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Academic advising administrators, academic advising professional organization leaders, and academic advising scholars have not had access to information about how academic advising is organized in their states. The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges; (b) to explore the influences budgets, institutional policies and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy had on academic advising; and (c) to examine the levels of influence budgets, institutional policies, and OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place.

The researcher used an exploratory mixed-method design that included: (a) structured phone interviews conducted with five state-level leaders in Ohio and (b) mail questionnaires sent to academic advising administrators at Ohio’s two-year public colleges. State-level leaders in Ohio reported that in general institutional budgets for academic advising would likely decrease and impact the effectiveness of academic advising. Institutional budgets remained stable over the last year, and grant budgets were rarely used. Academic advising administrators most frequently reported “no change” in institutional budgets and reported grant budgets were “not applicable” in their academic
advising programs during the past year. Results indicated that institutional variables (institutional policies and institutional budgets) had more influence on academic advising than external variables (state policies and grant budgets) had on academic advising.
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Chapter One

Introduction to the Organization of Academic Advising

Introduction

The purpose of academic advising is to help the student choose a program of study which will serve him in the development of his total potential. As such, academic advising is a central and important activity in the process of education. Academic advising occurs at least once each term for every student in the college; few student personnel functions occur as often or affect so many students. But while there is general agreement concerning the importance of academic advising for the efficient functioning of the institution and the effective functioning of the student, there is little agreement regarding the nature of academic advising and who should perform the function. (O’Banion, 1972, p. 62)

This is the introductory paragraph from O’Banion’s (1972) seminal position article entitled “An Academic Advising Model.” In 2009, O’Banion’s original work was reprinted, which has highlighted the relevance of his work in the field of academic advising today. In this article, which has been cited frequently in the advising literature for more than three decades, O’Banion offered a description of the concept and practice of academic advising that continues to accurately describe academic advising today. Further, he challenged higher education leaders to consider (a) that the ways in which academic advising was organized in four-year colleges might not be appropriate for two-year public colleges and (b) that the types of advising personnel who delivered advising in four-year colleges might not be appropriate for two-year public colleges.

The organization of academic advising has been described in terms of the following variables: (a) the person(s) who coordinate advising, (b) the distribution of coordination among coordinator(s) and locations, (c) the people who deliver academic advising, and (d) the locations where advising takes place (Habley, 1988; Habley & Morales, 1998; Habley, 2004b). Hardee (1970) offered short descriptions of five
“organizational practices” for faculty advising and one practice that involved non-faculty advisors (p. 16). Components of Hardee’s descriptions were evident in the seminal work of Habley (1983), who was the first to define seven organizational models of academic advising. These seven models have remained unchallenged in the literature and have been the basis for studies designed to describe the ways in which academic advising is organized.

These seven organizational models referred to the locations where academic advising takes place, such as academic departments, centralized advising units, or both locations. The concept of the organization in terms of academic advising also refers to the administration of academic advising and the ways that advising is distributed or shared among various delivery systems. In terms of administration of the organizational models, advising programs have centralized administration, decentralized administration, or shared administration (Pardee, 2000, 2004). Habley’s (1983) models included faculty-only, dual, satellite, self-contained, split, supplementary, and total-intake. Habley’s (1983) definitions are foundational to the literature on the organization of academic advising and have been included in academic advising research studies designed to identify and study the organizational models in place at various types of institutions (Avants, 2004; Jefcoat, 1991; Leymaster, 1989; Wong, 1986).

“Delivery systems” refer to the types of personnel who provide academic advising (Habley, 1983). Discussions on academic advising delivery systems are included in the first edition of Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook (Gordon & Habley, 2000) and the second edition of Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). In the second and most recent edition of this academic
advising resource, the delivery systems discussed included the following types of personnel: faculty, professional advisors, counselors, paraprofessional advisors, clerical staff, and peers.

ACT has described the organization of academic advising in the nation and has been a leader in the survey of academic advising in the United States. In 1979, ACT launched the first of six national, comprehensive surveys designed to describe several components of academic advising: leadership/coordination, organizational models, delivery systems, evaluation, and effectiveness of academic advising. ACT distributed surveys to one participant at each higher education institution in order to gather data on areas such as organizational models, delivery systems, administration/coordination, group advising, advisor training, staff and program evaluation, student-to-advisor ratios, frequency of contacts with advisors, recognition of advisors, and effectiveness of advising programs. In the third administration of the National Survey in 1987, ACT added Habley’s seven definitions of organizational models for academic advising to the instrument (Habley, 1988). These definitions remained in subsequent administrations including the sixth and most recent published administration in 2003 (Habley, 2004b).
Statement of the Problem

Academic advising administrators, academic advising professional organization leaders, and academic advising scholars have not had access to information about how academic advising is organized in their states. The literature review conducted for this study and discussions with academic advising scholars involved with the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and ACT revealed that neither Ohio nor any other state had implemented NACADA’s (2006) recommendation about understanding academic advising. This information is needed by administrators in order to develop and improve their academic advising programs. NACADA advocated that academic advising is a key strategy in institutional retention efforts. In 2006, NACADA recommended that every institution identify the organizational models, delivery systems, and locations where academic advising takes place in order to understand academic advising on their campuses.

The State of Ohio and individual institutions have implemented expectations for academic advising to assist in the communication of transfer policy and have implemented advising programs as strategies to assist in achieving increased degree completion. The specific problem addressed in this study is that the State of Ohio does not have data describing how academic advising is organized and therefore cannot assess the role academic advising plays in meeting these completion goals. More specifically, there is lack of research concerning the impact of institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy on the ways in which academic advising is organized in two-year public colleges. In 2003, ACT conducted the most recently published national study designed to describe the
organization of academic advising. Participants responding to ACT surveys in this 2003 study responded to several aspects related to the ways that academic advising was organized and delivered; however, ACT had not collected data on the impact of budgets and policies on the organization of academic advising.

ACT contributed to the comprehensive description of academic advising in community colleges. However, the data generated from the national surveys have been of limited value to academic advising leaders in Ohio and in other states. ACT has sorted the data by college type (e.g., two-year public, two-year private, four-year public; four-year private) but has not sorted the data by state.

This Ohio study on the organization of academic advising incorporated NACADA’s (2006) recommendation for better understanding academic advising: identify the institution’s organizational model of academic advising and the delivery systems of academic advising. More importantly, this study was the first state-specific population study designed to describe the ways in which academic advising was organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges and was the first to explore the perceptions two-year public college advising administrators had about the impact that budgets, institutional policies, and OA&T Policy had on the organization of academic advising in these colleges.

**The Theory Informing this Study**

Several student development theories inform the practice of academic advising. For example, involvement theory (Astin, 1984), transition theory (Schlossberg, Lynch, & Chickering, 1989), and engagement theory (Kuh, 2009) provide guidance to academic advising practitioners. Schlossberg et al. (1989) advocated that student services
practitioners should design programs and services to assist students as they move into, move through, and move out of the learning environment. This applies to academic advising because students need specific types of academic advising at certain points in their college experience. Astin (1984) and Kuh (2009) promoted that institutions must create and encourage student-to-staff and student-to-faculty interactions that are positive, regular, and on-going. These types of student interactions which often occur during academic advising appointments are intended to improve student success and retention (Astin, 1984; Kuh, 2009; Schlossberg et al., 1989).

Theories of involvement, transition, and engagement inform the practice of academic advising; however, these theories do not account for the ways in which academic advising is organized and delivered at the institutional level. Organizational theories that emerged out of behavioral management theory (Kuh, 1996) more closely align with and inform the study of the organization of academic advising. According to Kuh, these behavioral organizational theories presume that an institution behaves in certain ways based on the formality of the institution’s structures, policies, and procedures. Kuh further stated that several theories are housed under the umbrella of organizational theory. Conventional organizational theories include: rational-bureaucratic, collegial, and political (p. 274). Post-conventional organizational theories include: organized anarchy, culture, and learning organization (p. 280). Kuh asserted that practitioners should develop competency with many organizational theories in order to understand organizations through multiple lenses.

Organizational theory informs various types of academic advising studies. For example, the political view of organizational theory applies to research about the
development of academic advising policy as a strategy for organizing academic advising. The collegial lens of organizational theory informs studies designed to explore various academic advising committee structures formed to advance the organization of academic advising. Learning organization theory applies to research focused on exploring the various academic advising relationships a student has and on examining how the student makes meaning of the pieces of academic advising information received from these relationships. However, these organizational theories do not inform studies of the organization of academic advising in terms of the infrastructure of academic advising. Infrastructure refers to the leadership, staffing patterns, reporting lines, and alignment of the program within the institution’s overall hierarchy.

Max Weber (1947) introduced the rational-bureaucratic organizational theory in his book *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Weber’s ideas have continued to permeate and influence the scholarly work of current organizational theorists, including those that advocated for more flexible and less structured perspectives. Hage (1980) described the components of bureaucratic theory to include: “hierarchy of authority, limited authority, division of labor, technical competency, procedures for work, rules for incumbents, and differential rewards” (p. 25). Hage explained that bureaucracy was focused on discipline and control for the purposes of managing the efficiency and legitimacy of the organization. For example, a bureaucratic organization was one that had incorporated clear lines of leadership or “chain of command,” division of work among various employees with clear responsibilities, clear job descriptions, transparent and documented work flows for the purposes of assessment
and professional development of new employees, and competent, qualified employees (Hage, 1980, p.26).

The bureaucratic organizational theory continues to be recognized by those who apply newer, and opposing institutional analysis theories that account for institutional change (David & Bitektine, 2009). For example, Mouritsen and Skaerbaek (1995) opposed the discipline and structure of the bureaucratic theory and chose to apply neo-institutional theories to inform the study about a complex organization that was experiencing competing interests between the organization’s two missions. They observed that even though the institution had one area that deserved flexibility and creativity to prosper, the other area needed bureaucratic control, responsibility, and accountability in order to maintain the business operations of the organization (Mouritsen & Skaerbaek, 1995).

After reviewing several student development theories and organizational theories, the researcher decided that the bureaucratic organizational theory best informed the organization of academic advising. The researcher designed this study to describe organization in terms of the bureaucracy or infrastructure of academic advising. O’Banion (2009) stated “. . . while there is general agreement concerning the importance of academic advising for the efficient functioning of the institution and the effective functioning of the student, there is little agreement regarding the nature of academic advising and who should perform the function” (p. 83). O’Banion’s statement referenced efficiency and effectiveness which were major premises of bureaucratic theory; structure and organization lead to efficiency. Therefore, prior to studying the efficiency and effectiveness of academic advising, the organization and infrastructure of academic
advising must be described. In addition, the bureaucratic organizational theory aligned well with the conceptual model guiding this study, *Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising*. Both the theory and the conceptual model informing this study suggested that the organization of academic advising should be described in terms of the hierarchical structure of academic advising. This study provided data about who led advising (leadership, responsibility, and authority), to whom this person reported (hierarchy), to what area of the college this person reported (hierarchy), how much time this person allocated to coordinating academic advising (component of efficiency), who delivered advising (distribution of work), how much these personnel allocated to delivering academic advising (efficiency), the student-to-advisor ratios (efficiency), and where academic advising took place (distribution of work). In addition, this study provided information about the influences of budgets and policies on the organization of academic advising.

