
2. Current Pre-Health Advising Services
 - a. AHSC College Advising
 - b. Pre-Health Professions Advising Office
 - c. Career Services
 - d. Number of Undergraduate Students Seeking Pre-Health Professions Advising
3. Unmet Needs in Pre-Health Professions Advising

III. Proposal for a Pre-Health Professions Advising Center

1. Staffing and Resources
 - a. Staffing Needs and Responsibilities
 - b. Selection, Supervision, and Evaluation of Staff
 - c. Space and Resources
2. Services Contributed by AHSC
3. Justification
4. Evaluation and Accountability

Tables 1, 2, 3, 4

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

AHSC Working Group Members - Sponsors of the Proposal

Ted Tong, Chair, College of Pharmacy

Betty Atwater, School of Health Professions

Tammy Bassford, College of Medicine

Marty Dalton, College of Pharmacy
Linda Don, AHSC Office of Minority Affairs
JoLaine Draugalis, College of Pharmacy
Jay Gandolfi, College of Pharmacy
Adele Kelch, College of Nursing
Nancy Koff, College of Medicine
Chris Leadem, College of Medicine
Kathleen Martin, College of Public Health
Sheila Parker, College of Public Health
Vickie Radoye, College of Nursing
Pam Reed, College of Nursing
Denise Roe, College of Public Health
Sandy Rogers, College of Pharmacy
Chris Tisch, College of Public Health

Members of Subcommittee on Pre-Health Advising (*Responsible for preparing the Proposal*)

Betty Atwater, Chair, School of Health Professions
Marty Dalton, College of Pharmacy
Linda Don, AHSC Office of Minority Affairs
Raquel Givens, School of Health Professions
Andrew Huerta, AHSC Office of Minority Affairs
Adele Kelch, College of Nursing
Chris Leadem, College of Medicine
Kathleen Martin, College of Public Health
Sheila Parker, College of Public Health
Vickie Radoye, College of Nursing
Pam Reed, College of Nursing
Nancy Stiller, Pre-Health Professions Office, University College
Ted Tong, College of Pharmacy

Student Members

Trisha Martinez, Molecular & Cellular Biology major (pre-med)
Stefanie Reeves, Pharmacy (undergraduate major in physiological sciences)
Jeremy Short, Molecular & Cellular Biology major (pre-pharmacy)
Cecilia Urquides, General Biology major (pre-med)

Additional input was provided by pre-health professions students and student groups, and by students enrolled in UA health profession programs.

**Arizona Health Sciences Center and Main Campus PARTNERSHIP
For Advising Undergraduates Interested in HEALTH PROFESSIONS Careers**

I. PURPOSE OF PROPOSAL

The purpose of this document is to propose an expansion in size and a change in the mission of the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office on main campus, and to institutionalize greater collaboration between this Office and the Arizona Health Sciences Center (AHSC). The advising services described in this proposal are recommended as the "minimum level of service" that students deserve at the University of Arizona.

This proposal represents a unified plan and collaboration on the part of all Arizona Health Sciences Center colleges (Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, and the School of Health Professions), to work in cooperation with main campus to improve health professions advising for all current and prospective University of Arizona undergraduate students.

PROPOSAL GOAL: *All undergraduate students currently attending the UA, as well as those planning to attend the UA, should be assured of easy access to correct information, resources, and advising regarding careers in health professions and the academic requirements for these careers.*

II. BACKGROUND

This section provides three topics of background information that set the stage for the proposal. First, the initial findings of the Academic Advising Task Force (AATF) that pertain to pre-health advising will be presented. These findings were included in the May 10, 2001 progress report of the AATF. Second, the current academic advising and career counseling services for UA undergraduate students interested in health-related careers will be described. Also, the number of students who desire or need these services will be estimated. Third, a list of additional services that should be provided to students interested in health professions will be identified under the topic of "unmet needs."

1. Academic Advising Task Force (AATF) Initial Findings:

The "Progress Report of the Academic Advising Task Force" (dated May 10, 2001) states the following on page A-20:

"The University of Arizona Admissions office reports that about 20% of the entering class each year express an interest in the health professions."

In the section of the report that summarizes concerns uncovered in the subcommittee reports, Item #23 states:

"The Pre-Health Professions Program is viewed by many of its constituents as under-staffed and under-funded for its mission. The program is located within the Office of Academic Services (OAS) but is designed to serve students in all colleges, including colleges outside of those served by OAS. Further, the Pre-Health Professions advisor must handle general education advising for OAS in addition to the Pre-Health Professions responsibilities. These arrangements should be carefully assessed to determine whether they represent the most efficient ones possible given current resources, and whether new resources are warranted."

2. Current Pre-Health Advising Services:

The "assessment" of pre-health advising services called for by the AATF (in the last sentence of the section quoted above from the AATF Progress Report) has been carried out by the Subcommittee on Pre-Health Advising that prepared this proposal. The Subcommittee's findings are reported in this proposal and serve as the basis for the recommendation to establish an expanded Pre-Health Professions Advising Center on the UA main campus, with a mission to serve students interested in all health professions.

Academic advising and career counseling services for undergraduate students interested in health professions are currently provided in a fragmented and incomplete manner at the University of Arizona. These services will be described below under the categories of (a) AHSC college advising; (b) main campus Pre-Health Professions Office advising; (c) main campus career counseling. Also, in section (d), the number of students who desire or need these services will be identified.

Students, faculty, and staff have observed that there is inadequate articulation and communication among the present service providers, and there are many gaps and omissions in the type, amount, and quality of the services provided. Identification of these problems and of specific areas of "unmet needs" will be described in a subsequent section of this proposal.

(a) AHSC College Advising

Academic advising for undergraduate students planning to enter those health professions offered at the UA occurs in the manner listed below. The number of students declared as pre-majors and majors in these health professions (except medicine) is presented in [Table 1](#).

