Report of the Undergraduate Academic Advising Models Task Force
May 14, 2021

Overview:

This report provides a comparative analysis of advising models for academic advising at The College of New Jersey. The report has several sections that include: I. elements of advising; II. comparative analysis of the models; III. advising best practices for different student populations; IV. comparator institutions; V. campus wide consultation on advising.

I. Elements of Advising:

Different strategies and resources may be needed to accomplish two distinct components of advising: developmental advising and transactional advising. The following elements reflect foundational principles in the literature on academic advising.

Developmental elements of academic advising

1. Improve study skills, plan courses of study, improve interpersonal skills, understand their own values and explore career options - Fielstein and Lammers (1992)
2. Exploration of life goals, exploration of vocational goals, program choice, course choice and scheduling courses - O'Banlon (1972)
3. Setting career and life goals, building self-insight and esteem, broadening interests, establishing meaningful interpersonal relationships, clarifying personal values and styles of life and enhancing critical thinking and reasoning - Creamer and Creamer (1994)
4. Facilitating the student's rational processes, environmental and interpersonal interactions, behavior awareness, and problem-solving, decision-making and evaluation skills - Crookston (1972)
5. Helping students become effective agents of their own lifelong learning and personal development - Chickering (1994)
6. Using the advising relationship to involve students in their college experience, explore with students the facts that lead to success, show interest in academic progress and extracurricular activities, encourage students to ask open-ended questions, use campus resources to find answers and plan courses of study and schedules around the outcomes of their explorations - Frost (1994)

Transactional elements of academic advising

1. Understanding the Academic Calendar dates for drop/add, course withdrawal, registration.
2. Helping students learn to navigate PAWS modules and online resources for up-to-date academic information, policies, and procedures.
3. Understanding course sequencing for major/minor and creating schedules.
4. Understanding general education requirements and how it pertains to major/minor.
5. Understanding forms, policies and procedures for repeating courses, transferring courses, ungraded option, change of major, etc.
6. Referring students to appropriate campus offices for additional assistance.
7. Intersection of prescriptive/transactional and developmental elements (Barbuto et al., 2011)

II. Comparative Analysis of Models

Models of advising are identified in three basic categories: Decentralized, Centralized, and Shared. In this report, we define the various models based on resources from the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) (Organizational Models for Advising).

Models of Academic Advising

Category	Type	Description
Decentralized	Faculty Only	Advising dispersed across campus among faculty
Decentralized	Satellite	Advising on departmental level; similar to TCNJ's Undeclared students are advised in their schools (Undeclared Arts & Comm, Undeclared Business, etc.)
Centralized	Self-Contained/ Professional Advising Only	Advising Office: typically all professional advisors but there may be faculty advisors as well; however, advising occurs in centralized advising office/department
Shared	Dual	Student has TWO advisors: one professional advisor and one faculty advisor
Shared	Total Intake	Initial advising through centralized office (first/second year advising done by professional advisors); Students move to faculty/department advisors after their first or second year
Shared	Supplemental	Advising office (professional advisors) supports departments (often faculty); similar to how CSS provides supplemental advising to students and how CSS offers advising training workshops across campus
Shared	Split	Undeclared/Exploratory students are assigned professional advisors; Declared students area assigned faculty advisors

We provide a chart that describes the types of models that indicates the following information:

a. The percentage of institutions that use the particular model.
b. The type of institution that is most common to the model type.
c. The size of the institution that is most common to the model type.
d. The advantages and disadvantages of each model type that includes information about resources required.

See the comparative analysis chart at: Advising Models (Types with Advantages and Disadvantages)

Following is a summary of the findings from the chart.

Faculty only (Decentralized) model allows advisors to specialize in their major, certificate, program, or area of expertise, which leads to better guidance on schedule planning, academic support, career

preparation and staying on track to graduate. However, it places emphasis on the schools, which has an isolating effect on individual academic units. This hinders communication among the advisors from various units, which can have a negative impact on student support particularly since many of them switch majors and move from one academic school to another. Faculty load can also be wildly inconsistent for both students and faculty.