The researcher for this Ohio study on the organization of academic advising recognized that organizational structures must have strategic and planned flexibility in order to meet the changing needs of students and other stakeholders. However, the researcher also advocated the importance of focusing on the basic step of exploring and describing the infrastructure of academic advising in terms of leadership, staffing, reporting lines, and distribution of work by locations. This approach was best informed by the bureaucratic organizational theory. The researcher understood that future studies on the organization of academic advising that explore variables outside of exact hierarchical structures may be informed by other organizational theories. Prior to describing other flexible less-structured elements of the organization of academic
advising or the efficiency and effectiveness of academic advising, Ohio’s academic advising administrators needed specific information about the organization and structure of academic advising and the influences of budgets and policies on this infrastructure.

**Conceptual Model**

Gordon’s (1992) “Building Blocks of Academic Advising” provided a model for studying academic advising in colleges and universities. Gordon (1992) advocated that advising programs must be defined and described by responding to six questions:

1. Why advising?
2. What is advising?
3. Who advises?
4. Where is advising done?
5. When is it done?
6. How is it done? (p. 23)

Almost 15 years later, NACADA (2006) advocated that institutions must identify the organizational models and delivery systems in place in order to gain a better understanding of academic advising.

With approval, the researcher adapted Gordon’s model by incorporating NACADA’s (2006) recommendation to focus on identifying and describing the key components of the infrastructure of the organization of academic advising. In addition, the researcher incorporated components of Weber’s (1947) bureaucratic theory into the adapted model, “Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising,” displayed in Figure 1. The conceptual model that guided this study consisted of four blocks in the form of a pyramid that build on each other and defined the basic infrastructure needed for academic advising.

The first block in the pyramid is *Leadership* (responsibility) and is one of the most important. This block represents the foundation needed in order for the organization
Figure 1.1 Model adapted from Gordon’s (1992) “Building Blocks of Academic Advising.” Adapted with permission (V. Gordon, personal communication, June 10, 2009; see Appendix A)
of academic advising to advance and develop. An administrator must be assigned as the leader of academic advising. This leader must have responsibility for and authority over the coordination of academic advising and must have dedicated time in order to organize academic advising. Each academic advising program requires some form of leadership in order to function and grow. Although some form of academic advising may exist on a college campus, a campus having academic advising without leadership will likely not realize the potential academic advising has for fostering an efficient and effective student success program.

The second block in the pyramid is Personnel (distribution of labor) and is the second largest block. The personnel block builds on the leadership block. An academic advising program needs various types of academic advisors to assist in the delivery of services. Academic advisors must have a specific reporting line to someone responsible for the advising program. Although leadership is extremely important in the development and advancement of an academic advising program, an academic advising leader needs the collaboration with and support of academic advisors in order to develop and advance the advising program. This collaboration must be organized in terms of clear reporting lines to someone who is responsible for the efficiency and effectiveness of academic advising.

The third block in the pyramid is Time Spent Advising (efficiency) and is the third largest block. Advisors support students by managing and balancing various student-to-advisor ratios and percentages of time dedicated to advising. Personnel need dedicated time to spend on academic advising and require reasonable student-to-advisor ratios.
Dedicated time and reasonable student-to-advisor ratios have the potential to influence the efficiency of the academic advising program.

The fourth block in the pyramid is Locations (distribution of labor) and is the fourth largest block. Dedicated locations where academic advising can take place need to be identified and available as a component of the infrastructure of academic advising. Dedicated space for academic advising is important; however, without academic advising leadership, academic advising personnel, and dedicated time to coordinate and deliver activities, dedicated space is of limited use. Researchers and practitioners who need to gain a better understanding of advising but have limited time are able to gather data beginning with the bottom foundational block and move up through the pyramid as additional research and analysis time becomes available.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges; (b) to explore the influence budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy had on academic advising; and (c) to examine the levels of influence institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place.

**Research Questions**

1. How has academic advising been organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

2. How has budget impacted academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?
3. What levels of impact have institutional budgets and grant budgets had on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

4. How have institutional policies and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy impacted academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

5. What levels of impact have institutional policies and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy had on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

**Significance of the Study**

This study addressed Ohio’s and the nation’s need for focused research on academic advising in the two-year public college to include a study designed to describe the ways in which academic advising was organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges and to examine the impact institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the OA&T Policy had on the organization of academic advising. This study was needed for several reasons. First, this study was needed to address the National Academic Advising Association’s (NACADA) (2006) recommendation that understanding of academic advising at an institution must begin with a description of the organizational model in place, the delivery systems in place, and the locations where academic advising takes place. Ohio had not conducted this type of research.

This study provided the researcher an opportunity to take NACADA’s recommendation a step further by pursuing an understanding of how academic advising was organized among a population of two-year public colleges in one state and exploring
the influence budgets and policies exerted on decisions about who should provide academic advising and about where academic advising should take place. The literature review conducted for this study and discussions with academic advising scholars involved with NACADA and ACT revealed that neither Ohio nor any other state had implemented NACADA’s recommendation about understanding academic advising.

Second, this study was needed to explore the impact state policies developed by the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR), which are outlined in the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy, had on specific components of the organization of academic advising. OBR has maintained a team of legislative and higher education professionals who have developed and are developing the OA&T Policy on credit transfer to include the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM), Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGS), Career and Technical Credit Transfer Assurance Guides (CTAGS), Advanced Placement (AP) Policy, and Web-based online transfer information portals. Academic advising must be organized in ways to facilitate student understanding of and application of these policies in order to assist the State of Ohio in achieving these academic-advising related initiatives. This on-going state commitment to the development of the OA&T Policy supported the need for this study on the impact of state policy on the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges. Ultimately, this study will enable academic advising administrators and articulation and transfer leaders to advance academic advising as a tool to help students achieve their higher education goals in Ohio.

**Delimitations**

The researcher chose to delimit this study on the organization of academic advising in three ways.
1. The first delimitation of the study included a focus on specific components of the concept of the organization of academic advising. The organization of academic advising has been studied using a comprehensive list of variables to include, but not limited to: leadership of academic advising, delivery of academic advising, time spent advising, student-to-advisor ratios, locations of advising, policy statements for academic advising, technology for academic advising, advisor training and development, advisor evaluation, evaluation of academic advising effectiveness, etc. (Habley, 2004b). This study implemented NACADA’s (2006) recommendation for understanding the organization of academic advising and focused on specific components of the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges: who delivers academic advising and where it is delivered. The concept of the organization of academic advising in this study was guided by the conceptual model entitled Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising which included four components (e.g., leadership of academic advising; personnel who deliver academic advising; time spent delivering academic advising, to include student-to-advisor ratios; and, locations of academic advising).

2. The second delimitation of this study was that the researcher examined academic advising administrator perceptions on the levels of influence institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and decisions about where academic advising should take place.
3. The third delimitation was that the researcher conducted structured, phone interviews with five, specific Ohio Board of Regents leaders and professional organization leaders identified through a snowball sampling process (Creswell, 2005; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The snowball sampling process led to five names that regularly emerged as the most informed on public policy related to academic advising. The researcher selected interview participants based on their depth of understanding of and their recent and direct involvement with state-level policy and their awareness of academic advising in the State of Ohio. Participants provided their perceptions on the influences state policy had on the organization of academic advising.

Limitations

This exploratory mixed-method design included several limitations.

1. First, this study was a population study of academic advising administrators at two-year public colleges in one state; therefore, the findings should not be generalized to another state without further research on the demographics of Ohio and the comparison state.

2. Second, this mixed-method study design included only five leaders within the Ohio Board of Regents or state professional organizations. Although a snowball sampling approach was used to identify Ohio leaders who were likely the most informed on state policy related to academic advising, other leaders who were not interviewed may have been able to contribute to the study.
3. Third, this study relied on one individual’s understanding of academic advising at his or her college and his or her willingness and ability to honestly answer the questions. In addition to relying on one individual’s perspective, data were not collected on the participants’ length of service as the academic advising administrators at the colleges under examination. Therefore, relying on one participant per institution may represent a limited and biased perspective. Also, the participant’s knowledge of his or her academic advising programs may have influenced the accuracy of the questionnaire responses, the item response rate, and the overall response rate.

4. Fourth, although the data generated in this study was summarized in a way to avoid directly connecting any specific data to a specific institution, this may have been of concern to some participants who did not want readers to attempt to associate given responses with a given administrator. This may have also influenced response rates.

5. Fifth, the instrument was not statistically tested for validity and reliability. However, a panel of five professionals and scholars in the field of academic advising reviewed the instrument for face and content validity and edited the instrument. Also, five academic advising administrators with experience at a two-year public college who did not serve as the academic advising administrator at the institutions in the population under study served in a pilot test of the instrument. The researcher collected information on the ease with which the instrument could be completed, the validity of the questions, the
amount of time needed to complete the instrument, and other feedback the pilot group wanted to communicate.

Assumptions

This study on the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges was an exploratory and descriptive study developed under five assumptions:

1. The first assumption of this study was that academic advising was an important strategy toward achieving the goal of increasing degree completion and certificate completion through the implementation of the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy.

2. The second assumption of this study was that the Ohio Board of Regents and Ohio professional organization leaders selected for the structured phone interviews clearly understood and were informed about Ohio public policy designed to impact academic advising.

3. The third assumption of this study was that someone was responsible for the coordination and direction of academic advising at each of Ohio’s two-year public colleges.

4. The fourth assumption of the study was that one leader at each campus would be aware of the ways in which academic advising was organized on his or her campus, including situations in which the institution has one or more sites.

5. The fifth assumption of this study was that the interview participants would take time to participate in the structured phone interview and that each academic advising administrator would respond to the mailed, self-administered questionnaire in a timely manner.
Definition of Terms

Several concepts served as foundational components of this study which, together, comprehensively described the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public community colleges.

**Academic advising.** Academic advising is a developmental, student-to-advisor relationship that sometimes emerges informally and other times is created through organized programs and practices designed for the purpose of helping students maximize their college experience toward goal attainment. Academic advising could be offered by various college personnel and potentially in various locations on a college campus.

**Academic advising administrator.** An academic advising administrator is the person who is responsible for the oversight, leadership, and daily management of an academic advising program at a two-year public college in Ohio.

**Academic department/unit.** An academic department or academic unit is a location at which academic advising takes place.

**ACT.** “ACT is an independent, not-for-profit organization that provides a broad array of assessment, research, information, and program management solutions in the areas of education and workforce development” (ACT, 2011, Overview, para. 1). ACT has developed and managed the six administrations of the ACT National Survey of Academic Advising.

**Advanced Placement (AP) Policy.** AP Policy grants students who earn a 3 or better on a College Board Advanced Placement exam guaranteed transfer credit at Ohio’s public colleges and universities.
Career Technical Credit Transfer (CT)² (CTAGS). CTAGS are state-approved, guaranteed transfer agreements ensuring technical course transfer between career and technical centers and public colleges and universities.

Centralized organizational model. All advising is provided in one centralized unit and coordinated by one individual on campus in a centralized organizational model. All delivery systems might be found in the centralized model (Pardee, 2000, 2004).

Community college. A community college is a two-year institution eligible to provide associates of arts, associates of sciences, and technical degrees. These institutions are legally eligible to secure a local property tax levy (see Appendix B).

Decentralized organizational model. Academic advising is delivered in various advising units on campus in decentralized organizational models. All delivery systems might be found in these locations. Coordination of academic advising may or may not be centralized in a decentralized organization model (Pardee, 2000, 2004).

Delivery system. Delivery system refers to the personnel who provide academic advising on a campus.

Faculty advisor. A faculty advisor is a full-time or part-time instructional faculty member who has advising responsibilities along with primary teaching responsibilities.