- **Medicine:** There is no undergraduate "pre-med major." Students interested in medicine as a career are enrolled in majors throughout the university. The Pre-Health Professions Advising Office ([described below](#)) provides advice regarding course selection to meet medical school admission requirements, guidance in the medical school application process, and other services.
- **Nursing:** Pre-nursing majors are assigned to the University College, but they are advised by Nursing. Students admitted to the Bachelor of Science in Nursing program are advised by Nursing.
- **Pharmacy:** Pre-pharmacy majors are assigned to the University College, but they are advised by Pharmacy. Students admitted to the Pharm.D. program are advised by Pharmacy.
- **Public Health - Health Education:** Pre-majors and majors in Health Education are located in the College of Public Health and are advised by faculty and staff in Health Education.
- **School of Health Professions - Medical Technology:** Pre-majors and majors in Medical Technology are located in the School of Health Professions and are advised by faculty in Medical Technology.

(b) Pre-Health Professions Advising Office

The stated mission of this Office (located on main campus in the Office of Academic Services) is to provide advising services to students interested specifically in the following six health careers: medicine, dentistry, optometry, podiatry, osteopathic medicine, and physician assistant. As the Academic Advising Task Force progress report noted, the inadequate resources available to this Office have forced the limitation of advising services to only these six health careers. Thus, many UA undergraduates are surprised to learn that the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office does not have sufficient staff or funding to provide even basic advising services for 4 of the 5 health professions offered at the UA (namely, pharmacy, nursing, health education, and medical technology), or for other health professions in which they are interested.

The students served by this Office pursue majors in many different colleges at the university. In addition, many of the students enrolled in the University College and declared as "undecided" are interested in health-related careers. [Table 2](#) lists the majors frequently selected by many of the students who are interested in careers served by advisors in the Pre-Health Professions Office.

The Office is currently staffed by a 0.50 FTE pre-health professions advisor, a 0.50 FTE academic advisor, and a 0.75 FTE administrative assistant. Services provided by this Office include, but are not limited to: academic advising with regard to choosing a major/minor and selecting courses to meet admission requirements of the six health careers identified above; making available resource materials about health careers and their admission criteria; offering general information sessions on health professions for interested groups of students; providing a letter of recommendation collection and disbursement service for students applying to the six health careers on which this Office focuses; and counseling students about career options.

(c) Career Services

Career Services provides centralized career assistance to all students at the UA. Services include in-depth counseling on making major/career choices, and assistance in choosing and securing career-related experiences and placement alternatives (such as employment and graduate or professional schools). Examples of Career

Services resources that students interested in health professions may find particularly beneficial include: website links to information about a variety of careers, workshops and presentations on a variety of career and job search topics, a small career library with publications on specific health-related fields, medical/health mock interviews to assist students in preparing for health program interviews, and a computerized/interactive career planning tool (DISCOVER) which includes information and video clips on health-related professions.

Career Services resources tend to be under-utilized by students interested in health professions who instead seek career guidance from AHSC college advisors or from the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office.

(d) Number of Undergraduate Students Seeking Pre-Health Professions Advising

Twenty Percent of Entering Class: Based on estimates by the UA Office of Admissions, 20% of the entering class each year express an interest in health professions. In the past four years, the freshman class has ranged from 5,098 to 6,100 students, and 20% of this total is 1,020-1,220 students. Hypothetically, if 20% of each class maintained their interest in a health-related career over a four-year period, there could be as many as 4,000 to 4,800 students currently attending the UA who need advising for health professions.

UA Majors of Students Interested in Health Professions: In Fall 2001, more than 800 undergraduate students have declared themselves as pre-majors hoping to enter one of four health professions offered at the UA: health education, medical technology, nursing, and pharmacy. [See Table 1] In addition, more than 2,000 undergraduate students enrolled as majors in other UA departments are estimated to be planning a career in health professions. [See Table 2] The majority of these students (at least 1,500) are hoping to enter medical school (either at the UA or elsewhere), and consider themselves to be "pre-med" although there is no such major at the UA. [See Table 3]

Health Professions Not Offered at UA: Other undergraduate students (perhaps 500) are interested in health professions not offered at the UA and not included among the six health professions served by the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office. [See Table 3] These health professions include: physical therapy, occupational therapy, cardiac rehabilitation, chiropractic, cardiac perfusion, genetic counselor, nuclear medicine technologist, etc. The majority of these professions require admission to a professional or graduate school following the bachelor's degree.

Students Admitted vs. Not Admitted to Health Programs: Table 3 shows that only about 200-250 UA undergraduate students are admitted to UA (AHSC) health profession academic programs each year, including the professional programs in medicine and pharmacy. It is estimated that another 100-200 students are admitted to health professions post-baccalaureate programs at other universities. ***This number of successful health professions applicants per year represents only 5-10% of all those that enter the UA each year and initially express interest in health professions.*** Therefore, academic advising and career counseling are needed not only for all students planning to pursue a health-related career, but also for those many students who do not achieve success in gaining admission to the health profession of their choice. These latter students deserve considerable advising assistance as they re-evaluate and redirect their career goals and perhaps change their academic major.

Under-represented Students Interested in Health Professions: The University of Arizona is particularly interested in providing students from disadvantaged backgrounds and under-represented groups the opportunity to be competitive applicants for admission to academic programs in health professions. Advising services needed to support the success of these students often are quite intensive, because these services may involve referrals to the numerous tutoring programs, cultural support groups, and mentoring programs available at the UA. Furthermore, it is important to provide continued advising for under-represented students

who initially fail to gain admission to their health career of choice. Advising them of strategies that will improve their admission chances upon re-application, or that will assist them in redirecting their career goals is critical to their successful completion of an undergraduate degree and to their constructive contribution to the State of Arizona workforce.

3. Unmet Needs in Pre-Health Professions Advising:

The majority of UA undergraduate students interested in health professions (estimated between 2,000 and 4,000 students) are not provided advising services from the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office. If the mission of this Office is broadened to include all students interested in health professions, the advising task would be impossible to fulfill with the current staffing level of only one full-time equivalent advisor. Furthermore, any one advisor cannot reasonably master the in-depth knowledge about the many different health careers and the specific academic requirements of each. Clearly, additional pre-health professions advisors are needed to serve the needs of UA undergraduate students.