Self-Contained/Professional-Only Advising (Centralized) model allows for a central location for students to receive advising. Centralized advising tends to provide students with more consistent information about requirements, and regular advising about programs and study and future career goals, and has been found to contribute to higher school success (GPA) and graduation rates. There is also evidence that when students are assigned to professional advisors in an advising center, faculty advising that might take place as part of a dual model, is more likely to evolve into a mentoring relationship, as opposed to a faculty-only decentralized model.

The disadvantages include the space issue and the expense of hiring professional advisors. Space in a meaningful location is an essential factor in effective centralized advising. Housing the center in a building that is primarily classrooms (rather than a library or student center) makes it more convenient for students, and may reduce the cost of such a model. Some institutions house centralized advising within schools/colleges. The other cost factor, hiring professional advisors, can be partially offset by having faculty participate in the advising center. Some institutions use this model only for first-year students. Centralized advising does not guarantee a low advisor to student ratio.

Dual (Shared) model allows every student to have two advisors for their entire time at the institution: one professional advisor and one faculty advisor. The professional advisor handles prescriptive (transactional) actions and general education requirements. Faculty advisors discuss careers, areas of interest, elective choices and goals. This model is not included in the 2011 NACADA Advising Survey. Several examples of institutions include Frostburg State, Georgia Tech's School of Chemical Engineering, and San Diego State's School of Public Affairs.

The dual model allows for professional staff to be more available and accessible to students than faculty members. It also allows faculty to have time for deeper conversations related to careers, fields of study, research opportunities and other discipline specific issues. It is more efficient for double majors/minors and those switching majors. It also levels the field for students to have similar advising experiences. However, staff training would be required for a variety of majors or would need to be specialized around particular schools. The efforts to coordinate staff and faculty would be prominent, and the responsibilities would need to be articulated clearly. There would be increased cost for professional staff and/or advising center. Students could still go for advising where they are most comfortable. Faculty would need to buy-in to the model.

Total Intake (Shared) model involves initial advising through a centralized office. Typically, the first year and sometimes the second year advising is done by professional advisors. Students then move to faculty/department advisors after their first or second year. The professional staff handle all prescriptive advising, such as course sequencing, policies, procedures and referrals to campus resources. The faculty mentor focuses on career related advising and discipline-specific guidance. From the NACADA survey, approximately 16% of all institutions use the total intake model (16% of four-year public bachelor institutions and 4% of four-year private.) It is the third most common at medium-size institutions, such as the Rowan College of Engineering and Clemson College of Business.

The total intake model has similar advantages to the dual model. This model works well for undeclared students who would receive the same advising as other students for their first and second year. Some institutions require all students to come in undeclared, which would also work with this model. It allows for consistent planning and resources for all first year students. However, it would limit the contact with faculty during the first/second year. There would be a high cost for professional staff who are only working with the first-year cohort of students and would also need to be trained in a variety of majors and schools. Once the students move to faculty advisors, there would need to be clear communication regarding their past advising meetings and plans. Institutions noted that they created online resources for students, staff and faculty, which can also be used to share curriculum changes from the departments to the staff.

Supplementary (Shared) model entails an advising office (professional advisors) that supports departmental (often faculty) advisors. Professional staff provide advising training, workshops, and support for faculty advisors. However, with the majority of advising facilitated by faculty advisors, the caseloads are often unevenly distributed and student experiences with advising vary greatly. Double majors and those switching majors may not have sufficient support. While the cost is lower than utilizing a self-contained model (centralized advising office), this structure lacks continuity across advising services. Also, it relies greatly on the buy-in from faculty advisors to utilize advising resources/training.