Licensed professional counselor (LPC). A licensed professional counselor (LPC) is an academic advisor trained at the master's level degree or higher in mental health counseling. LPCs may provide counseling services along with academic advising.

National Academic Advising Association (NACADA). NACADA is the leading national academic advising organization in the United States and was designed to offer professional development, research support, consulting services, and a platform for
advancing the discussion on the importance of academic advising as a key retention strategy for colleges and universities (NACADA, 2009a).

**Ohio Academic Advising Association (OHAAA).** OHAAA is Ohio’s leading academic advising organization and was established to provide professional development opportunities and a network of discussions for academic advising professionals and stakeholders of academic advising (OHAAA, 2009).

**Ohio Board of Regents (OBR).** The OBR reports to the OBR Chancellor and serves in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor and to the higher education institutions (Ohio Board of Regents, 2009a).

**Ohio Board of Regents administrative position.** An OBR administrative position is one in which the employee works directly for the OBR or works for a closely affiliated organization endorsed by the OBR.

**Ohio Transfer Module (OTM).** The OTM consists of a state-approved set of general education and elective courses guaranteed to transfer among Ohio’s public colleges and universities.

**Organizational model.** “An organizational model is the formalized way in which advising services are structured for delivery to students, not only at the institutional level but also at the campus, college, or department level” (Pardee, 2000, p. 192).

**Paraprofessional advisor.** A paraprofessional advisor is a part-time advisor who assists other advisors by providing academic advising and often serves in the role of a graduate student, practicum student volunteer, and staff member hired for peak times.

**Peer advisor.** A peer advisor is a current two-year college student who assists other academic advisors in providing academic advising.
Professional advisor. A professional advisor is a staff member whose primary responsibility is providing academic advising. Professional advisors may be full-time employees or part-time employees.

Shared organizational model. Shared organizational models of academic advising include both a centralized academic advising center and academic departments and units. All delivery systems might be found in a shared model (Pardee, 2000, 2004).

State community college. A state community college is a two-year college eligible to provide associates of arts, associates of sciences, and technical degrees. Unlike community colleges and technical colleges, state community colleges are not eligible to secure a property tax levy (see Appendix B).

Technical college. A technical college is a two-year college eligible to offer technical degrees but is not approved to offer associates of arts or associates of sciences degrees. Like community colleges, technical colleges are legally endorsed to propose a local property tax levy (see Appendix B).

Transfer Assurance Guide (TAGS). TAGS are state-approved, guaranteed transfer agreements among Ohio’s public higher education institutions and include OTM general education and elective courses combined with major courses.

University System of Ohio (USO). The USO is Ohio’s approach toward creating and coordinating a network of higher education options for citizens that includes Adult Basic Literacy Education (ABLE), workforce education, two-year colleges, and four-year colleges and universities (University System of Ohio, 2009)
Summary

This Ohio study was the first to explore the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges in Ohio and the first to examine the influence of budgets and policies on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place in these institutions. The conceptual model for this study, entitled *Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising* was an adaptation of Gordon’s (1992) “Building Blocks of Academic Advising” and incorporated Weber’s (1947) bureaucratic organizational theory. Gordon advocated that the building blocks of academic advising could be explored by gathering answers to questions about academic advising in terms of who, what, when, where, why, and how. The adapted *Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising* model provides researchers and practitioners a focused foundation upon which to explore the infrastructure of academic advising (i.e., who leads academic advising; who delivers academic advising; the time spent in the coordination and delivery of academic advising, including student-to-advisor ratios; and the locations where academic advising takes place). NACADA’s (2006) recommendation that the understanding of the organization of academic advising begins with the identification of and description of who delivers academic advising and where academic advising is delivered supported the focused approach of the *Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising* model.

This dissertation was an exploratory and descriptive study using an exploratory mixed-method approach with two phases: Phase I consisted of structured phone interviews with five Ohio higher education leaders, and Phase II consisted of a mail questionnaire sent to academic advising administrators at Ohio’s community colleges.
The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges; (b) to explore the influence budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy had on academic advising; and (c) to examine the levels of influence institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies and OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place.

Chapter One introduced the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, delimitations, limitations, assumptions, and definitions of terms found in the study. Chapter Two consists of a comprehensive literature review on academic advising as it relates to community colleges and the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

The opening of Chapter One began with a quote from O’Banion (2009) and a description of his seminal article on academic advising. O’Banion concluded that the organizational models and delivery systems used in four-year colleges might not be appropriate for two-year colleges. This literature review will explore the characteristics of two-year public colleges in the context of the variables academic advising leaders and scholars should consider about the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges. Academic advising administrators who have a comprehensive understanding of the factors influencing two-year public colleges will have more information with which to design and implement academic advising programs for two-year college students. This literature review will cover the factors influencing the organization and delivery of advising at two-year public colleges to include: history and missions of two-year public colleges, history of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) and resources available to leaders at two-year public colleges, characteristics of two-year public colleges and students at two-year colleges, academic advising research related to the organization of academic advising, history of academic advising and the concept of developmental academic advising, ACT National Survey of Academic Advising, organizational models for academic advising and delivery systems for academic advising, conceptual models related to academic advising, and student-to-advisor ratios.

History of Two-Year Public Colleges

Specific landmark occurrences in the United States history have shaped the development of two-year public colleges. To begin, the first and second Morrill Acts of
1862 and 1890 provided funding for land-grant institutions to offer practical majors. Unlike the liberal arts education provided during university education, the Morrill Acts launched curriculum designed to prepare students for technical careers and technical employment (Vaughan, 1982, 2000).

Second, the German “gymnasia” philosophy, which held that the first two years of a university education should be done prior to or outside the university, influenced the development of two-year public colleges (Lucas, 1996, p. 219). Vaughan (2000) identified Harper, former President of the University of Chicago, as a key advocate for this German ideology and a prominent leader in the development of two-year public colleges. Vaughan (2000) documented Harper’s accomplishments to include: (a) In 1892, Harper designed and incorporated a junior college into the University of Chicago’s structure by implementing many of the ideas developed with his colleagues who supported the German ideology; (b) Harper became the “father of the junior college in America” after creating Joliet Junior College in 1901, the first two-year public college (p. 12); and (c) Harper also influenced four-year colleges to focus on providing the first two years of a bachelor’s degree versus providing all four years. For example, Stephens College in Missouri was a four-year college that successfully became a high-performing two-year college and later reverted back to a four-year college (Vaughan, 1982, 2000).

Third, in 1907, California’s legislation was the first to legally allow high schools to offer the first two years of a bachelor’s degree (Vaughan, 2000). No funding was attached to this legal support; therefore, these institutions had to provide private education (Vaughan, 1982, 2000). Vaughan also documented that in 1917, California legislation allowed for public funds to be allocated to these high schools offering the first
two years of a university education. In 1921, two-year public colleges separated from high schools and created separate boards, budgets, and operational procedures (Vaughan, 1982, 2000).

Fourth, Vaughan (2000) also documented that the 1941 GI Bill of Rights, or Serviceman’s Readjustment Act, was another landmark occurrence that impacted the development of two-year public colleges. The GI Bill was designed to provide funding for veterans returning from the war. Although the GI Bill was aimed at veterans who were academically prepared for college work, this Bill often has been discussed as the precursor to financial aid legislation and policy designed to increase access for all learners regardless of academic preparation for college (Vaughan, 2000).

Fifth, according to Vaughan (2000) the community college movement was further developed by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation which provided $10 million in funding for Junior College Leadership programs. This fund was allocated to university centers to provide training for aspiring and current community college leaders. The University of Michigan and Wayne State University in Michigan were among the original schools who received the grant.

Sixth, the concept of open access and increased financial aid for students emerged in the 1960s. Discussions about a student’s “right” to an education versus education being a “privilege” were at the forefront of open access (Vaughan, 1982, 2000). Open access, the G.I. Bill, Truman’s 1941 Commission report entitled “Higher Education for Democracy,” and the Higher Education Acts of 1965 and 1972 influenced the financial aid movement (Vaughan, 1982, 2000). Open access led to increased enrollment in underprepared students, students from lower socioeconomic statuses, women, and
minorities. Unlike the G.I. Bill, later financial aid legislation was designed to provide funding to the student versus to the institution which allowed students to transfer their eligibility from institution to institution (Vaughan, 1982, 2000).

**Missions of Two-Year Colleges**

The history of two-year colleges as described above indicated that up to the 1930s the primary mission of two-year colleges focused on preparing students for the first two years of a four-year degree program (Lucas, 1996) and preparing students for teacher training (Vaughan, 2000). Vaughan (2000) documented how the missions of two-year colleges expanded after the 1930s. Vaughan noted that two-year colleges (a) added practical, technical, and vocational education programs to the curriculum and (b) introduced remedial or developmental education into the curriculum. Cohen and Brawer (2008) discussed that “social forces” (p. 1) such as the need for workforce development to respond to developing industry and the country’s commitment to provide access to higher education for all socio-economic classes had influenced the mission and growth of two-year colleges. In closing, the original mission of two-year colleges evolved over the years to include an open door, low cost, comprehensive curriculum. In addition to the transfer function of two-year colleges, technical education, career education, developmental education, business and industry training, non-credit training, and cultural programming became common components of this comprehensive curriculum.

In the year 2010, two-year public colleges continue to focus on the mission of providing students with general education in preparation for transfer to four-year colleges and universities. This mission has grown to include several other components as described by the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR), the higher education advisory board in
Ohio. The OBR published that the mission of two-year public colleges should focus on pre-baccalaureate/transfer education, career/technical education, adult continuing education, community service, workforce skills enhancement, and developmental education (OBR, 1998, p. 100.01). The philosophy of two-year public colleges has been of open access which allows students an open door to begin their college education.

The State of Ohio and OBR have invested human and fiscal resources in the development of seamless transfer policies and systems. The state leaders and legislators who developed the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy initiated in 1990 have increased the momentum of credit transfer. The legislated Articulation and Transfer policy has evolved to include additional legislation related to the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM) (general education), Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGS) (introductory courses in major), Career and Technical Assurance Guides (CTAGS) (career center to college), and the Advancement Placement policy (AP Policy) (competency exam transfer). The Ohio Board of Regents website has a comprehensive overview of all credit transfer related policies and resources.

**History of American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)**

The American Association of Community Colleges has been the national advocacy agency for community colleges that provides two-year public college leaders with the information, guidance, and professional development needed to advance the organization of two-year public colleges. Vaughan (1982, 2000) described specific events that guided the development of AACC into the comprehensive professional association that it is today. In 1920, the first meeting of two-year college stakeholders was held. This meeting led to the development of the American Association of the Junior College
(AAJC). In 1930, *The Junior College Journal* emerged and later became the *Community and Junior College Journal*. In 1972, the American Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT), a professional development-focused organization for college trustees, emerged out of AAJC. In 1975, AAJC created the President’s Academy, a professional development experience for aspiring and current presidents of two-year colleges. In 1992, AAJC had a name change to become the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) (Vaughan, 1982, 2000). Ohio has the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC), which is the main community college advocacy group in Ohio and an affiliate of AACC.

