

The University Advising Office 2005-2006 Program Assessment Report

Unit: The University Advising Office

Individual Completing Report: David Bowditch, Associate Dean

Assessment Overview

The University Advising Office's original assessment plan established a total of three (3) goals for assessment. These goals were developed with the intent of gaining feedback concerning three critical areas of importance with regards to the advising services that the University Advising Office espouses to provide for our students.

The 2004-2005 Assessment Report was shared with the advising staff during early fall semester 2005. The assessment data was reviewed, as well as the established goals and criteria used to measure the goals.

Based on input from the advising staff, the assessment instruments and criteria remained the same for the 2005-2006 assessment process.

Changes in Advising Structure

In November 2005, the organizational structure of The Advising Center underwent some changes. The most significant of the changes was the move of the former Transfer Advising staff advisors from under the auspices of Enrollment Services to the auspices of the Division of Student Affairs. Prior to November 2005, the Transfer Advisors were residents of The Advising Center, but under the auspices of Enrollment Services. From an advising standpoint, the organizational restructuring united the Transfer Advising Office advisors and the University Advising Office advisors.

During the spring of 2006, the job descriptions for all of the academic advisors in The Advising Center were slightly altered and tweaked to ensure that all of the academic advisors have the same job description and responsibilities, and that they all formally report to the Associate Dean.

From an assessment perspective, due to the timing and the fractured nature of the reorganization, no changes to the assessment instruments or process were made during the 2005-2006 academic year. However, the 2006-2006 assessment report and results will be discussed with the staff during the summer of 2005, and any changes to the assessment process and instruments will be discussed at that time. Assessment of the advising services provided for students will most likely be expanded beyond the freshman level for the upcoming 2006-2007 academic year.

Assessment Instruments

The University Advising Office utilized three surveys to assess advising services in 2005-2006.

1. General Education Comprehension Survey: This survey is completed each semester by the advising staff as a means of evaluating the comprehension levels of the General Education requirements of the students in their caseloads
2. Post-Advising Appointment Survey: This survey is completed for a period of time during the fall and spring semester as students exit The Advising Center following their advising appointment.
3. Post Freshman Year Experience (FYE) Exit Survey: This is survey that is sent to all students once they complete the FYE and move on to their respective college advising office

The University Advising Office staff contributed to the process in selecting the questions in the surveys to be used to assess the level of advising services that are provided to students.

Assessment Instruments and Goal Criterion

There were no changes in the assessment instruments and goal criterion for the 2005-2006 academic year.

ASSESSMENT GOAL #1: Freshman students will have a basic understanding of General Education academic requirements

Outcome Measure for Goal #1: A General Education Comprehension Evaluation form is used to measure this particular goal. This instrument is one that allows the advisor to assess a student's comprehension of the General Education requirements based on the advisors interaction and intervention with the student during appointments where course selection or planning takes place, or a Gen Ed degree audit or an advising check sheet is discussed and/or presented to a student.

The criterion to measure goal #1 is as follows:

A minimum of 80 % of students assessed by University Advising advisor receive "agree" or "strongly agree" ratings that they "are able to identify Gen Ed courses" (Gen Ed Comprehension Survey question #3)

OUTCOMES

The General Education Comprehension Survey form was used by the University Advising Office staff during the fall 2005 and spring 2006. The academic advisors completed the survey in assessing their student's comprehension and understanding of the General Education requirements. These assessments are snapshots of the student's comprehension at a specific time.

RESEARCH

During the fall semester 2005 and the spring semester 2006, the Gen Ed Comprehension Survey forms were completed and submitted by the advising staff.

During the fall semester 2005, a total of **66** Gen Ed Comprehension evaluation forms were turned in from the advising staff. Analysis of the evaluation data for fall semester 2005 revealed that **86%** (57) students have a satisfactory basic understanding of the General Education requirements (48% (32) agreed, 38% (38) strongly agreed).

During the spring semester 2006, a total of **92** evaluation forms were turned were completed. Analysis of the evaluation data for spring semester 2006 revealed that **81%** (75) students had a satisfactory basic understanding of the General Education requirements (53% (49 students) agreed), 28% (26 students) strongly agreed).