Split (Shared) model utilizes professional advisors to assist students who are undeclared on their major while declared majors are advised by faculty advisors within their programs. This model provides additional support for students who are undecided on a major. Professional advisors are often better equipped to facilitate career counseling conversations to help students explore various degree programs. However, some students may feel excluded from major specific programming and faculty mentoring (for example, missed research opportunities) until they have been accepted into their major (or new major). Students who have been academically dismissed from their major lack an 'academic home.'

III. Advising Best Practices for Specific Student Populations

Undeclared, open-option
- Best practices include assessing personal interests, abilities and skills. Exploring jobs, careers, majors and skill development. Exploring a variety of decision-making tools. Understanding students' values and allowing them to make the decision. Developing a written plan of action, including follow-up appointments, reflections and goal setting. Referring students to career counselors or other campus resources for assessment tools and job shadowing experiences. Creating hands-on learning experiences with discussions. Guiding students toward informal support systems, such as student organizations and other campus social networks.
- Advising Undeclared Students
- Undecided Resource Links

Transfers
- Best practices include communicating with transfer students before they arrive regarding their specific transfer courses, time to graduation and courses required. Using a transfer center on campus to provide a central point of contact. If the transfer student population is low (and transfer center not feasible), individual advisors should be designated to work with transfer

students. Collaborating closely with the prior institutions by visiting campuses to identify transfer students and plan courses prior to transfer. Creating connections to campus and campus climate. Understanding financial issues, commuting, families, working and other obligations outside of school.
- [Advising Transfer Students](#)
- [Creating Bridges Between Institutions](#)

Major-Changers
- Best practices include conversations about strategies and reassurance that they are not alone (many students change their major). Integrating career and life goals with academic programs. Allowing students to explore multiple options and develop decision-making skills. Academic advisors and faculty should work closely with career advisors and use exploration and assessment tools.
- [Changing Majors](#)
- [Academic Advising and Career Development](#)

At-Risk (dismissed from major/probationary status)
- Best practices include creating individualized academic plans, referring to campus resources and assisting with personal issues which may be hindering academics. Encourage student engagement on campus and exploration of majors and careers. Use peer mentors in introductory courses. Increasing sense of belonging with faculty, student and advisor mentorship programs. Developing short and long term goals with increased frequency of advising meetings.
- [Probation (At-Risk) Resources](#)
- [Advising Students on Probation](#)

Underrepresented and/or minoritized groups (include first-gen)
- Best practices include advising with continuous and accessibility of support, including multiple meetings during a semester. Faculty and staff should be trained and knowledgeable about financial aid, academic support and other campus resources to assist students. Creating a cohort with other first-generation and/or underrepresented students increases retention rates and sense of belonging.
- [Best Practices for First-Generation Students](#)
- [Research and Policy to Help Students Succeed](#)
- [Academic Advising and First-Generation College Students](#)
- [First Generation College Student Advising Community](#)
- [Proactive Advising with First Generation Students](#)

No matter what model of advising is employed, or whatever student populations are of most interest to an institution, having well-trained advisors makes a significant contribution to advising effectiveness. The components of advisor training may include conceptual, informational, relational, technological, and personal content, delivered through a combination of in-person workshops, online modules, and experiential learning.
[Advisor Training Components](#)
[Advisor Training](#)

Advising Specific Student Populations at TCNJ:

Cohort	Advising
Declared Majors	Assigned faculty advisor
Undeclared (School)	Assistant dean or professional staff (coordinators in HSS and Business; Engineering-faculty member)
Undeclared (General)	Center for Student Success
Provisional Students	Center for Student Success
Transfer Students	Faculty advisor, chairs, or coordinators
Undesignated Transitional (dismissed from major)	Center for Student Success, followed by chair or Assist Dean of potential new dept.
Underrepresented Students (minority, first gen, etc.)	Some advised based on participation in other programs, unofficial advising. PRIDE Mentoring Program.
Student Athletes	Assigned advisor within program, Athletics
EOF	Assigned advisor within program, EOF advisor
Scholarship	Assigned mentors/advisors depending on scholarship: Cooperman (faculty, Center for Student Success), Harcourt (Center for Student Success), Commitment Scholar (Center for Student Success)
Honors	Assigned advisor within program, Honors advisor/coordinator