**Resources Available to Leaders at Two-Year Public Colleges**

Community college leaders have not had access to research related to the ways in which academic advising is organized by states. However, community college leaders have had access to resources designed to describe two-year public institutions in order to increase leader understanding of the two-year public college sector, which may influence their decisions about the design and implementation of academic advising programs. This understanding of two-year public colleges provides context for those involved with organizing academic advising in two-year public colleges. There are two recent reports written for Ohio’s community college leaders. These reports are the *Report on the Condition of Higher Education in Ohio: Meeting the States Future Needs* (OBR, 2008a) and *The Strategic Plan for Higher Education 2008-2017* (OBR, 2008b). These documents have provided leaders with the data and research needed to understand the characteristics of community colleges, the students who attend these institutions, the role community colleges play in American higher education, and the current and future
expectations national and local leaders have for community colleges. The most recent and influential report in the 2000s for higher education leaders in Ohio has been the Ten-Year Strategic Plan which outlines three main goals for Ohio: “graduate more students, keep more of our graduates in Ohio, and attract more degree holders from out of state” (OBR, 2008b, p. 5). Academic advising has the potential to help the State of Ohio achieve these objectives. Understanding how academic advising is organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges and examining the impact budgets, institutional policies, and state policy has had on the organization of academic advising in these institutions is the first step toward defining academic advising as a solution toward achieving state goals.

Another resource for community college leaders has been the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) report entitled Community Colleges: Special Supplement to the Condition on Education 2008 which provided data on the characteristics of two-year colleges in the U.S. and on the characteristics of two-year college students (Provasnik & Planty, 2008). Components of the institution section included: number, size, and location; enrollment patterns; state community college systems; degrees conferred; tuition and fees; faculty; admissions criteria, and remedial education (Provasnik & Planty, 2008, p. v.). Understanding of these variables will help guide academic advising administrators in their decisions about how to serve students through the delivery of academic advising services. NCES also produced relevant statistical information and descriptive reports for two-year colleges to consider for research purposes and for gaining a better understanding of the students they serve.

Additional resources for academic advising leaders have been provided by or have been affiliated with the National Association of Academic Advising (NACADA).
According to Cook (2001) NACADA formed in 1979. NACADA introduced the *NACADA Journal* in 1981 (Cook, 2001) and has provided a comprehensive array of support services: summer institutes, administrator institutes, consulting services, and topical committees. The NACADA website (www.ksu.edu) offers higher education professionals a comprehensive professional network of services. NACADA has human, electronic and paper resources to assist institutions in the development of academic advising mission statements, academic advising syllabi, redesigning and assessing academic advising programs, and creating academic advising core values. Ohio’s NACADA affiliate is the Ohio Academic Advising Association (OHAAA) which formed in 1996 (OHAAA, 2009).

The home of NACADA is Kansas State University (KSU). KSU has been offering a 15 credit hour “Graduate Certificate in Academic Advising in Higher Education” and a Master of Science in Academic Advising degree. Masters candidates pursue an option in “advising administration” or “intercollegiate athletics and college student development” (NACADA, 2009b). KSU’s commitment to graduate education in the study of academic advising will increase research on academic advising to address NACADA’s call for researchers and practitioners to contribute descriptive and empirical studies of academic advising to the literature (Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008).

**Characteristics of Two-Year Public Colleges and Students at Two-Year Public Colleges**

The next section of this dissertation is dedicated to examining the research regarding specific variables that have the potential to influence the decisions that two-
year public college leaders and two-year public college academic advising administrators make during the process of developing and advancing campus initiatives.

**Enrollment in and quantity of two-year public colleges in the United States.**

NCES (2009) created a report that included the largest fall 2009 enrollment in the top 120 largest public colleges and universities. The top enrollment was found at The University of Phoenix Online Campus, and the lowest enrollment was found at Palomar College. Two community colleges from Ohio were on the list: Columbus State Community College and Cuyahoga Community College District with rankings of 104 and 86 respectively.

According to data collected in 2008-2009 by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES, 2009), the 1,024 two-year public colleges in the United States were distributed with as few as one per state to as many as 112 in one state. The states having only one two-year public institution included: Nevada, Rhode Island, and Vermont. California had the largest quantity of two-year public colleges with 112. Texas and North Carolina trail behind with 64 and 59 respectively (NCES, 2009).

**Classification of and enrollment in Ohio’s two-year public colleges.** The Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) indicated that there are 23 two-year public colleges in Ohio (OACC, 2012). These 23 institutions fall into one of three types: community colleges, state community colleges, and technical colleges. The OBR Operating Manual for Two-Year Campus Programs published in 1998 provided detailed definitions for each type (see Appendix B). Unlike technical colleges that are only eligible to offer technical associates degrees, both community colleges and state community colleges offer Associates of Arts and Sciences degrees as well as technical
degrees. Another distinction between the types emerges around local property tax levies. Unlike state community colleges that are not eligible to receive local levy funding, community colleges and technical colleges are eligible and supported by the State to secure a local level in addition to state funding (see Appendix B).

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2010) classified two-year colleges using a system developed by Katsinas and Hardy (Katsinas, 1993, 2003; Hardy & Katsinas, 2006). The work initiated by Katsinas and Hardy and now implemented by the Carnegie system classified Associates degree two-year colleges as rural, urban, or suburban, by size, and then by single or multi-campus. Each classification system for two-year colleges must be applied cautiously. For example, the OBR has classified Rio Grande Community College as a two-year public college while Carnegie has classified Rio Grande as a four-year university according to its connection with the University of Rio Grande.

Among the 23 two-year public colleges, Ohio has classified six as community colleges with one of the six having three sites. Cuyahoga Community College has eastern, metro, and western campuses. Nine state community colleges exist in Ohio. Southern State Community College has four locations (Central, Fayette, North, and South campuses); and, Owens Community College has two locations (Toledo and Findlay campuses). Ohio also has eight technical colleges. In late 2009, Jefferson Community College transitioned its name to become Eastern Gateway Community College. Eastern Gateway maintains its Jefferson Campus and is planning to expand course offerings to additional sites (K. Taylor, personal communication, November 3, 2009).
Tuition and financial aid in two-year public colleges in the United States and Ohio. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2010), the national average tuition and fees at two-year public colleges for an academic year increased from $2,136 in 2008-2009 to $2,285 in 2009-2010. Tuition at Ohio’s two-year public colleges was higher than the national average with $3,155 in 2008-2009 and $3,014 in 2009-2010. According to the Ohio Board of Regents (2011a) in 2009-2010, eighty percent of students in Ohio’s two-year public colleges received some sort of financial aid. The percentage of students receiving financial aid ranged from 64% to 98%.

Remedial education in two-year public colleges in Ohio. The OBR provided statistical data to describe the percentages of first-year students who have taken remedial or developmental education courses. The OBR (2011b) provided percentages of students who have taken remedial education for the following categories:

- math or English
- math only
- English only
- math and English

According to the OBR (2011b, 2010a, 2009c) first-year students (in total) over the age of 20 have taken remedial courses in both English and math at two-year public colleges at higher percentages than first-year students (in total) under the age of 20. This finding was consistent among fiscal years 2007, 2009, and 2010.

By 2010, the State of Ohio had shifted the Adult Basic Literacy Education (ABLE) function from the Department of Education to the OBR. The purpose of this shift...
was to align educational opportunities for all Ohio citizens. In addition, two-year public colleges often rely on ABLE to provide remedial education for those students who are high school graduates or General Education Diploma (GED) holders who are interested in attending college but are not prepared for developmental education at the two-year public college level.

**Student diversity.** The Ohio Board of Regents (2010d) organized a diversity report entitled, “Undergraduate and Graduate Student Diversity Fall 2009: University System of Ohio Institutions”. The report included statistical information for the following categories: American Indian or Alaskan native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, White, Two or More Races (new category), Non-resident Alien, Race Unknown, Part-time, Over Age 24, Male, Ohio Students, High School Students, and First-generation College (2010d, p. 1). According to the fall 2009 data, among all institutions within the University System of Ohio community colleges have a higher percentage of students in the following categories of students: Black or African American, Race Unknown, Part-time, Over Age 24, High School Students, and First-generation College. These fall 2009 reported statistics are consistent with the fall 2008 reported statistics (OBR, 2010e).

**Students and technology.** Technology not only supports advisors in the engagement of students and in the organization and documentation of advising work, but it also provides students with a platform to manage their own advising. Research has recommended that an advising administrator’s first step toward understanding technology in the context of academic advising is to understand the ways that students use technology (Leonard, 2008). According to Smith (2011) of the Pew Research Center,
66% of adults 18 years old and older have used social media, such as Facebook, MySpace, LinkedIn, or Twitter. In a research study entitled “Why Americans Use Social Media?” Smith (2011) found that the primary purpose for which individuals in the United States used social media was to manage relationships with old friends and new friends. Smith did not explore education and social media in this particular study.

In another Pew Research Center study entitled “College Students and Technology,” Smith, Rainie, and Zichuhr (2011) examined similarities and differences between 18-to-24-year-old individuals who were attending college and individuals within the same age range who were not attending college. These authors found that “School attendance has little correlation with social media usage, as young adults use social networking sites such as Facebook or LinkedIn at roughly similar rates regardless of educational attainment – although non-students are a bit more likely than community college students to use these sites (Smith, Rainie, & Zichuhr, 2010, para. 7).

These authors also found that in terms of Internet usage and broadband usage, 18-to-24-year-old community college students were similar to those within the same age range who were not attending college. Community college students within this age range were also more likely to have one or more of the following: a desktop computer, a laptop, or an iPod, and to access the Internet using their cell phones while those within the same age range who did not attend college were more likely to have a game console.

Lenhart, Purcell, Smith, and Zichuhr (2010) studied social media and mobile Internet use among teens and young adults. They found a decreasing interest in blogging, a form of online journaling, among teens and young adults ages 18-29. However, they
found an increasing interest in blogging among adults age 30 and older. They also
discovered that social networking had increased among all age groups, with Facebook
and LinkedIn preferred by younger adults (ages 18 to 29) and older adults (ages 30 and
over). MySpace was preferred among teens. In addition, teens showed a decreasing
interest in Twitter while young adults, those 18 to 29 years of age, showed an increasing
interest in Twitter.

Technology has become an integrated part of daily life for many Americans and
has become a way of organizing and delivering academic advising. Three comprehensive
texts have been written for advising administrators, advising practitioners, advising
stakeholders, and advising scholars (Gordon, 1992; Gordon & Habley, 2000; Gordon,
Habley, & Grites, 2008). From the early 1990s, when the first of these texts was
published, until 2008, when the latest of these texts was published, the coverage of
technology in these advising handbooks has increased. Gordon’s (1992) version included
only brief sections on computer-assisted advising, telephone advising, and technology as
a potential future method of delivering academic advising. The most recent text infused
discussions of technology into several chapters as well as dedicated a chapter on using
technology to deliver academic advising. Gordon (1992) concluded her text on academic
advising with a section on the future of academic advising, which included a brief
discussion on technology. She discussed computer-assisted advising and telephone
advising as tools to assist advisors in the organizing and documenting advising sessions.
Technology was also suggested to support advisors in the engagement of students. The
technology which explored degree audits, computerized advising systems, and electronic
calendar systems used to organize and support academic advising (McCauley, 2000) and included a chapter on the various technologies used to deliver academic advising to students (Sotto, 2000). Sotto described technologies that allowed students to self-advise and to manage their academic advising experiences. She discussed synchronous technologies, or “real-time” advising, and asynchronous technologies, that allow students to access information about advising at any time. Asynchronous technologies included websites and email; however, these technologies have not allowed for the type of immediate response or interaction students experience with synchronous advising.