FINDINGS

The data collected from the GenEd Comprehension surveys was analyzed by measuring of the frequency of the basic understanding of the GenEds as determined by the advisor. The comprehension survey uses a five-point Likert scale, with a five (5) representing a "strongly agree" response and a four (4) representing an "agree" response. The tabulations of the "4" and "5" responses are what are used to determine the understanding on not understanding of the GenEd requirements.

The data collected to measure Goal #1 indicates that the University Advising Office has met its goal.

REVIEW

A review of the GenEd Comprehension Survey data with the advising staff will take place during the summer 2006. The University Advising Office staff has not been involved in the review of this data to date.

ACTIONS

There have been no changes made to the assessment activities or review process to date. There will be a review process established during the summer 2006 to analyze the assessment activities conducted to date, with changes and revisions to occur if deemed appropriate.

ASSESSMENT GOAL #2: Ensure that freshman students receive a consistently high level of advising services

Outcome Measure for Goal #2: An advising survey is used to provide assessment feedback for goal number two (2). There are two surveys with similar questions that are used. One survey (Post-Advising Appointment Survey) is utilized for a period of time during each semester where students are asked to complete the advising exit survey following advising appointments. The other is a survey (FYE Completion Exit Survey) which is mailed to students with a self-addressed envelope at the time they earn 30 credit hours, complete the Freshman Year Experience Program, and transition from the University Advising Office to their respective college advising office. This process allows students to submit feedback about the advising services they received once they transition out of the Advising Center and the Freshman Year Experience.

The criteria to measure Goal #2 are:

- *Criterion (A) – A minimum of 70% of FYE students surveyed “strongly agree or agree” their advisor “clearly explains CSU’s academic requirements so that I understand them” (post appointment survey, question #3);*
- *Criterion (B)- A minimum of 70% of FYE students surveyed “strongly agree or agree that their advisor “provided me with the accurate information about CSU requirements and prerequisites so that I understood them” (post FYE survey, question #9);*
- *Criterion (C)- A minimum of 70% of FYE students surveyed “strongly agree or agree” their advisor “is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students” (post appointment survey, question # 11, post FYE survey question #25)*
- *Criterion (D)- A minimum of 70% of FYE students surveyed “strongly agree or agree” their advisor was always prepared and organized for appointments (post appointment survey, question #6)*

OUTCOMES

Based on the outcome measures and criteria listed above to determine satisfactory advising services, it appears that the University Advising Office has met assessment goal #2.

Goal #2 Criterion A: A minimum of 70% of FYE students “strongly agree or agree” their advisor clearly explains CSU’s academic requirements so that I understand them (post advising appointment survey, question #3)

Post-Advising Appointment Survey

During fall semester 2005, a total of 375 students responded to the statement “my advisor clearly explains CSU academic requirements so that I understand them” on the post-appointment advising exit surveys. Of those respondents, a total of **93%** agreed or strongly agreed with the survey statement (88 students agreed (23%), and 264 (70%) strongly agreed).

During the spring semester 2006, a total of 257 students responded to the same statement listed above on the post-appointment advising exit surveys. Of those respondents, **92%** agreed or strongly agreed with the survey statement (57 students agreed (22%) and 179 (70%)students strongly agreed.

Goal #2 Criterion B: 70% of FYE students “strongly agree or agree that their advisor “provided me with the accurate information about CSU requirements and prerequisites so that I understood them” (FYE completion exit survey, question #9)

Post Freshman Year Experience (FYE) Exit Survey

Following the spring semester 2005, 125 FYE exit surveys were sent to students moving from the FYE to their respective college advising offices. A total of nine (9) students returned their surveys to the University Advising Office. Of those respondents, **78%** agreed or strongly agreed with the survey statement “my advisor provided me with accurate information about CSU requirements and prerequisites so that I understood them.” (1 student agreed (11%) and 6 students strongly agreed (67%).

Due to an administrative oversight, there were no post-FYE exit surveys sent to students following the conclusion of the fall 2005 semester.

Goal #2 Criterion C: 70% of FYE students “agree or strongly agree” that their advisor “is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students.” (post-appointment survey, question #11; post FYE survey question #25)

Post-Advising Appointment Survey

During fall semester 2005, a total of 374 students responded to post-appointment advising exit surveys statement “My advisor is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students.” Of those respondents, **94%** agreed or strongly agreed (63 students agreed (17%) and 287 students (77%) strongly agreed).