IV. Comparator Institutions/ New models

At The College of New Jersey, most schools use the split (shared) model, with faculty advisers for declared students, and professional advisers serving undeclared students. This model is most common at 4-year public small and medium-sized institutions that grant bachelor degrees. Most use individual advising sessions, with group advising often done on 099 courses. We provide a chart of the advising models presently used by each School and Center at TCNJ; see: TCNJ Advising Models.

We compiled our list of comparator institutions from three sources: Admissions, CSPP Comparator Institutions (March 28, 2018) and Institutional Research Peer/Aspirant List (2016).

Boston College	Miami University of Ohio
Bucknell University	Ramapo College of New Jersey
Christopher Newport University	Rutgers University
College of William and Mary	Saint Mary's College of Maryland
Elon University	St. Joseph's University
Fairfield University	State University of NY – Geneseo
James Madison University	Truman State University
Lehigh University	University of Delaware
Loyola University Maryland	Villanova University

For each of these institutions, we provide basic institutional data (e.g., number of students, number and type of degree programs, acceptance rates, and graduation rates) and information specific to advising models. See the chart of comparator schools at: Comparator Institutions.

Central Themes

As we examined our comparator institutions to learn more about their advising models, a number of themes emerged for consideration. These themes reflect the centrality of institutional context, alongside current conversations and trends in academic advisement at peer institutions and within recent scholarly discourse (e.g. White, 2015; Himes, H., & Schulenberg, J., 2016; McGill 2018, Velasco et al. 2020).

(1) Larger institutions are more likely to rely on centralized advisement, whereas smaller institutions favor decentralized models.

(2) The enrollment intake model matters. In most instances, students arrive on campus without having declared their majors. In some instances, students were not allowed to declare their major (even if they had already been accepted to specific arts, STEM, or honors programs) before the end of their first year of study.

(3) Typically, declaring a major is a straightforward process. Once students determined their area of interest or field of study, they were automatically enrolled in the major.

(4) Undeclared and first year students often interact first with a professional advisor and then, following the declaration of major, are matched with a faculty member in that department. In some cases, students identify this faculty member themselves, in other instances, this assignment was arranged by the department.

(5) Professional advisors might be full-time professional staff or faculty who receive additional training (and sometimes monetary compensation or course-release) to support first-year and

undeclared students. These advisors are often housed in a center or designated space on campus.

(6) The use of professional advisors to support first-year, undeclared, and special student cohorts has been growing significantly at many institutions, and is now employed at institutions that previously relied on faculty-only advising models.

(7) Many schools provide additional support for designated groups of students through targeted mentorship programs. Compensation for mentors in these programs varies. In some instances, mentors are additionally compensated or were designated professional advisors. In other cases, mentors are faculty, staff, or student volunteers.

(8) In the case of specialized programs, colleges (or individual schools within a college) often rely on professional advisors.

V. TCNJ Constituent Concerns and Suggestions for Improvement via Campus Consultation

The task force reached out to colleagues across campus to better understand and examine ways in which TCNJ advising could be strengthened. The following four questions were posed to Deans and Assistant/Associate Deans, Directors (i.e., the Director of the Accessibility Resource Center, the Director of the Career Leadership and Development, the Executive Director and Support Specialists in the Center for Student Success, the Executive Director for Global Engagement, the Director of Student Transitions in the Office of Transitions, and the Associate Directors of the EOF Program), Department Chairs, and Program Assistants/School Professional Advising Staff:

(1) What are your general observations about advising at TCNJ?
(2) What are some of the challenges for those in your area who advise?
(3) What structure or supports would help you advise your students more effectively?
(4) How could advising at TCNJ be improved (which areas need improvement)?