In 2008, Leonard stated the following:

The first edition of this book [Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook] was published in 2000. Since then, the iPod was introduced in 2001, Facebook (a social networking site) in 2004, YouTube (a video-sharing Web site) in 2005, and the iPhone in 2007. Cell phones were not as common as they are today, and the use of instant messaging in advising was rare. Now all of these technologies are having, or will have, a significant impact on advising and other forms of teaching in higher education. (p. 292)

Leonard (2008) suggested that all advising administrators should be informed about the various technologies that students were using or might soon be using. By 2008, students were actively using social media sites to communicate with friends and family. Although students were actively engaged in social networking for personal reasons, academic advising had only begun to explore the potential of social media as a tool for the delivery of advising. Leonard (2008) initiated his discussion of technology for
academic advising by introducing the terms “digital natives” and “digital immigrants” (p. 293) to describe individuals who have grown up in a culture of technology and those who adopted technology later in life.

Palfrey and Gasser (2008) conducted interviews and focus groups to fully explore the lives of digital natives. They studied 100 digital natives and 150 individuals who interacted with the digital natives. Palfrey and Gasser (2008) offered the following definitions:

- Digital Native: A person born into the digital age (after 1980) who has access to networked digital technologies and strong computer skills and knowledge. Digital Natives share a common global culture that is defined not strictly by age but by certain attributes and experiences related to how they interact with information technologies, information itself, one another, and other people and institutions. (p. 346)

- Digital Immigrant: A person who has adopted the Internet and related technologies, but who was born prior to the advent of the digital age. (p. 346)

Palfrey and Gasser (2008) encouraged parents, educators, and others who serve digital natives to “. . . balance caution with encouragement” (p. 9). Palfrey and Gasser discussed that parents, educators, and law makers have considered limiting access to technology for elementary and secondary school-aged digital natives due to social concerns regarding technology and online safety, identity theft, legality of online interactions, and confidentiality and privacy. However, Palfrey and Gasser suggested that these cautions must be balanced with encouragement. Digital natives have been found to be creative learners by using technology as a way to learn and communicate. Palfrey and
Gasser further asserted that parents, educators, and technology vendors must work together to become involved in the lives of digital natives. They have suggested that involvement may lead to understanding and appreciation of digital natives and therefore may lead educators and others to create opportunities to encourage appropriate use of technology and to discourage inappropriate use of technology.

In terms of technologies that enhance academic advising and student affairs, Martinez Aleman and Lynk Wartman (2011) provided an example of educating students about the appropriate use of technology. Martinez Aleman and Lynk Wartman suggested that student affairs personnel monitor and study students’ technology use in order to understand the development of students’ online identity and to assist students in creating and maintaining a professional image online. Martinez Aleman and Lynk Wartman illustrated the responsibility that student affairs personnel have to inform students about the ways in which technology is used in the hiring process. These authors pointed out that employers now explore potential employees’ social networking sites as a form of reference checking. Digital natives often share their lives online, including those items that they might not share in a job interview. These texts have suggested that advising professionals and student affairs professionals have a responsibility to educate students about how to appropriately incorporate technology into their personal and professional lives.

Prior to the publication of the second edition of *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook*, Leonard (2004) discussed the findings of the NACADA National Survey of Technology in Academic Advising. Likely due to the timing of the survey, which had been administered in 2000, NACADA members had not yet
experienced the launch of social media. The five technologies used by the majority of those surveyed included e-mail, Internet, word processing software, electronic calendars, and spreadsheet software. Participants reported being very comfortable with the technical tools needed to perform the functions of their jobs.

Advising administrators have been required to balance and manage issues with technology related to funding, training and development, confidentiality and legal concerns, and student usage (Leonard, 2004). Technology has become integrated into the lives of community college students. Therefore, student technology use must be a consideration as advising administrators develop the infrastructure needed for the organization and infrastructure for academic advising.

Academic Advising Research on the Organization of Academic Advising

Community college administrators and community college academic advising administrators not only need an understanding of the institutional and student characteristics of two-year public colleges but also must be familiar with the scholarly work on the organization of academic advising. The literature on academic advising has been documented and expanded in seminal books and articles. This section will focus on key authors in the field of academic advising who have defined the study of the organization of academic advising.

Hardee (1959) wrote the first research-informed text aimed at exploring the organization of faculty advising, “The Faculty in College Counseling”. In 1959, Hardee discussed the findings of her “survey of counseling practices among 218 institutions of higher education” (p. 148). Although Hardee had not developed the discussion of findings into specific organization models, her work has been visible in the work of other
advising scholars and researchers who have written about the organization of academic advising (Crockett, 1982; Habley, 1983, 2004b). O’Banion’s 1972 seminal article in which he provided an academic advising model that applied to two-year colleges has been reprinted as late as 2009. O’Banion’s work discussed the student-to-advisor relationship and the types of advisors who should deliver academic advising at each stage of a student’s experience in college rather than focused on specific locations for academic advising. O’Banion developed his model for the delivery of academic advising according to student development and counseling theories that applied to the delivery of academic advising as students attended college to realize their purpose as well as to train for the workforce. In 1972, Crookston introduced the concepts of developmental and prescriptive advising which led to additional research and literature on academic advising. Like O’Banion, Crookston’s work does not appear to have been based on empirical research. Crookston’s discussion of developmental advising focused more on the approach or strategy an advisor used to deliver academic advising, such as directive information giving or developmental counseling, than focused on the ways in which academic advising should be organized.

Empirical research on the ways in which academic advising was organized and delivered launched with the work of ACT, specifically with ACT’s National Survey of Academic Advising. ACT Surveys have provided a comprehensive description of the organization of academic advising in two-year and four-year colleges and universities. In 1987, with the third administration of the ACT National Survey of Academic Advising, ACT introduced Habley’s (1983) seven organizational models for academic advising as a forced-choice survey item. Habley expanded the advising literature base with his
influential article describing the seven organizational models of academic advising in colleges and universities. Although Habley’s article had not discussed the specific research study guiding the development of the models, his models described the coordination of academic advising, who delivered advising by organizational model, and the locations of academic advising. These definitions have become a staple of the instrument in the subsequent administrations and have been the benchmark definitions for the study of organizational models in academic advising (Avants, 2004; Jefcoat, 1991; Leymaster, 1989; Wong, 1986).

Cook (2001), in her document “A Chronology of Academic Advising in America,” noted other landmarks in the history of academic advising that influenced the density of the academic advising literature base. The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) formed in 1979. Academic advising was adopted as a “descriptor” in the Educational Resource Information Center database in 1981, and the NACADA journal began in the same year (p. 5).

NACADA contributed to the publication of two foundational books on academic advising, the first edition and second edition of Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook (Gordon & Habley, 2000; Gordon, Habley, & Grites, 2008). Gordon initiated the development of these influential texts with her 1992 work on the Handbook of Academic Advising. Another landmark development in the field of academic advising has been credited to Kansas State University (KSU), home of NACADA. KSU has been offering a graduate certificate and a Masters degree in Academic Advising. This certificate provides academic advising administrators and practitioners with the knowledge of organizational models and delivery systems needed to produce future
research on the organization and delivery of academic advising. These are only a few successes in the field of academic advising leading toward a profound literature base. Due to the diversity and comprehensiveness of literature on academic advising, this literature review focused on organizational models, delivery systems, student-to-advisor ratios, and scholarly perspectives on “ideal” models for academic advising.

**History of Academic Advising**

Cook (2001) provided the most complete history of academic advising in her “A Chronology of Academic Advising in America.” Begun primarily as one of the many roles of the first college presidents, academic advising was later delegated to faculty, and then to dean positions created especially for student counseling (Gordon, 1992). Brubaker and Rudy (1976) asserted that Kenyon College created the first faculty advising system in the 1830s. According to Gordon (1992) the first faculty advising system was formed at Johns Hopkins in 1876 and was followed by a presidential appointment of the first “chief of faculty advisors” in 1899 (p. 2).

Other sources credit Harvard’s President Eliot for creating the need for academic advising in the 1870s (Rudolph, 1962). Eliot’s push for the elective system of course delivery in the 1870s required faculty to become more involved in students’ academic decisions. Eliot appointed the first administrator of academic advising in 1870 (Rudolph, 1962). Increased enrollments, including enrollments of women, led college presidents to create dean positions to handle student discipline, extracurricular activities, and academic advising (Gordon, 1992). By 1888, Eliot had appointed freshmen advisors (Rudolph, 1962). Grites (1979) and Raskin (1979) stated that most colleges had some form of academic advising by the 1930s.
Developmental Academic Advising

Crookston (1972) and O’Banion (2009) introduced the literature on the concept of developmental advising in the 1970s. Crookston’s work focused on academic advising in general and was not specific to four-year or two-year colleges. Crookston introduced the notion that academic advisors tend to perform advising functions from one of two approaches, the prescriptive approach and the developmental approach. The prescriptive approach is one in which the advisor assumes responsibility for the advising relationship by using a directing type of behavior. The developmental approach to academic advising consists of advisors and students sharing the responsibility for the advising relationship and the outcomes of academic advising (Frost, 1991). Crookston explained that these approaches define the behavior of advisors and not the activity performed by advisors.

Also in 1972, O’Banion introduced an academic advising model that applied to two-year colleges. This developmental model for the delivery of academic advising proposed that academic advising be delivered by a team of advisors to include full-time professional advisors and counselors, faculty, peers, and paraprofessionals. According to O’Banion each advisor type had a role in academic advising and should engage students at certain stages of the student’s academic development.

Fielstein (1994), like Crookston, suggested that academic advising was best conducted from the developmental approach. She concluded from her research on developmental advising that advisors must perform both prescriptive (informational) and developmental (counseling) activities in order to have a developmental advising relationship. She described how the process of academic advising related to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. As humans must fulfill basic needs to survive, academic advisors
must provide basic information (prescriptive information) in order for students to “survive” in college. Just as humans become more competent with general life activities as they mature, students too will become more confident in their identities as students and will become ready to accept more responsibility for their educations. Academic advisors must encourage students to take more responsibility for their academic experience and must support students by respecting the choices students make. The concept of developmental advising was also advanced by Winston, Miller, Ender, and Grites (1984) who devoted an entire text to developmental academic advising.

In his article, an “Academic Advising Model”, O’Banion (2009) proposed a five-step process for academic advising in two-year colleges: “exploration of life goals, exploration of career goals, selection of a major or program of study, selection of courses, and scheduling of courses” (p. 10). O’Banion’s steps placed more emphasis on developing the whole student than on the clerical tasks of advising. Also, O’Banion challenged the academic advising profession to consider that delivery systems typically found in four-year colleges might not be the best for two-year colleges. Given the diversity of and developmental needs of two-year college students, O’Banion proposed an advising partnership of faculty and mental health counselors versus advising from faculty only would be appropriate for two-year College advising programs.

**ACT National Survey of Academic Advising Described**

ACT designed ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising, which was last administered in March 2003, to study how academic advising was organized in colleges and universities. The instrument consisted of four major sections and 47
questions, with many questions requiring multiple responses. The four sections of the survey included:

1. background information (11 questions);
2. advising in the academic unit or department (19 questions);
3. campus-wide advising or centrally-controlled advising offices (14 questions);
4. overall institutional effectiveness of academic advising (3 questions).