To enhance the retention and graduation of students interested in health professions, to improve the quality of health career information provided for these students, and to attain greater advising personnel efficiencies, improved collaboration is needed among the AHSC college advising offices and between AHSC and the main campus Pre-Health Professions Advising Office. A key partner in this collaboration should be the AHSC Office of Minority Affairs which provides numerous services for students, particularly those from under-represented groups, preparing for admission to several health-related academic programs.

Listed below are some of the specific unmet needs that concern many advisors attempting to serve UA undergraduate students interested in health professions.

- a. **Mission of the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office needs greater breadth:** The mission of the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office is not broad enough to serve the number of health professions career interests of the UA undergraduate students who want and need advising services. This Office currently serves students interested in only six health careers because insufficient resources are available to expand services. Four of the five health profession programs offered at the UA are not included in the careers advised by this Office. Undergraduate students, especially freshmen and sophomores, need a central source of information on main campus about all health-related careers as well as advice regarding the academic requirements for admission to these careers.
- b. **Students need a central source of accurate and comprehensive pre-health academic information:** Undergraduates who are unsure about their career plans and are curious about opportunities in health professions need access to centrally located pre-health advisors who can provide basic information on various health careers. Because the current Pre-Health Professions Advising Office is understaffed and overburdened with inquiries, students are often sent to one or more of the AHSC colleges for basic program information. Students have reported considerable frustration in having to talk with people in several different offices around campus in order to learn enough information about health career options, admission requirements, and academic prerequisites to enable them to make wise decisions concerning which career to pursue. Centralized and informed pre-health professions advising would alleviate much of this frustration.
- c. **Student progress in a pre-health profession academic program requires close monitoring:** In their sophomore or junior year, students seriously preparing for admission to a health profession academic program should receive advising to determine if they are "on-track" to meet the program admission requirements **and** the requirements for their undergraduate degree and major. Also, they should receive guidance in conducting a "reality check" to evaluate whether their academic performance is likely to make them a viable applicant to the health profession program of their choice. At that time, additional health career or major exploration could take place for those students whose career goals have changed.

- d. **Advising and encouragement of diverse students in health professions deserves higher priority:** Greater attention and effort must be devoted to increasing the diversity of the students applying for admission to health profession programs. Support services to enhance the chances of successful health profession admission of diverse students should be expanded and advisors should provide students with more frequent referrals to existing services on campus. Coordination of these services with the activities of the AHSC Office of Minority Affairs should be strongly encouraged.
- e. **Students not among the 5-10% admitted to a health profession program need intensive advising:** Expanded academic and career advising services are needed for the students who are not successful in gaining admission to UA undergraduate health majors (e.g., nursing, medical technology, and health education) and to graduate/professional health programs (e.g., pharmacy, medicine, and others). These students, particularly those from under-represented or disadvantaged groups, need assistance in re-evaluating their career goals and in redirecting their academic pursuits so that retention and graduation objectives are achieved.
- f. **Community college advisors and students need more detailed information on academic requirements for health professions:** Improved articulation and communication are needed with pre-health profession students and their advisors at Pima Community College and at other Arizona community colleges. The preparation requirements for health professions are very specific and many transfer students have experienced problems that lengthen their undergraduate career. On average (from 1992-2000), 757 students transferred each fall semester from Pima Community College to UA. More than half of the female students said they planned to enter health professions (273 females, 54.1% of all females and 59% of ethnic minority females), compared to about 30% of the men. (Data from "Futurebound" NSC grant project.)
- g. **Better coordination is needed in presenting health professions information to prospective UA students:** The UA Summer Orientation program and outreach programs for prospective students need to work with all UA health professions programs to offer one coordinated session on career information rather than separate sessions conducted by each health profession academic unit on campus.
- h. **Admission materials should be more informative about health professions academic programs:** Admission materials sent to new students need to be more specific to help them make effective decisions regarding the major and college in which they will enroll if they are interested in pursuing a career in one of the health professions. For example, students who consider themselves to be "pre-med" need to know there are many alternatives available to them in selecting a major.
- i. **Resource materials on many different health professions should be more readily available to students:** UA students interested in health professions would benefit from an expanded set of current resource materials on the wide variety of health careers available (located either in the Pre-Health Professions Advising Office or in Career Services). Also, a redesigned "umbrella" Health Professions web page could describe the many resources, offices, programs, etc. available to UA students interested in pursuing a health-related career. This page could provide links to existing UA academic programs, to available UA resources, and to informational health career links external to the UA. (Websites at Michigan State University and the University of Florida might serve as models.)

III. PROPOSAL FOR A PRE-HEALTH PROFESSIONS ADVISING CENTER

In its role as a major land grant, public university, the University of Arizona should step up to the challenge of providing advising services that are adequate and appropriate to meet the needs of the large number of undergraduates interested in pursuing health-related careers.

This proposal seeks to expand the mission of the current Pre-Health Professions Advising Office to include all health professions rather than just the six health careers currently served. To accomplish this goal, the current Office, with its staff of one FTE advisor, should be expanded into a Pre-Health Professions Advising **Center** staffed by a director and several advisors. An important feature of this proposal is the commitment of increased collaboration and partnership between the AHSC colleges and this new main campus Pre-Health Advising Center.

The Pre-Health Professions Advising Center can be an integral component in continuing to develop the AHSC as the national exemplar in health professions education.

The primary objective of this partnership is to assure current and prospective students who wish to pursue a career in health professions that they will have access to correct and current information, helpful resources, support services, academic advising, and career counseling throughout their undergraduate years.

The features of this proposal will be outlined in the following sections dealing with: [\(1\)](#) staffing and resources, [\(2\)](#) services contributed by AHSC, [\(3\)](#) justification, and [\(4\)](#) evaluation and accountability.

1. Staffing and Resources:

Health professions advising requires more than periodic meetings with students to assure they are "on-track" for graduation. It consists of a range of services that encompass advising services and referrals to improve retention, assistance with health professions career exploration, advice on meeting the academic requirements for several different health careers, guidance in the process of applying for admission to health profession programs, re-evaluation of career goals and academic plans if admission to a health profession program is denied or if student interests change, and a full range of informational sessions to assist new and prospective students in making knowledgeable decisions about health profession selection.