All raw data organized by category of respondent appears in the Appendix: Campus Feedback- Academic Leaders and Staff. See: [Campus Feedback -Academic Leaders and Staff](#)

Out of this data ten specific themes surfaced identifying areas of advising at TCNJ that might be improved with corresponding suggestions for improvement. We organized them at the level of the institution, department, and student.

At the level of the institution:

1. *No centralized mechanism for tracking advising conversations across units*
2. *Advising practices that vary across campus, for example: unequal use of holds; lack of consistent advising guides or planners; and lack of consistent expectations of advisors in advance of meetings*
3. *Poor communication between TCNJ's various Schools*
4. *More students are undeclared or unsure of their selected major or face problems changing majors*
5. *Graduation check-outs are too late to fix program requirement problems*

Institutional-level suggestions for improvement highlighted the importance of creating a TCNJ Advising Office, using software for advising, using new enrollment software/practices, and making better use of

our current systems and practices.   Within these categories, we highlight the following suggestions for improving academic advising at the institutional level:

- A TCNJ Advising Office (or other designated unit) could:
    - Create and maintain a central advising website to organize advising knowledge
    - Create and distribute common advising checklists that go out each semester with all content related to registration
    - Provide a handout to all advisors that includes a list of available resources or links to resources to determine who to contact when for things like CARE reports, health or record holds, ungraded options, who to contact for LOA, withdraw from classes deadlines and fees, etc.
    - Coordinate across Schools/departments to improve consistency and transparency in 099 curriculum
    - Provide supplemental advising to students and/or to advise TCNJ undeclared students
- Advising software could be used to capture notes, link various interested parties across campus (e.g., ARC, Athletic advisors), track data, trigger reminders, smooth advisor transfers, handle referrals from one unit to another
- New enrollment processes could be implemented to streamline advising about coursework
    - New enrollment software that automatically places students into the next appropriate course in their planner or asks them to select a course within a set of appropriate courses. This would improve advising and also reduce stress experienced by students when classes close.
    - Consider priority registration/reserved seats for students without a major for foundations classes; have a central system for waitlist requests
- To make better use of our current systems and practices, suggestions were made in several different areas:
    - To improve communication and consistency across Schools:
        - Provide cross-training for advisors in the case of Dual Education majors or double majors, and better communication between Education advisor and content area advisor
        - Rich experiences, such as independent courses (study, research, internship) should be equally accessible to students across majors. There are some Schools that limit these experiences.
        - Improve inconsistencies in use of pre-majors and simplify the process of changing majors.
        - Assign students a formal advisor in intended area before they are accepted as a major or pre-major
        - Create a support system for students who change majors, especially those who have been dismissed; part of this system should collect institutional data to determine the extent to which marginalized students are being dismissed or choose to leave majors as a result of feeling like they don't belong
    - To improve use of PAWS and related processes:
        - We should make better use of Student Viewable Comments in PAWS

- Need a Junior graduation audit prior to summer classes to allow students a summer plus the following academic year to address problems
- Need outreach to juniors and seniors to provide extra support if they are behind
- Improve PAWS to more accurately reflect requirements
- Create extra supports for transfer students who are more likely to have issues with transfer credit and being short units for graduation

At the level of the department and with respect to faculty responsibility:

6. *A misunderstanding of the student-faculty advising relationship which often includes a lack of a developmental approach.*
7. *Lack of training for faculty advisors lack training or lack of interest in becoming a good advisor resulting in the shift of advising burden to uncompensated staff*
8. *Uneven advising loads for faculty advisors and large numbers of general advising questions*
9. *Non-major advising (ex. career exploration or global/study abroad opportunities) not done well within units*

Departmental-level suggestions for improvement highlighted the need for more general advising support, better coordination with other campus units and improved training for faculty. Overwhelmingly, respondents appreciated the faculty-advising model when done well. However, critically, it was suggested that we need:

- Mechanisms for when faculty advisor doesn't meet expectations
- A commitment to accountability in tenure and promotion process
- Reward system to recognize excellence in advising

For more general advising support and coordination to address the concerns above, we need:

- A system for knowing requirements that is separate from rich faculty advising relationship
- Create an advising office to answer all routine questions (ex. how to add a minor, how to change majors, how to apply for transfer credit...) and assist with questions about common classes taken at community colleges for transfer credit
- Develop a resource for faculty members who have questions; need a central advising website
- To refer students to other units so that faculty are not serving as career counselors or mental health counselors; provide more access to mental health services
- Provide more targeted advising support for international students or other populations

Our faculty training and support of students could be improved by:
- Training faculty on the developmental advising approach and how that changes over time; and make sure students understand that their responsibility increases over time
- Use the advising agreement that was already created when students first enter TCNJ, and remind students of their changing responsibilities.
- Create practices such that all students (especially marginalized students) are provided

with developmental advising
- Need School-based and TCNJ-based workshops on a regular basis that are required
- Improve communication to students about departmental policies/practices after Chairs change
- Include modules/consultation by non-academic departments to make sure students provided with best practices
- Clarify the role of non-academic advisors (ex. ARC staff are not primary advisors)

To manage the problem of uneven advising loads, additional suggestions include:
- Use professional advising staff in first years at TCNJ with faculty advising later
- Use professional advising for all requirements with faculty advising for richer conversations (ex. study abroad, internships, referrals for academic support); Consider allowing Program Assistants to serve as secondary advisors
- Change the enrollment system to reduce stress as classes close and students need to meet with their advisor again to create a new plan. This doubles the advising load if students need to meet with faculty twice during the period around registration.
- Make use of group advising within departments to help with larger loads
- Use of cohort models works in some departments; consider cohorting Education students within content area

Pertaining to student responsibility and supporting them developmentally:

10. *Students not prepared for appointments or unresponsive to advisor or departmental/program outreach*

    To improve the student (and faculty) experience with advising, it is suggested that:

    - Advisors need to be more proactive with outreach and guidance
    - Increase use of advising holds
    - Do not drop LOA students from advisor's record; note that they are on leave instead
    - Use professional advising to teach students how to use PAWS and about TCNJ policies and practices
    - Need consistent communication about the value of the liberal learning curriculum and that these courses are intended to challenge students (and not be easy As outside of their majors) and an enrollment system that helps students select courses

The task force also reached out to Student Senators to get a student perspective on advising with the following questions:

    (1) What are some strengths of advising at TCNJ?
    (2) What are some weaknesses of advising at TCNJ?
    (3) How could advising at TCNJ be improved (which areas need improvement)?

Our students sample is relatively small (7 students) and does represent a special cohort that may not be representative of the TCNJ student body. We recommend that a later task force collect a more robust sample from students. The student respondents reported that advisors are accessible and helpful. One student commented on the value of registration holds on student accounts. Student respondents reported similar problems as the academic leaders. For example, one student wrote, "Not all advising is equal and some professors are more supportive of certain plans than others, can be discouraging/might not have sufficient knowledge regarding advising for that field of interest." Another student noted that a weakness is the "limited knowledge of advisors on areas outside of the core content."

Student suggestions for improvement highlighted the need for standardized training for faculty with information available in each advising office about policies and practices (e.g., infographics about adding a minor), increased communication between faculty and their advisees, and better monitoring of graduation requirements prior to graduation.

In summary, feedback from the campus suggests that while advising is being done relatively well, there are opportunities for improvement. At the institutional level, the highlighted problems and corresponding suggestions for improvement coalesced around the need for an Advising Center to provide general support to both students and faculty, the need for improved training for faculty, and also the need for advising software to coordinate our advising efforts across units and better support students. Linking these elements back to models of advising, they are consistent with a total intake model that could transition into a dual model as students advance academically. Many of the articulated problems at the departmental and student levels could be addressed by making these changes. Notably, equity concerns may be addressed. Anecdotally, we observe that BIPOC and female faculty have a large hidden service burden, which benefits White male faculty as they are able to spend more time on research. Using a dashboard system to track advising will provide a critical source of information to bring that hidden service to the forefront. As an institution, we will be able to more accurately evaluate the time spent on service and consider how to rebalance the FWH assigned to individual faculty members. An Advising Center and improved faculty training may also improve equity in advising as long as there is an institutional commitment to holding faculty accountable and assess the workload changes and student experience over time.