Habley (2004b) stated that college administrators often rely on the data from ACT’s National Surveys of Academic Advising to inform practice and to improve advising. In ACT’s most recent summary of results from the ACT National Survey of Academic Advising, Habley briefly described the first through fifth administrations of the instrument. Habley described the first National Survey of Academic Advising administered by Cartensen and Silberhorn in 1979 as, “That first survey provided ‘baseline’ data on academic advising in post-secondary institutions across the country” (Habley, 2004b, p. 7). In 1983, Crockett and Levitz replicated the 1979 study (Habley, 2004b). The Third ACT National Survey of Academic Advising done in 1987 had two major changes. Questions related to advising done in advising centers were separated from questions done in academic units. A survey-item asking administrators to identify the organizational models in place at their institutions was added using Habley’s (1983) definitions. Habley (2004b) replicated the Third National Survey in 1992. Habley (2004b) stated that the Fifth National Survey on Academic Advising had major modifications; however, he did not give details other than that the changes were “. . . both in content and formats”.
Organizational Models

Hardee (1959) researched the organization of academic advising in terms of faculty advising. She sent an open-ended survey to colleges and universities requesting that they describe how academic advising was organized. In her 1959 text on faculty advising, she presented the findings of her study.

Hardee’s work re-emerged in 1970 with a monograph on faculty advising. In this monograph, Hardee (1970) provided brief descriptions of “organizational practices” (p. 16) of organizing academic advising for faculty. In 1979, ACT launched the first National Survey of Academic Advising which included a survey item for participants to select from a series of brief descriptions that reflected various ways in which academic advising was organized. One practice described by Hardee appeared in the 1979 ACT survey and later would be discussed as an ideal model for delivering academic advising (Crockett, 1982). This particular practice described initially by Hardee (1970), then added to ACT’s 1979 survey, which was later discussed by Crockett as an ideal model, was not officially labeled the “split model” until 1983 in the work of Habley. The split model found a home among six other models Habley described. These seven organizational models have provided the framework for studies on the organization of academic advising, including the last three ACT National Surveys of Academic Advising. The definitions of the seven organizational models began with Wes Habley’s (1983) seminal article entitled, “Organizational structures in academic advising: Model and implications.” This article title highlights the terms organizational structures which he used interchangeably with the term organizational models in the literature on academic advising. Although Habley’s organizational model definitions became a staple of ACT
National Surveys of Academic Advising and the foundation for studies on the organization of academic advising, participants were not given an open-end question in these studies to which they could describe in their own words the organizational model at their institution.

Habley’s (1983) organizational model definitions included reference to the following components: coordination of academic advising, types of advisors in a model, and location(s) of academic advising.

**Leadership, coordination, and administration.** Habley’s organizational models have been divided into three categories: centralized, decentralized, and shared (Pardee, 2000, 2004). Pardee categorized the models based on the level of centralization of the advising service. For example, she categorized advising models that included one primary leader and one centralized location with the delivery “centralized”. She categorized shared models as those in which the leadership was shared among one or more administrators and or advising was delivered in multiple locations. Her category of decentralized captured those organizational models that had multiple leaders for academic advising and multiple locations for academic advising. In the one centralized organizational model, the self-contained model, academic advising is coordinated by one academic advising administrator. Two organizational models, faculty-only and satellite models, have decentralized or potentially multiple advising coordinators. In the four “shared” models (dual, split, supplementary, total-intake) the coordination of academic advising is shared between a centralized administrative unit and one or more academic unit coordinators.
**Types of advisors.** Types of advisors are collectively primarily referred to as delivery systems in the literature on academic advising. However a few authors have described the types of academic advisors with terms that provided a clearer label for academic advisors. The term delivery system has become a phrase that elicits several meanings beyond just the types of advisors, including the way in which a service is delivered or the mechanism in which a service is delivered. Gordon (1992), King (2008), and King and Kerr (2005) provided clearer labels to describe the types of academic advisors. Gordon (1992) used the term “personnel” (p. 23) to describe delivery systems. The typical delivery systems, or advising “personnel”, are faculty, professional advisors, counselors, paraprofessionals, and peers. King and Kerr (2005) used the term “advising providers” in place of delivery systems. King (2008) included clerical staff in her discussion of delivery systems.

**Locations of advising.** Academic advising on college and university campuses has been provided either in one centralized location, in several decentralized locations, or in both a centralized location and in multiple academic units. Advising that takes place in one location is a centralized organizational model and is often called an advising center. Advising “housed” in multiple locations occurs in a decentralized organizational model (King, 2008). Shared organizational models include advising programs that take place in a centralized advising unit and in one or more advising units.

Habley (1983) described seven organizational models for academic advising in detail:

The Faculty-Only Model – In this model, each entering student is assigned to a specific faculty advisor. Under most circumstances, this assignment is in the
major field of the student. Students who are undecided about a major are assigned to individual faculty members from the liberal arts. This model is the only one . . . in which advisors are prescribed by the organizational structure. In the faculty-only model supervision of advising is generally decentralized in the individual academic departments.

The Supplementary Advising Model – In this model, faculty serve as advisors for all students in the institution. This model features a supplementary advising office, which has as its major responsibility the assistance of faculty members in their role as advisors by providing resources such as an advisor handbook and adviser training. The advising office also supplements faculty advising by handling concerns that require higher skill levels or broader knowledge than is commonly available from faculty. The advising office is usually supervised by an individual who is charged with the functions mentioned above, but there is no specific advising responsibility and usually few additional advising staff. Direct supervision of faculty advising is decentralized in the individual academic departments.

The Split Advising Model – In the split advising model, initial advising of students is split between faculty members and staff of an advising office. There are at least two major variations of this model. In one variation, the advising office is responsible for advising students who are undecided about a major; faculty members advise all students with declared majors. Once a student has declared a major, advising responsibility shifts from the advising office to a faculty member in the student’s major department.
A second variation of the split advising model includes the provision of special advising services for students who need entry-level skill building in mathematics, reading, or writing. The students are assigned to a special advising office. Once the student has successfully completed the compensatory activities, advising responsibility is shifted to a faculty member in the student’s major department.

The advising office in this model includes an individual who is responsible for supervising the advising staff necessary to carry out the advising function. The advising office may also be given additional campus-wide responsibilities such as preparing the advising handbook, training advisors, and supplementing faculty advising.

The Dual Advising Model – This model is characterized by shared responsibility for advising each student. Faculty members provide advisement directly related to the student’s major, and the advising office is responsible for advising each student on requirements for general education and institutional academic policies and procedures. In the dual advising model, personnel in the advising office usually advise undecided students. The advising office may also be charged with campus-wide advising responsibilities.

The Total Intake Model – The total intake model for academic advising vests initial advising responsibility with an advising office. All students are advised by a staff member in the advising office until a specific action takes place or a predetermined period of time has elapsed.
In some instances this model requires that all students enter the institution with undecided majors. Declaration of or admission to a major program follows the completion of core courses, the achievement of a stated grade point average, or other specified accomplishments.

In other instances, this model requires that all students be advised by advising office staff for a specified period of time. The advising office may be responsible for lower-division advising only or for all freshmen advising. Thus, both students with declared majors and those who are undecided are advised by staff of the advising office for a predetermined period of time.

The Satellite Model – The satellite model features advising offices that are maintained within academic subunits on the campus. Satellite offices provide advising for all students whose majors are within a particular college or school. Students who are undecided about majors are advised in an office for undecided students or in existing satellite offices with the colleges. The advising responsibility generally shifts from the satellite advising office to a faculty advisor in the student’s major at a later time.

The Self-Contained Model- In the self-contained model, all academic advising takes place in a centralized unit from the point of matriculation to the point of graduation. The centralized advising office is directed by a dean or director of academic advising who supervises all advising functions that take place on the campus. (pp. 536-538)

ACT paraphrased Habley’s 1983 definitions of organizational models for the purposes of first studying them with the ACT Third National Survey on Academic
Advising. Scholars of academic advising must be familiar with Habley’s initial work because ACT’s paraphrased definitions leave some elements of an organizational model up for interpretation. For example, the faculty-only model is the only organizational model that incorporates the delivery system into the label. Habley’s original definitions described the supplementary model as one in which faculty were the only providers. However, ACT’s paraphrased organizational model definitions have not indicated that faculty members were the only providers in this particular model. College and university administrators who participated in these studies selected the organizational model definition that best described the coordination, administration, and delivery systems in place. The paraphrased definitions listed below are those that were included in ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising.

Faculty only: All students are assigned to an instructional faculty member for advising. There is no advising office.

Supplementary: All students are assigned to an instructional faculty member of [for] advising. There is an advising office that provides general academic information and referrals for students, but all advising transactions must be approved by the student’s faculty advisor.

Split: A specific group(s) of students (e.g., undecided, underprepared, etc.) are advised in an advising office. All other students are assigned to academic units and/or faculty advisors.

Dual: Each student has two advisors. A member of the instructional faculty advises the student on matters related to the major. An advisor in an
advising office advises the student on general requirements, procedures, and policies.

Total Intake: Staff of an administrative unit are responsible for advising ALL students for a specified period of time and/or until some specific requirements have been met. After meeting those requirements, students are assigned to an academic subunit and/or member of the instructional faculty for advising.

Satellite: Each school, college, or division within the institution has established its own approach to advising.

Self-contained: Advising for all students from point of enrollment to point of departure is done by staff in a centralized unit. (Habley, 2004b, p. 18)

Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education CAS

Professional Standards for Higher Education

Since 1979, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) has been a professional organization consisting of a membership of approximately 35 student affairs professional organizations. CAS was designed to communicate best practices and to provide organizations with tools to assist in the auditing of student affairs programs. CAS has provided eight editions of CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education with the latest in 2008. Through a process of “consensus validity” (CAS, 2006, p. v.), CAS collaborates with experts affiliated with CAS and external content experts to develop professional standards for various higher education programs. Currently CAS has professional standards and guidelines for 35 higher education student-focused programs, including academic advising. CAS standards and guidelines consist of 13
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areas: (1) mission, (2) program, (3) leadership, (4) organization and management, (5) human resources, (6) financial resources; (7) facilities, technology, and equipment; (8) legal responsibilities, (9) equity and access, (10) campus and external relations, (11) diversity, (12) ethics, and (13) assessment and evaluation. “. . . they [CAS standards and guidelines] can be used for the design of new programs and services, for determining the efficacy of programs, for staff development, or for programmatic assessment as part of an institutional self-study” (CAS, 2006, p. 9). CAS explained that standards must be implemented for program success and that guidelines, when implemented, will guide organizations in the creation and development of exceptional programs. CAS also provides a self-study tool called the “Framework for Assessing Learning Development Outcomes”; these tools are institutional-assessment guides for each of the student service programs represented in the CAS document.

The Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) made the following recommendations for the human resources needed for academic advising programs. The recommendations on the education and training of professional academic advisors include:

An academic advisor must hold an earned graduate degree in a field relevant to the position held or must possess an appropriate combination of educational credentials and related work experience.

Academic advisors should have an understanding of student development, student learning, career development, and other relevant theories in education, social sciences, and humanities.
Academic advisors should have a comprehensive knowledge of the institution’s programs, academic requirements, policies and procedures, majors, minors, and support services.

Academic advisors should demonstrate an interest and effectiveness in working with and assisting students and a willingness to participate in professional activities. (CAS, 2006, p. 32)

The next section of this literature review will explore the typical delivery systems, or academic advisors, who provide advising. CAS standards do not address all delivery systems. However, CAS standards will be provided in the context of peer advisors and professional advisors for the purposes of more fully understanding the delivery of academic advising.