Health professions advisors must share the basic goals of all advisors: to help students pursue a major that is intellectually engaging rather than one thought of as merely a means to an end (e.g., gaining admission to medical school), and providing students with resources to enhance academic success for degree completion.

(a) Staffing Needs and Responsibilities

To provide these academic and career advising services for the 3,100+ undergraduate students (see [Table 3](#)) and the large number of transfer students interested in health professions, the Pre-Health Professions Advising Center should consist of:

- 1 Director of the Center
- 4 Academic Advisors
- 1 Outreach Advisor
- 1 Administrative Assistant

Center Director - This individual will oversee the academic and health career advising, informational outreach activities, and support services provided by advisors at the Center, and will assure the coordination of information and activities between the Center and AHSC college advising offices. The director also will chair a Pre-Health Professions Advisory Committee (with representatives from AHSC and main campus colleges); will recruit, train, and supervise pre-health and outreach advisors; and will assure that information about academic preparation for health professions is shared with appropriate constituents at numerous venues (i.e., community college advisors, high school guidance counselors, prospective students, as well as current UA students across all majors including 'undecided', etc.).

Academic Advisors - Each of the four pre-health academic advisors will have in-depth knowledge about certain health professions as well as general knowledge of careers and academic preparation required in numerous health-related fields. For example, one advisor may have specialized knowledge of pharmacy and medical technology, while another may focus on advising about careers in nursing and various therapies (e.g., physical, occupational, rehabilitation, etc.), yet both would be prepared to discuss the basic preparation needed to pursue most health-related careers. At least one advisor will surely need to focus solely on the special needs of students preparing for admission to medical school.

Outreach Advisor - The outreach advisor will have in-depth knowledge of admission requirements for health professions. This person will provide outreach activities and informational sessions throughout Arizona and primarily in Maricopa County, which supplies over 60% of new admissions to the University of Arizona. Also, the outreach advisor will be the central contact for primary feeder community colleges such as Pima and Maricopa Community Colleges. The outreach activities of this advisor will eliminate some of the duplication of efforts by the individual AHSC colleges and will contribute to a coordinated outreach effort that will assist in getting accurate and timely information on health professions to the potential new freshmen and transfer students. [\[See Table 4.\]](#)

Administrative Assistant - The staff member will support the activities of the Center and will facilitate communication among pre-health advisors, students, and AHSC counterparts.

(b) Selection, Supervision, and Evaluation of Staff

The director of the Pre-Health Professions Advising Center will be responsible for the academic and outreach advisors and staff at the Center. However, collaboration with AHSC College personnel in preparing job descriptions of the staff, in staff selection and hiring, and in evaluating the services and performance of the staff is essential in order to expect this partnership to succeed.

(c) Space and Resources

The Pre-Health Professions Advising Center should be located centrally on campus to provide easy access for students to receive services. Individual office space for the director and each advisor is needed to assure privacy for student advising. Space for small group meetings (i.e., advisor meetings with small groups of students) and for the convenient display and use of health career resource materials is *essential*.

The Center should also include a work area for student/advisor use with one or two computers linked to the Internet. Students will find the computers useful for course selection and schedule preparation, for self-advising regarding health career exploration, and for checking on-line descriptions of health program admission requirements at various professional schools.

Sufficient funds should be provided for salaries of the director, academic and outreach advisors, and the administrative assistant. Additional funds should be available to allow Center personnel to attend an annual professional meeting for pre-health advisors and to perform health professions outreach sessions in the state, to support computer hardware and software required for advising, and to obtain basic office supplies.

2. Services Contributed by AHSC:

Academic advisors from the AHSC colleges will be able to augment the advising services provided by the Center to pre-health professions students by developing programs that enhance the educational experiences of these students. For example, such activities may include socializing the student to health professions and the AHSC, mentoring programs, shadowing opportunities, college open houses and tours, faculty and advisor presentations on health careers for interested groups of students, etc.

The college advisors will work as partners with the Center's pre-health advisors, providing them with accurate and up-to-date information about the academic requirements for admission to UA college health programs, about the job outlook in these health careers, and about the various types of specialization opportunities within these careers.

College advisors and representatives will work in collaboration with the Center's advising and outreach staff to assure that informed representation of UA health profession programs is provided for the many outreach

activities in which the UA and AHSC participate. [\[See Table 4.\]](#) Coordination and planning for the number and type of representatives needed to attend each outreach activity will allow for more efficient use of personnel and for more effective coverage of the many outreach events served.

3. Justification:

Information provided in the "Background" section of this proposal offers considerable justification for expanding the Pre-Health Professions Advising Center to serve **all** UA students interested in health-related careers. Specifically, the following points summarize the rationale supporting this proposal:

- **Mission:** The Pre-Health Professions Advising **Center** should have sufficient resources to change its mission and expand its advising services for students interested in the full range of health-related careers, including those academic programs offered here at the UA in the Arizona Health Sciences Center (AHSC).
- **Number of Students:** In Part 2,d of the "Background" section of this proposal, data are provided on the number of students reported to be interested in health professions. More than 1,000 undergraduates have declared their major (or pre-major) in one of the four AHSC health profession programs [Table 1], and more than 2,000 additional students are enrolled in other UA majors while declaring their interest in pursuing a health-related career [\[Table 2\]](#).
- **Health Professions Advising Services:** All students interested in a health profession should have access to centrally located pre-health professions advisors in order to obtain information about health career alternatives, academic requirements, selection of a major at the UA (if not in one of the AHSC colleges), and referral to services that will support academic success. A centralized and comprehensive advising center that serves all health professions would significantly improve the current disjointed and fragmented system that requires students to seek basic information about health profession preparation from many different sources.
- **Retention:** Quality academic advising is one of many factors that contribute to student retention and degree completion. Undergraduates who do not make satisfactory progress toward their desired career goal become discouraged and are at risk for failure and attrition from the university. Students who are not successful in gaining admission to one of the health profession academic programs offered at the UA or elsewhere will need assistance in re-evaluating their educational and career goals. Retention of these "at risk" students can be aided by pre-health profession advisors who help such students determine whether their interests and talents are well matched to their career goals, or to explore new career options and/or academic majors.
- **Needs of Diverse Students:** Students from disadvantaged backgrounds or under-represented groups have special needs for academic support and encouragement. Success of these students in health professions is vitally important to serve the needs of the diverse populations and regions of Arizona. Pre-health advising that includes provision of, and referral to, appropriate academic, mentoring, and cultural support services for these students should increase their persistence and graduation rates as well as their career success.
- **Transfer Student Assistance:** Better communication and articulation with academic advisors at other Arizona colleges, and particularly community colleges, is needed regarding the academic requirements students must meet for admission to health-related academic programs at the bachelor's or post-baccalaureate levels. Pre-health professions advisors can help to improve this communication and to meet the special advising needs of transfer students.
- **Outreach and Career Exploration:** Information about health professions offered at the UA and about the academic preparation needed for health careers even beyond those provided at the UA is the focus of many outreach activities in which AHSC and UA advisors participate. [\[Table 4\]](#) Greater effectiveness and efficiency in providing these outreach services should occur as a result of collaboration between AHSC advisors and the Center's pre-health and outreach advisors. The sharing of health career information can be extended to a greater degree than presently occurs