During the spring semester 2006, a total of 257 students responded to the statement listed above on the advising exit surveys. Of those respondents, **95.1%** agreed or strongly agreed (43 agreed (17%) and 201 (78%) strongly agreed).

Post FYE Exit Survey

Following the spring semester 2005, 125 FYE exit surveys were sent to students moving from the FYE to their respective college advising offices. A total of nine (9) students returned their surveys to the University Advising Office. Of those respondents, **89%** agreed or strongly agreed (1 student agreed (11%) and 8 students (78%) strongly agreed).

Due to an administrative oversight, there were no post-FYE exit surveys sent to students following the conclusion of the fall 2005 semester.

Goal #2 Criterion D: 70% of FYE students “strongly agree or agree” their advisor “is prepared and organized for appointments” (post appointment survey, question #6)

Post-Advising Appointment Survey

During the fall semester 2005, a total of 370 students responded to the statement “My advisor is prepared and organized for scheduled appointments” on the post advising appointment surveys. Of those respondents, **92%** agreed or strongly agreed with the statement (61 students agreed (16%) and 280 students (76%) strongly agreed).

RESEARCH

The testing instruments that were used to collect assessment data for goal #2 were surveys. These surveys were given to students as a post-appointment survey during the course of the semester, and also sent to students who had completed the Freshman Year Experience Program and were in transition to their respective college advising offices.

The post-appointment surveys used during the fall of 2005 and the spring of 2006 were identical to those used the previous academic year.

FINDINGS

Based on the results of the advising surveys that have been completed, and based on the criteria data collected for Assessment Goal #2, the University Advising Office has met its goal and students are receiving a consistently high level of advising services. All of the criteria measures for Goal #2 were met.

REVIEW

To date, there have been no staff or students involved in the review process of the data collected. This review process with staff will occur during the summer of 2006, and potential changes in the assessment goals and/or measures will be considered at that time. Any changes will be implemented for the upcoming 2006/2007 academic year.

ACTIONS

As stated above, there have been no changes to the services, goals or assessment activities to date.

ASSESSMENT GOAL #3. Ensure that all freshman students receive academic advising

Outcome Measure for Goal #3: The Advising Center utilizes a student advising database to log all ongoing contacts with students. Each time a student is contacted by one of the advisors, the contact is documented into the database. This database was utilized to determine if we have met the established criteria to measure our achievement of assessment goal #3.

Goal #3 Criterion: No less than 100% of all freshman students will receive academic advising from the Freshman Year Experience and Advising Office

OUTCOMES

Based on a query made in the Advising Center student database, during the fall semester, 2005, there were a total of 2107 students with less than 30 credit hours earned (who are considered freshman students) active in the University Advising Office advising caseloads. Of those students, our advising database shows that there were a total of 2157 student contacts documented, 1,217 of which were advising-specific contacts made with those students from August 27, 2005 through December 18, 2005. This is an advising contact rate of **58%** of active caseload students.

During the spring semester 2006, there were a total of 1409 students with less than 30 credit hours active in the University Advising Office advising caseloads. Of those students, our advising database shows that there were a total of 1206 contacts in our database, of which 745 were advising-specific contacts with those students from January 14, 2006 through May 11, 2006. This is an advising contact rate of **53%** of active freshman caseload students.

RESEARCH

The goal of having 100% of all freshman students advised is a very ambitious goal for several reasons which have a direct impact on the advising data included in this report.

First and foremost, academic advising is not mandatory for all freshman students at Cleveland State, apart from the advising students receive during the mandatory orientation programs new freshmen must attend. After orientation, advising is only mandatory for those students who are admitted provisionally, or for those students placed on academic probation.

Secondly, with the availability of online registration, students can register for classes on their own (over 95% of CSU students register online), and bypass advising altogether.

Third, the advising contacts which result through the orientation advising are not included in the data of this report, since the preponderance of spring and fall orientation programs take place during the winter and summer breaks. This data is not included for the purposes of this report.

FINDINGS

Based on the data collected, the University Advising Office has not met the criteria for goal #3, which indicates we have not met our goal.

REVIEW

To date, there have been no staff or students involved in the review process of the data collected. This review process with staff will occur during the summer of 2005, and potential changes in the assessment goals and/or measures will be considered at that time. Any changes will be implemented for the upcoming 2005/2006 academic year.

ACTIONS

To date there have been no changes made to the assessment activities or the type of research, or the review process.