**Delivery Systems**

Institutions have committed human resources to relieve faculty and/or to support faculty in the important responsibility of academic advising. The term “delivery system” refers to the people who provide advising (Habley, 1983). Three well-known researchers in academic advising, Gordon (1992), Habley (2004b), and King (2008), approached the concept of delivery systems with slight similarities and slight differences that require discussion for better understanding of how different authors categorize delivery systems.

First, the concept of delivery systems will be explored. In the most recent and comprehensive publication on academic advising, *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook* (2nd ed.), delivery systems are divided into the people who deliver advising (e.g., faculty, professional advisors, counselors, and other staff, p. vi) and the strategies (e.g., “methods” in Gordon’s terms, 1992, p. 22) used to deliver advising. Gordon (1992),
Habley (2004b), and King (2008) were similar in that they divide the “who” of advising from the “how” of advising.

Second, the terms to describe how advisors provided advising differ between Gordon and King. Gordon uses the term *methods* and King uses the terms *strategies* to discuss how academic advising is provided. The ACT instrument has certain survey items aimed at identifying the people who deliver advising and other questions aimed at gathering data on group advising.

Third, the most common human delivery systems discussed included the categories of faculty, professional advisors, counselors, peers, and paraprofessionals (Gordon, 1992; King 2008). Although counselors have been frequently discussed in the literature on delivery systems (Gordon, 1992; King, 2008), the ACT National Surveys of Academic Advising, the most comprehensive tool used to describe academic advising in the nation, does not include counselor as an option for questions on delivery systems. The phrase “primary provider” or term “people” have been used to describe advisors by ACT for the delivery systems questions. Participants are able to write in “counselor” as a delivery system on the “other” line. King (2008) discussed clerical or support staff in her work on delivery systems. ACT 2003 offers the option of “clerical staff” for questions related to delivery systems in academic departments, but does not offer this option for similar questions for delivery systems in advising centers.

Fourth, the slight similarities and differences in delivery systems are understandable after review. Gordon (1992) separates “personnel” from “methods” in her framework, “Building Blocks of Academic Advising”, (p. 22) which is a model used to gather data on how academic advising is organized on a campus. King (2008) separates
advising delivery from advising strategies. Also, ACT’s National Survey of Academic Advising separates delivery systems from formats. Personnel (Gordon, 1992), delivery systems (Habley), or advising providers (King & Kerr, 2005) are addressed in certain questions.

Institutions may utilize several delivery systems for academic advising within their organizational model. Examples of delivery systems include faculty, professional advisors, clerical staff, peer advisors, and paraprofessional advisors. Every delivery system has its strengths and weaknesses (Crockett, 1982, 1985; Migden, 1989; Self, 2008). This section will also include recommendations from the Council on the Advancement of Standards (CAS) related to the various delivery systems.

**Faculty advisors.** Faculty members have provided academic advising in some format on most campuses (Habley & Morales, 1998; Habley, 2004b). Faculty advising allows students an opportunity to meet with faculty one-on-one outside the classroom. These important relationships help students to connect their goals with an academic program (Tinto, 1985). Students who learn to integrate their future goals with their academic programs and who are satisfied with these connections are more likely to be retained.

Hemwall (2008) described the benefits and challenges of having faculty advisors in an advising program. The benefits of faculty include that faculty have the best understanding of curriculum and academic content when compared to professional advisors, paraprofessional, clerical, and peer advisors. The challenge of working with this delivery system is that faculty members often do not have academic or practical training in student development and have to balance teaching, research, and advising. Another
potential challenge in Ohio is the availability of full-time faculty for advising. According to the OBR (2009b), full-time faculty members have been teaching a smaller share of total scheduled credit hours than part-time faculty. The percentage of credit hours taught by full-time faculty has been decreasing while it has been increasing for part-time faculty.

Faculty advisors must be included with organizational models for academic advising in Ohio. Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGS) and Career and Technical Assurance Guides (CTAGS) are developed by faculty; therefore, faculty advisors need to be included in all academic advising models. Faculty who were involved in state-level committees pertaining to articulation and transfer may be best able to explain to students and other advisors how TAGS were developed and how these tools will assist students planning to transfer to another institution.

**Professional advisors.** Professional advisors come from various academic disciplines and from student development fields (Self, 2008). Unlike faculty members who have teaching responsibilities, professional advisors primarily perform academic advising. This focus on advising, without the demands of teaching responsibilities, increases their availability to students (Gordon, 1992). Migden (1989) suggested that advising programs should consist of a group of full-time academic advisors with each advisor assuming the responsibility of developing a relationship with one or several academic departments. This communication between advisors and non-advising faculty members can increase the accuracy of information that is relayed to students.

Although professional advisors are the most costly delivery system within an advising program, full-time professionals must be included in the organizational model. Full-time professional advisors are the only delivery system that has providing academic
advising as its first priority. Other delivery systems, such as faculty and peer advisors, have other priorities as its first priority: faculty members teach and students take classes. Professional advisors are often the best resource to help advising administrators, faculty, and students manage high student ratios and complex advising scenarios.

**Peer advisors.** Higher education institutions have hired peer advisors for positions in Student Affairs offices. The research of Winston and Ender (1988) provided additional research on peer advisors to follow-up on three national surveys aimed to evaluate the use of student paraprofessionals in Student Affairs programs. Winston and Ender (1988) concluded from their research that the five most important activities performed by paraprofessionals in academic advising, listed in order of importance, were to: (a) provide information, (b) make referrals to other campus/community agencies, (c) provide academic advice, (d) explain policies and procedures, (e) provide personal counseling, and (f) implement social activities. The last two activities (provide personal counseling and implement social activities) were tied in importance. “Also, it is striking to note that all programs associated with academic advising agreed with the rationale that student paraprofessional advisers were more effective than were faculty or allied professional advisers” (p. 472). This conclusion has been supported by many other studies as well (see, for example, Barman & Benson, 1981; Brown & Myers, 1975; Habley, 1979; Gnepp, Keating, & Masters, 1980; Goldberg, 1981).

The CAS (2006) recommendation on peer academic advisors included:

Student employees and volunteers must be carefully selected, trained, supervised, and evaluated. They must be trained on how and when to refer those in need of assistance to qualified staff members and have access to a supervisor for
assistance in making these judgments. Student employees and volunteers must be provided clear and precise job descriptions, pre-service training based on assessed needs, and continuing staff development. (p. 33)

**Paraprofessional advisors.** The terms *peer* advisor and *paraprofessional* advisor have been used interchangeably in some research. However, for the purposes of this study paraprofessional advisors refer to those advisors who are not students at the institution in which they are advising. Paraprofessional advisors are those who have completed a bachelor degree (Self, 2008). Unlike Winston and Ender (1988), who labeled peer advisors as paraprofessionals, Gordon (1992), King (1993, 2008), and King and Kerr (2005) identified part-time advisors who have baccalaureate or master’s degrees and graduate students as paraprofessional advisors. Paraprofessional advisors may be graduates of the institution; however, they are not advising their peers. A benefit to supplementing an advising program with paraprofessional advisors has been that paraprofessionals may have had work experience in the area in which they advise, whereas, peer advisors most likely have not had work experience in the program they advise. Like peer advisors, paraprofessional advisors are not as costly as professional advisors.

The CAS (2006) recommendation on paraprofessional advisors included:

Degree or credential-seeking interns must be qualified by enrollment in an appropriate field of study and by relevant experience. These individuals must be trained and supervised adequately by professional staff members holding educational credentials and related work experience appropriate for supervision.
Ideal organizational models and delivery systems for academic advising in two-year colleges. Documented studies on the organization of academic advising have not explored academic advising administrator perspectives on the ideal organizational model or ideal delivery system for academic advising in two-year colleges. This section of the dissertation will explore scholarly discussion about the organization of academic advising that weaves both commentary on ideal organization and ideal delivery systems. Four scholars in the area of academic advising have provided commentary on ideal organizational models and ideal delivery systems for academic advising. The first scholar to comment about the ideal model for organizing academic advising was O’Banion (1972). O’Banion (1972) described a five-step process for advising community college students: “exploration of life goals, exploration of career goals, selection of a major or program of study, selection of courses, and scheduling of courses” (p. 10). O’Banion proposed that professional counselors assist students with steps one and two. Steps three and four should be facilitated by faculty, according to O’Banion. Step five could be covered by properly trained peer advisors as well as by faculty. O’Banion’s five-step process advocated for a team approach to advising built on a strong communication plan to assist students transitioning from one type of advisor to another and from one step to another.

The second scholar to comment about the ideal model for the delivery of academic advising was Crockett (1982). Like O’Banion (1972), Crockett did not point to one delivery system or one type of advisor as the ideal for academic advising. Crockett presented an ideal model but did not specify for which type of institution the model was ideal i.e. – two-year colleges or four-year colleges or universities. Crockett included the
most common delivery systems: faculty, staff advisors (either full-time professional advisors or full-time counselors), paraprofessionals, and peers. Unlike O’Banion, Crockett included the locations at which students would receive certain types of academic advising. Crockett’s description for the ideal organizational model for academic advising was later labeled by Habley (1983) as the split model. Crockett described the ideal advising model as one in which entering students would be served by a professional advisor or counselor in a centralized advising unit if the student was undecided or had some type of specialized need. These students would then be referred to faculty advisors once they had declared a major or met their academic need. Other entering students who were decided on their major and prepared for college would be assigned directly to faculty advisors. Crockett also advocated that each advising program be led by a full-time director of advising who reported directly to the chief academic affairs officer. O’Banion did not make recommendations about the leadership of academic advising or reporting structure.

The third and the most frequently cited scholar to comment about the ideal model for academic advising in two-year colleges was King (1993, 1996) and then King and Kerr (2005). King’s ideal model for organizing academic advising included the same advisor types and locations as Crockett (1982). The major distinction between Crockett’s (1982) and King’s (1993, 1996) recommendations was in the description of the organizational model. Crockett recommended the split organizational model for academic advising, and King recommended the total-intake organizational model for academic advising. The total-intake model included the same advising delivery systems and locations as discussed in Crockett’s recommendation. However, King recommended that
all entering students receive academic advising in a centralized advising center for the first year of their college experience. After one year, these students would be transferred to faculty advisors. King (1993, 1996), like Crockett, advocated that each academic advising program be led by a full-time director of academic advising. In her 1996 work, King added a few cautions along with another important value of the total-intake model. Although the staffing patterns required to maintain the total-intake model are more expensive than other models and administrators must strategically organize and manage the transferring of students from advising center advisors to faculty, King noted that, unlike some organizational models, the total intake model assists with the management of large student-to-faculty advising loads. In the total-intake model, students are only assigned and transferred to faculty advisors after the students are firm in their choice of academic programs. King and Kerr (2005) had not offered comment on the director of advising reporting line until 2005. Another distinction in the work of Crockett (1982) and King occurred in the work of King and Kerr (2005). Crockett recommended that each advising director report to the chief academic officer of the college; King and Kerr recommended that the advising director report either to the chief academic officer or the chief student affairs officer. In closing of the discussion on ideal organizational models and delivery systems, Crockett, King, and King and Kerr provided a conceptual model for academic advising administrators to consider when organizing their academic advising programs; however, these scholars did not explore the study of the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges.
Conceptual Models for the Study of the Organization of Academic Advising

The literature related to academic advising theory had not revealed a specific conceptual model to guide the study of the organization of academic advising. Several theories apply to the student-to-advisor relationship aspect of academic advising (Astin, 1984; Schlossberg et al., 1989; Kuh, 2009). However, a specific theory of academic advising has not emerged to guide the study of the organization of academic advising. Studies on the organization of academic advising have been guided using the seven organizational models for academic advising proposed by Habley (1983) and included in ACT’s third through sixth administrations of ACT’s National Survey of Academic Advising (Habley, 2004b). Leymaster (1989) and Jefcoat (1991) were among the few researchers who conducted national studies on the organization of academic advising using ACT’s survey items in two-year colleges. Leymaster explored the organizational models in community and technical colleges, and Jefcoat conducted a similar study with rural community colleges.