with the Advising Center for Exploratory Students (ACES), thus serving more students whose career goals have not yet been determined.

4. Evaluation and Accountability:

To obtain information on the strengths and the effectiveness of the advising program, the CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education) Academic Advising Program Self-Assessment Guide is recommended for annual evaluation of the Center. This Self-Assessment Guide translates the CAS Academic Advising Program Standards and Guidelines (grouped under the thirteen components listed below) into a format that enables self-assessment.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mission | 8. Legal Responsibilities |
| 2. Program | 9. Equal Opportunity, Access, and Affirmative Action |
| 3. Leadership | 10. Campus and Community Relations |
| 4. Organization and Management | 11. Diversity |
| 5. Human Resource | 12. Ethics |
| 6. Financial Resources | 13. Assessment and Evaluation |
| 7. Facilities, Technology, and Equipment | |

Identified areas of deficiency and a plan for improvement will result from this evaluation. Representatives from the AHSC colleges will serve with the Center's staff on the self-assessment team.

Accountability to the students for the improvement of pre-health advising services will be addressed by surveys which assess student satisfaction with (a) access to pre-health advising services, and (b) the quality and usefulness of advising information provided.

Table 1. University of Arizona Major Programs

AHSC Undergraduate Majors (or pre-majors) * [Fall 2001]

* Selective admission (not all applicants or pre-majors are admitted to these programs)

Major	College	# of Pre-majors	# of Majors
Health Education	Public Health	145	39
Medical Technology	School of Health Professions	178	24
Nursing	Nursing	281	234
Pharmacy	Pharmacy	198	students apply to Pharm.D.
TOTAL		802	313

Table 2.

Other UA Majors Frequently Selected by Students Interested in Health-related Careers [Fall 2001]

Major	College	Total # of Student Majors	# Interested in a Health-Related Career **
Biochemistry	Science	284	30
Chemistry	Science	150	40
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology	Science	314	25
General Biology	Science	577	380
Microbiology	Agriculture & Life Sciences	145	75
Molecular & Cellular Biology	Science	634	320
Physiological Sciences	School of Health Professions	520	500
Psychology	Social & Behavioral Sciences	1500	150
Veterinary Science	Agriculture & Life Sciences	255	15
Undecided/Undeclared	University College	3000+	500
Other	Various colleges		200
TOTAL			2,235 **

** = estimates provided by college advisors

Table 3.

AHSC HEALTH PROFESSIONS *

Student Interest vs. Number admitted per year

* Selective admission (not all applicants are admitted to these programs)

	Health Education	Medical Technology	Nursing	Pharmacy	Medicine	Careers not offered at UA	Total
Career Interest among all UA undergraduates	200	200	300	400	1,500+	500+	3,100+
UA Students Admitted/Enrolled Per Year	25	24	100	31	50		230
Total Number of Applicants (2001)				169	444		
Total Number Admitted/ Enrolled				70	100		

Table 4.

Arizona Health Sciences Center (AHSC) Undergraduate Outreach and Informational Activities											
					AHSC Colleges/Units Involved						
Activity	Frequency	Number Attending	Level of Participants	Location	Office of Minority Affairs	College of Medicine	College of Nursing	College of Pharmacy	College of Public Health	School of Health Professions	
I UA Recruitment and Informational Programs: Pre-College Level (includes some Health Professions Career Information)											
1	APEX Advisor Day (Academic Preparation for Excellence)	Once a year	60	Advisors	UA	X					
2	High School Career Fairs	Eight times a year	180	High School	Tucson			X			
3	Junior Day	Once a year		High School	UA						
4	LULAC Conference (League of United Latin American Citizens)	Two days/ Once a year	100	Middle/High School	PCC-Tucson	X					
5	Maricopa Community College Advisors	Once a year	25	Advisors	Phx Campus	X		X	X		
6	MESA Advisor Day (Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement)	Once a year	60	Advisors	UA	X					
7	MESA Regionals	Once a year	100	Middle/High School	UA	X					
8	MESA Saturday Academy	Once a year	40	Middle/High School	UA	X					
9	Outstanding Junior Day	Once a year	100	High School	UA	X	X	X	X	X	
10	Outstanding Senior Day	Once a year	100	High School	UA	X	X	X	X	X	
11	Phoenix Area HS Counselor Breakfast	Once a year	100	HS Counselors	Phx Area	X	X	X	X	X	
12	UA 101	5 times a year	750	High School	UA	X	X	X	X	X	
II Health Professions Recruitment and Informational Programs: Pre-College Level (Primary Focus is on Health Professions Career Information)											
1	ACE + Health Scenarios (Achieving a College Education Plus)	Once a year	125	High School		Phx Campus	X				
2	APEX Health Scenarios (Academic Preparation for Excellence)	Twice a year	100	Middle/High School	UA	X					