References

Barbuto Jr, J. E., Story, J. S., Fritz, S. M., & Schinstock, J. L. (2011). Full range advising: Transforming the advisor-advisee experience. Journal of College Student Development, 52(6), 656-670.

Chickering, A. W. (1994). Empowering lifelong self-development. NACADA Journal, 14 (2), 50-53.

Creamer, D. G. & Creamer, E. G. (1994). Practicing Developmental Advising: Theoretical Contexts and Functional Applications. NACADA Journal 14(2), 17-24.

Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13(1), 12-17.

Fielstein, L.L. and Lammers, W. J. (1992). The Relationship of Student Satisfaction with Advising to Administrative Support for Advising Services. NACADA Journal 12(1), 15-21.

Frost, S. H. (1994). Advising Alliances: Sharing Responsibility for Student Success. NACADA Journal 14(2), 54-58.

Himes, H., and Schulenberg, J. (2016). The evolution of academic advising as a practice and as a profession. Beyond foundations: Developing as a master academic advisor, 1-20.

McGill, C. M. (2018). Leaders' perceptions of the professionalization of academic advising: A phenomenography. The Journal of the National Academic Advising Association, 38(1), 88-102.

O'Banion, Terry. (1972). An Academic Advising Model. Junior College Journal, 42 p. 62, 64, & 66-69. Reprinted with permission in the NACADA Journal 14(2), 10-16.

White, E. R. (2015). Academic advising in higher education: A place at the core. The Journal of General Education, 64(4), 263-277.

Velasco, T., Hughes, K. L., & Barnett, E. A. (2020). Trends in Key Performance Indicators Among Colleges Participating in a Technology-Mediated Advising Reform Initiative. Community College Research Center, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Web Links

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Organizational-Models-for-Advising.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advisor-Training-Components.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/Administration-of-Advising/Advisortraining.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advising-Undeclared-Students.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Undecided-Exploratory-Student-Resources.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/Advising-Transfer-Students.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advising-Transfer-Students.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Changing-Majors.aspx

http://apps.nacada.ksu.edu/conferences/ProposalsPHP/uploads/handouts/2017/C085-H01.pdf

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Students-on-probation-resources.aspx

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advising-students-on-probation.aspx

https://firstgen.naspa.org/blog/beyond-barriers-best-practices-for-first-generation-students

https://firstgen.naspa.org/research-and-policy

https://firstgen.naspa.org/scholarly-article/academic-advising-and-first-generation-college-students-a-quantitative-study-on-student-retention

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Community/Advising-Communities/First-Gen-College-Student-Advising.aspx

https://journals.psu.edu/mentor/article/view/61250/60883

https://www.achievingthedream.org/resources/initiatives/integrated-planning-and-advising-for-student-success-ipass-initiative

Additional Resources
NACADA 2011 Advising Survey:
https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/2011-NACADA-National-Survey.aspx
NACADA Resources - The Global Community for Academic Advising
    Core Values - **https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/CoreValues.aspx**
    Core Competencies - **https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/CoreCompetencies.aspx**
    Concept of Academic Advising - **https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/Concept.aspx**

Committee Members:
Emily Meixner, Co-Chair
Kathryn Jervis, Co-Chair
Madeline Anthes
Lisa Grimm
Mary Lehr-Furtado
Laurel Leonard
Helene Anthony
Anne Farrell
Nate Magee
Eugene Kim
Alexa Giacoio
Heather Collins