3	Health Career Conference (at Grand Canyon University)	Once a year	100	High School	Phx Campus	X					
4	Health Careers Day - Med-Start	Once a year	125	High School	UA	X	X	X	X	X	X
5	MedCamp	Once a year	60	High School	UA		X				
6	Med-Start Summer Program	Six weeks in Summer	60	High School	UA	X	X	X	X	X	X
7	Pre-Health Career Workshop	Twice a year	250	High School	Phoenix	X		X	X	X	
8	Professional Intern Program	8-10 times a year	2-3	High School	UA				X		
9	SAB-HCOP Saturday Academy (Southern Arizona Border - Health Careers Opportunity Program)	Twice a year	150	Middle/High School	UA	X		X	X	X	
10	Tours by High School Groups	Approx. 15 groups/year	200	High School	UAa	X		X	X		

AHSC Colleges/Units Involved											
Activity	Frequency	Number Attending	Level of Participants	Location	Office of Minority Affairs	College of Medicine	College of Nursing	College of Pharmacy	College of Public Health	School of Health Professions	
III Health Professions Informational and Service Programs: College Level (University and Community College, including Transfers)											
1	AAIP Conference (Association of American Indian Physicians)	Once a year	75	Undergraduate	National	X					
2	African American Forum	Once a year	75	Undergraduate	UA	X					
3	ASU Health Fair	Once a year	75	Undergraduate	ASU	X	X		X	X	
4	Arizona Nurses Association Convention	Once a year	200	Undergraduate/Graduate	UA		X				
5	Careers in Science	Once a year	100	Undergraduate/CC	PCC			X			
6	Community College Advisor Wksp	Once a year		Undergraduate/CC							
7	FACES Conference (Fostering and Achieving Cultural Equity and Sensitivity in Health	Once a year	100	Undergraduate	UA	X	X	X	X	X	X

	Professions)											
8	FACES Internship	Spring/ Fall Class	25	Undergraduate	UA	X						
9	FACES Retreat	Twice a year	60	Undergraduate	Phx Campus	X						
10	FACES Student Organization - ASU	Bimonthly	70	Undergraduate	ASU	X						
11	FACES Student Organization - UA	Bimonthly	50	Undergraduate	UA	X						
12	HCOP Parent Day (Health Careers Opportunity Program)	Once a year	75	Undergraduate/ Parents	Phx Campus	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
13	Hispanic Alumni Mixer	Once a year	75	Undergraduate	UA		X	X	X	X	X	X
14	Minority Medical Education Program (MMEP)	Six weeks in Summer	40	Undergraduate	UA	X	X					
15	Minority Transfer Day	Once a year		Undergraduate/CC	UA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
16	Mock Interviews - Phoenix	Once a year	20	Undergraduate	Phx Campus	X						
17	Mock Interviews - Tucson	Once a year	30	Undergraduate	UA	X						
18	Multicultural New Student Recept.	Once a year	100	Undergraduate	UA	X						
19	Native American Blessing Ceremony	Twice a year	> 75	Undergraduate/ Graduate	UA	X		X				
20	Native American Honoring Ceremony	Once a year	75	Undergraduate/ Graduate	UA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
21	Native American Transfer Day	Once a year		Undergraduate/CC	UA							
22	NAU Health Fair	Once a year	60	Undergraduate	NAU	X	X		X	X		
23	New Start Pre-health Workshops	Once a year	60	Undergraduate	UA	X						
24	Nursing Information Meetings	20 times a year	400	Undergraduate	UA			X				
25	Pre-Pharmacy Club	Monthly/ academic year	100	Undergraduate	UA				X			
26	Sierra Vista Open House for RNs (nurses)	Once a year	50	Undergraduate	Sierra Vista			X				
27	Talking Medicine Circle	Twice a year	50	Undergraduate	UA	X	X					

28	Tucson Community Health Fairs							X			
29	UA Health Fair	Once a year	75	Undergraduate	UA	X	X	X	X	X	X
30	UA Meet your Major Fair	Once a year	75	Undergraduate	UA	X	X	X	X	X	X

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix J: Academic Counseling

Academic advising and academic counseling overlap in several areas; however, while many academic advisors also conduct counseling activities in addition to academic advising, academic counselors do not have signature authority and do not sign off on academic advising documents. Yet, academic counselors may contribute to retention by supporting academic advisors and helping educate individual students on how to navigate through the University of Arizona. The various ways that academic counselors inter-relate with advisors include (but are not limited to) the following activities:

- assist students in connecting to the academic community (i.e. identify and connect academic advisors for general education requirements with advisors for major, participate with faculty-students interaction)
- assist students in finding and/or establishing smaller populations with whom they can interact (i.e. have special orientations, provide study areas, learning workshops, tutoring services, host community building activities)
- assist students in finding resources to enhance their educational experience that are specific to individual needs (i.e. dorm or housing issues, money concerns, life skills, time management)
- provide students with referrals to academic as well as specialized services (i.e. Counseling And Psychological Services, University Learning Center, Freshmen Year Center, Cultural Centers, TRIO, faculty advisors, tutoring, career services)
- assist students in identifying their strengths and weakness (i.e. balancing academic schedules, examining difference among various majors, referrals to workshops on study strategies)
- assume advocate roles for individual students and special populations to ensure that their needs are being addressed (i.e. represent student voice at a special committee or Task Force, direct intervention when appropriate)
- provide students with information about specific requirements unique to their special population (i.e. NCAA requirements for student-athletes, immigration requirements for international sponsored students)
- clarify policies and procedures that students can use to their advantage (assistance with additional explanation on how to use SAPR's, GRO's, withdrawals, add/drop, services for individuals with a disability).

Academic counseling services are provided by several different centers on campus for targeted populations (see list below). Currently, we have not been able to identify any formal lines of communication (or policies) established between academic advising and academic counseling except in a few cases. Also, it is unclear how much or how often academic advisors refer students to such services, and what kind of feedback they would like to have from the academic counselors. In addition, there does not seem to be a comprehensive list of the identified counseling

areas for special populations that is readily available for academic advisors. Thus, academic advisors may not be aware of the services that a student is receiving from a counselor, or what services are available from the different centers. In all of these cases, the recommended Common Place (section II-C of the Report) can make a decisive difference.

In the survey of academic advisors conducted in May and June of 2001, professional and faculty advisors were asked to describe the coordination of information and services between themselves and seven counseling centers. The response from the faculty advisors reveals that more than 1/3 of the responding group said that the coordination of information was "non-existent" for 5 of the 7 centers. In the remaining categories, "Good," "Adequate," "Poor" or "not sure", a very small percentage reported that the coordination of information and services was good (2,5,6,4,0,6 percents respectively). The responses from the professional advisors had higher percentage for the "Good" category, but only one counseling center received more than a 25% rating of "good" (The learning Center with the high of 29%). In addition, less than 45% of the professional advisors reported that there is "adequate" communication, and three centers had at least 10% of the advisors reporting that communication was "non-existent." Overall, the survey shows that this is an area that needs improving.

After seeing the survey results from the academic advisors, a survey was sent out to the academic counselors. Counselors at the following Centers participated in the survey:

African American Student Affairs (AASA)

Web site: <http://w3.arizona.edu/~mlkc>

Asian Pacific American Student Affairs (APASA)

Web site: <http://w3.arizona.edu/~apasc>

Career Services

Web site: <http://www.uacareerservices.arizona.edu/students/>

C.A.T.S. Academic Services for Student Athletes)

Web site: <http://www.u.arizona.edu/~cats>

Chicano-Hispano Student Affairs (CHSA)

Web site: <http://w3.arizona.edu/~chsa>

Disability Resource Center (DRC)

Web site: <http://drc.arizona.edu>

Honors College

Web site: <http://www.honors.arizona.edu>

International Student Programs and Services

Web site: <http://internationalstudents.arizona.edu>

Multicultural Academic Student Affairs (MASA)

Web site: <http://w3.arizona.edu/~masa>

Native American Student Affairs (NASA)

Web site: <http://w3.arizona.edu/~narc>

Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC)

Web site: <http://w3.arizona.edu/~rotc>

University Learning Center

Web site: <http://www.ulc.arizona.edu>

Strategic Alternative Learning Techniques (SALT--a fee based service)

Web site: <http://www.salt.arizona.edu>

Sixty-five (65) academic counselors out of 73 responded to the survey for a 89% response rate. The counselors represented fourteen centers including two Transfer Counselors.

Several of the questions asked of counselors were the same questions that were presented to academic advisors. Since academic counselors often support and supplement academic advisors, the intent of several questions was to assess the degree in which the support is given.

Counseling Activities

When responding to the various topics that academic counselors discuss with their students, responses indicate that most of the counselors (75% or more) discuss all of the topics with their students at least "sometimes" with the exception of transfer issues. The topics that received the highest percentages for being discussed "most of the time" and "often" were career choice issues, registration procedures, study abroad (. . .etc), general education requirements, and academic probation issues.

Topics with the highest percentages for being discussed "sometimes" include major/minor requirements (48%), transfer credit issues (45%), application to grad/professional schools (44%), and study abroad (. . .etc) (43%).

Only 24% of the academic counselors reported that they rarely or never discuss probation issues, and 37% rarely or never discuss transfer credit issues.

We were asked to find out from the counselors if they perceive that they spend time discussing issues that should be addressed by the academic counselor. The majority (57%) of those responding to the survey indicate that they spend time discussing advising issues with students. In addition, 47% reported that the students say that they have a difficult time scheduling appointments with advisors so they seek out someone who has knowledge about the university, is accessible, and perceived as interested and willing to help. If the students do not have a close relationship with a faculty member, they usually find an academic counselor. The following are different issues that counselors said students bring to them.

Course selection	GPA requirements
Major exploration	General education issues
Registration	Tier requirements and options
ALS minor requirements	Foreign language options (Nat. Am. Languages)
Pre-professional issues	College information
Internships	Study abroad
Probation	Disqualification
Administrative issues	Where to go - process related

Advisors not taking time - bad attitudes, not getting enough information	Conflicting information from advisors
Can't get appointment with advisor	Unable to see advisor in a timely manner (BPA)
Changing major	Graduate school/professional school requirements
Drop/add	Substitutions
AP/IB transfer credit	SSI; II and winter sessions
Transfer / course evaluation	Academic skills
SAPR	Policy interpretation
Mediating their desires/parents expectations	Withdrawing

Another question dealt with the coordination of information and services between academic advisors and academic counselors. Fifty-four percent of the counselors indicated that they have poor to non-existent coordination of information with faculty advisors. For professional advisors, the academic counselors indicated that 43% have poor to non-existent coordination of information with advisors.

The units with the strongest coordination were the ULC (65%), DRC (53%), and Multicultural (48%). On average, 15% of the academic counselors indicated that their relationship with academic advisors was non-existent. We believe the results of the survey indicate the need for improved coordination of information and services between these two professional groups. Once again, the recommended Common Place can be of help here. The results also indicate that there is an uneven "orbit pattern" with some counseling centers having a closer relationship than others with academic advisors.

When asked about their use of various resources (SIS, On-line catalog, CEG, CAS, etc.), responses indicate that a great majority of academic counselors take advantage of the resources provided that outline policies, processes, and general academic information. Approximately 80% of the respondents use SIS, the On-Line-Catalog and the On-Line Schedule of Classes. Responses also indicate that utilization of resources that are more detailed and specific to academic requirements are consistently accessed, but at a lesser rate.

- 42% access the APRR, while 53% indicate that they rarely or never do
- 53% access the Advisor-Link/SAPR, while 47% indicate that they rarely or never do
- 39% access the On-line CEG and CAS, while 60% indicate they rarely or never do
- 43% access the UPAC Listserv, while 57% rarely or never do
- 26% access the NACADA materials/listserv, while 63% rarely do

Academic counselors need current information regarding policies, procedures, and general academic requirements in order to address issues specific to their target population. In a broader role, however, academic counselors must remain current and well informed on all of the above if they are to understand and impact campus climate and the

student experience at this institution. In some respect, academic counselors serve as a bridge for a Research 1 institution towards becoming and being perceived by students as 'student-centered'.

Finally, the survey showed that on the average, academic counselors spend 30 hours per week on counseling activities.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Appendix K: Work to be Done During Year One

The purpose of Appendix K is to serve as a convenient place that itemizes and brings together the various tasks that remain unfinished and that need to be completed during the first year (2002-03). The tasks fall into two main categories-those that require further study during the first year and those for which all or part of the first year is needed to be able to establish the foundation required to implement the recommendation.

Tasks that require further study involve seven areas. First, a representative working group needs to be brought together to build and agree upon a database sensitive to issues about academic advising. The database is needed to establish the benchmark information about student academic advising demand by colleges and units and also the available academic advising personnel resources to those colleges and units upon which to make decisions about the need for new resources ([section II, G-1](#) of the Report). The working group is needed to assure the accuracy of the data that are being used as well. The working group should report no later than in the early spring of the first year. The ultimate decisions about new resource needs, based upon the benchmark data, should follow the ratio recommendations found in [section II, G-1](#) and [Appendix D](#). The benchmark data should presume that all professional academic advising positions existing as of November 2001 still continue-that is, that the University and colleges should have treated all of these positions as strategic saves during the recent budget reductions.

Second, a working group should be formed immediately to assist with planning for establishing the Common Place and recruiting the professional staff.

Third, many questions exist about the accuracy of the information on students coming to academic advisors electronically through Advisor Link. As a result, the AATF has recommended that a study be carried out during the first year under the Vice President for Undergraduate Education to learn the magnitude of the problem by measuring the proportion of data about students' records accessible to advisors through Advisor Link that is inaccurate. If the level of inaccuracy is determined to be unacceptably large, recommendations for correcting the situation should be developed (see [section II, B-6](#)).

Fourth, there is the issue of salary equity and compression. The AATF has recommended that Human Resources create a group to examine the salaries of professional academic advisors as well as the salaries of other professionals comparable to them in qualifications and responsibilities at the University and at our sister state universities in Arizona ([section II, B-4](#)). The group should make recommendations no later than the early spring of the first year both about salary compression and salary equity among professional academic advisors. Based upon incomplete data, the AATF has estimated that salary inequity and compression will require about \$150,000 in continuing dollars to correct.

Fifth, as recommended in [section II, B-4](#), Human Resources should investigate the various position titles currently used for professional advisors and develop a plan to utilize the definition of academic advising described in the Report ([Appendix B](#)) so as to address the confusion currently existing regarding the similarities and differences in the roles of advisor, academic advisor, faculty advisor, counselor, mentor, and others. A career ladder for professional advisors should be established.

Sixth, there is a need to examine the Orientation Program with regard to the information provided to students about the academic advising system at the University and the quality of the experience students have with academic advising during the program ([section II, B-2](#)).

Seventh, outcomes must be identified, and measures developed, to create a system of accountability for academic advising at the University, college, and unit levels. The AATF has identified several areas that are appropriate to measure outcomes ([see section II-F](#)) and some that are inappropriate without extensive further examination and work. In addition, the AATF recommends that a system of accountability also include measures of resource commitments. The Vice President for Undergraduate Education in conjunction with the Academic Council should bring together a representative working group to recommend any additional outcome areas apart from those already suggested by the AATF and to develop measures for all of the outcomes. To provide benchmark data, the outcomes measures should be developed during the summer and first semester of the first year and begin to be applied during the second semester, which could then serve as the benchmark year. This will be prior both to the devolution of general education to the colleges and to the infusion of the majority of new personnel resources into the advising system. The working group should also identify measures using data from 2002 and before that can serve as benchmarks.

There is also a second category of tasks. These are tasks that need to be done during the first year to develop the foundation required to implement the recommendations. The first and largest of these involves the recommended reorganization of the OAS and Freshman Year Center and devolution of general education academic advising to the Colleges of Humanities, Science, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and University College ([section II-A](#)). During the first year, these colleges will need to prepare for the devolution. The phase-in budget ([see Table 2](#)) includes three and one-half new positions during the first year for this purpose to help the colleges prepare and to maximize the success of the devolution during the second year. In addition, as suggested in section II-A, a representative working committee of colleges and other appropriate units should be established with the charge of discussing questions relevant to academic advising and reviewing how University-wide requirements are interpreted, adjusted, and upheld.

Second, the AATF has recommended the establishment of a number of awards to recognize excellence in academic advising and professional development grants for academic advisors ([section II, B-4](#)). During the first year, the office of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education should establish a representative working group to determine the guidelines for these awards and professional development grants, to decide upon a process for making the awards and grants, and to put this process into motion so that the awards and grants can begin to occur during the second year.

Third, recommendations of the AATF in section II, B-4 of the Report call upon the colleges and units to put a process of in-depth yearly evaluation of individual academic advisors into place during the first year. The process should include student feedback as an important component. [Appendix G](#) of the Report provides examples of how to gather student feedback on academic advisors and incorporate it into the evaluation process.

Fourth, the AATF has recommended the creation of an on-line academic advising manual for academic advisors ([section II, B-3](#)). This manual should be developed through the Common Place during the summer and first semester of the first year.

Fifth, the AATF has recommended that all academic advisors engage in a basic level of training respectful of their time and targeted to whether advisors are responsible for major advising, general education advising, or both ([section II, B-3](#)). The training programs should be on line as much as possible and require the time of advisors only in areas where they do not yet have a basic level of knowledge. During the summer and first semester of the first year, and under the review of the Office of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education, the Common Place

should develop a template training program. Colleges should have the choice of adopting this template, amending it, or creating an entirely new one, under the review of the Vice President for Undergraduate Education. These decisions should be made during the second semester of the first year.

Sixth, as recommended in [section II-G](#), during the first year the Office of the Provost should establish a procedure for future years so that personnel resources devoted to academic advising will maintain their recommended ratios as student demand shifts from unit to unit and college to college. Consulting with the Cabinet and SPBAC, and with the support of representatives of the students, the Office of the Provost should also work out a system for determining how academic advising expenditures- especially those funded from student tuition raised for this purpose-will be treated in future department, college, and University budgetary cuts.

Seventh, an implementation team should be established, as proposed in [section II - H](#).