Although the review of the literature had not revealed researchers who used the work of Gordon (1992), or had not indicated that researchers had implemented NACADA’s (2006) recommendations for the study of academic advising, Gordon’s work or NACADA’s recommendations could be considered for adaptation into a conceptual model for the study of the organization of academic advising. Gordon (1992) proposed a framework for studying the organization of academic advising which suggested that advising programs must be defined and described by responding to the following questions:

1. Why advising?
2. What is advising?
3. Who advises?
4. Where is advising done?
5. When is it done?
6. How is it done? (p. 22) See Figure 1.

Gordon (1992) proposed college administrators answer these questions which describe academic advising. These questions also align with certain survey items on ACT’s National Survey for Academic Advising. Another option for guiding the study on the organization of academic advising is ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising (Habley, 2004b). This comprehensive survey addressed the questions recommended by Gordon along with several other areas related to academic advising to include, but not limited to, the following: recognition and reward for academic advisors, training and development, effectiveness of advising. A third and more focused approach to the study of the organization of academic advising was related to NACADA’s (2006) recommendation for the understanding of academic advising. NACADA asserted that the first phase of understanding academic advising was to identify who was providing academic advising and to identify where academic advising was taking place.

**Student-to-Advisor Ratios**

Discussions regarding specific recommendations on ideal student-to-advisor ratios have had limited coverage in the literature on academic advising. However, a few academic advising scholars have commented on the topic. First, King (1993) asserted that multiple delivery systems should be employed in the “ideal” (p. 53) model of academic advising in order to off-set high student-to-advisor ratios. King did not provide a recommended number for practitioners to consider. Secondly, the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) (2006) also commented on the importance of student-to-advisor ratios and recommended that advisor ratios should be assigned after assessing
student needs and the time an advisor would need to adequately work with his/her advising population. Again, CAS had not provided specific numerical recommendations. Although CAS had not provided a recommended ratio, CAS (2006) authors asserted, “Academic advising caseloads must be consistent with the time required for the effective performance of this activity” (p. 31). CAS recommended that the student needs and academic status be taken into consideration as caseloads are developed. Third, Habley (2004a, para. 1) discussed the topic of student-to-advisor ratios in terms of “advisor load.” Habley was the first to provide a numerical recommendation for consideration. Although Habley did not provide the rationale by which he provided his recommendations, Habley’s regular involvement with ACT’s National Survey of Academic Advising and the analysis and documentation of its results makes Habley an informed scholar of academic advising in terms of the organization of academic advising. Habley discussed that there are currently no empirical studies on the topic of advisor load. However, Habley provided a scholarly recommendation with numbers attached to the recommendation. Habley also qualified his numerical recommendation. He discussed that factors such as the type or content of advising, the level of preparedness of students, and the use of technology should be taken into account while considering student-to-advisor ratios. He recommended that student-to-advisor ratios should not exceed 300:1 for full-time professional advisors who are working with students who are in good academic standing. According to Habley, these ratios could increase if the advisor works solely with high-performing students such as honors students and or successful upper-classmen. He also stated that this recommendation ratio of 300:1 for professional advisors should decrease if the advisor is working who students who are underprepared.
for college and/or have high academic needs. Habley’s (2004a) recommendation for full-time faculty advisors who work with students in good academic standing was 20:1. As Habley had noted with his recommendation for student-to-full-time professional advisor ratios, he noted that this ratio for full-time faculty should be adjusted based on the needs of the student population.

Habley (2004a) cited data from ACT’s 2003 Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising in his article on “advisor load.” The average student-to-advisor ratio for two-year public colleges was 375:1 for a full-time advisor equivalent. The next largest ratio was at four-year public colleges with 285:1. Student-to-full-time faculty ratios on average were 37.3:1 at two-year public colleges and followed four-year publics that had a 38.2:1 faculty-to-student ratio. Habley (2004a) supported CAS recommendations that advising case loads needed to be developed based on student characteristics and student need. However, Habley stated that the ratios of 300:1 for student-to-full-time advisor and 20:1 for full-time faculty-to-student should be considered when possible. He cautions readers to use this data only as an “off the record” expert comment (Habley, 2004a, para 4).

Ohio Transfer and Student Success Initiatives

The Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy launched in 1990 (OBR, 2010c) with the Ohio Transfer Module (OTM). The OTM consisted of specific general education courses that had been approved for state-wide transfer to any Ohio public institution of higher education. In 2005, additional legislation required the development of transfer assurance guides (TAGS) which expanded on the OTM. TAGS are transfer advising guides which include general education courses and introductory courses approved for state-wide transfer to Ohio public institutions of higher education. The
addition of the Advanced Placement (AP) Policy further developed the articulation and transfer initiative. Students who have earned a score of 3 or higher on College Board Advanced Placement exams have been guaranteed college credit for the course for which they earned AP credit. The Career and Technical Transfer (CTAGS) policy emerged in 2007 to guarantee students college credit for approved technical courses completed in high schools and career centers. Prior to a course being included within a TAG and CTAG, the course must have undergone a rigorous faculty review. Seventy percent of the course content and student learning outcomes must match already approved TAG or CTAG courses in order for it to be approved as a TAG or CTAG course (OBR, 2010c).

The State of Ohio has partnered with outside vendors and has developed several technical tools to assist students as they self-advise during their transfer experience and to assist academic advisors who work with students intending to transfer. These tools include College Source’s course applicability system called u.select (College Source, 2012) and OBR searchable databases for state-approved TAGS and CTAGS courses (OBR, 2012).

The importance of advising in the implementation of OA&T Policy was included within the policy.

Both sending and receiving institutions shall provide appropriate transfer advising to students. Materials such as transfer guides, transfer equivalencies and brochures on special articulation programs shall be made available to students as early in their matriculation as possible, so that they can plan their programs to maximize transferability and applicability of credits. Cooperation between
institutions in the development of advising materials is also encouraged. (OBR, 2010c, p. 19)

In terms of funding student success initiatives like the OA&T Policy, the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) (2008) stated that funding for higher education must align with the goals of the Ohio Strategic Plan for Higher Education, 2008 - 2017 (OBR, 2008b) which focused on increasing enrollment and retention in Ohio’s institutions of higher education. The OA&T Policy has been one strategy designed to increase enrollment, certificate completion, transfer, and degree completion in Ohio. The transfer policy includes guidelines to ensure guaranteed transfer for select general education courses, introductory major courses, and career and technical courses.

In this OACC (2008) position document referenced above, OACC recommended a funding component for community colleges that would support Ohio’s student success initiatives aimed at increasing student progress and completion. Building from the state of Washington’s “momentum points” component of their funding formula for higher education, OACC recommended that Ohio gradually shift from a funding formula primarily based on enrollment to a funding formula that includes both enrollment and performance. Ohio colleges and universities will receive success point credit toward the funding formula for the following areas:

1. Students earning their first 15 college level semester SCH [Scheduled Credit Hours] at this institution by the current year.

2. Students earning their first 30 college level semester SCH at this institution by the current year.
3. Students earning at least one associate degree from this institution in the current year.

4. Students completing their first developmental course in the current year earn 2/3 of a point.

5. Students completing any developmental English in the previous year and attempting any college level English either in the remainder of the previous year or any term this year earn 2/3 of a point.

6. Students completing any developmental math in the previous year and attempting any college level math either in the remainder of the previous year or any term this year earn 2/3 of a point.

7. Students enrolling for the first time at a USO University main campus or branch campus this year and have previously earned at least 15 college level semester SCH at this community college. (OBR, 2010b, para 2)

The OA&T Policy and the success points funding recommendations were both designed to impact certificate completion, degree completion, and successful transfer. Academic advising has been one strategy for the implementation of transfer policy (OBR, 2010c) and a strategy for increasing student success (Tinto, 2004). Overall, the OA&T Policy has been a strategy to assist students with the transfer process. The success points funding component, to be implemented fall 2011 (OACC, 2010), provides community college leaders support and incentive for transitioning from enrollment driven to performance-based practices.
Understanding the Organization of Academic Advising in Ohio

NACADA (2006) recommended that the first step toward understanding academic advising programs is to identify the organizational model in place. In 2003, ACT administered the ACT Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising which was the most recent published study on the organization of academic advising in American colleges and universities. The last national study on the organization of academic advising in two-year colleges was conducted by an Ohio graduate student in 1989 (Leymaster, 1989). Leymaster used select questions from ACT’s National Survey related to organizational models and program effectiveness; however, delivery systems were not explored. Jefcoat (1991) conducted a similar national study of 75 rural community colleges. Neither of these studies provided information on the organization of advising at two-year public colleges in any specific state nor provided data on the perceptions of academic advising administrators on the impact of budget, institutional, and state policy on the organization of academic advising. Therefore, academic advising administrators in Ohio need information about the organizational models, delivery systems, student-to-advisor ratios, advising administrator perceptions on the ideal organizational model and delivery systems for two-year public colleges in Ohio, and advising administrator perceptions on the influences budgets, institutional polices, and state policies have on the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges.

Summary

Discussions about advising delivery systems and organizational models are common in student development journals. However, this literature review had not revealed studies that described how academic advising was organized in any specific state or in the State of Ohio’s two-year public colleges. Also, this literature review had
not revealed studies about how budgets and policies influenced decisions about academic advising.

NACADA’s (2006) recommendation for better understanding advising systems must become part of the State of Ohio’s strategies. Before Ohio’s academic advising administrators are able to advocate that academic advising is a strategy to assist in student success initiatives, advising administrators must conduct research designed to describe the ways in which academic advising is organized to include who delivers advising (e.g., delivery systems), how it is organized (e.g., organizational models), and the locations where academic advising takes place. Several survey items on ACTs Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising collect data that respond to Gordon’s (1992) “Building Blocks of Academic Advising” model (p. 22). Higher education professionals have many objectives to accomplish as a State over the next ten years. The prominent researchers and authors cited in this literature review strongly supported academic advising as a strategy to increase student success. Therefore, the description of the organization of academic advising (e.g., who provides advising, who coordinates advising, time spent coordinating advising and student-to-advisor ratios, and where it takes place) combined with advising administrator perceptions on the impact budgets and policies had on the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges must be studied in order to more strongly advocate for academic advising as a key strategy in the implementation of Ohio’s strategic student success initiatives.

Chapter three will describe the methodology for this study. The researcher used an exploratory mixed-method approach, which included two phases. Phase I consisted of structured phone interviews with three Ohio Board of Regents administrators and two
leaders within a professional organization focused on academic advising, and Phase II consisted of the Ohio Advising Survey, a 37-item mail questionnaire, sent to 25 academic advising administrators in Ohio’s two-year public colleges.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Introduction

The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) (2006) has recommended that gaining a better understanding of advising programs must begin by identifying the individuals who provide academic advising as well as the locations in which academic advising occurs. The researcher used an exploratory mixed-method approach (Creswell, 2005; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009; Smith & Hinderliter Ortloff, 2010) for this study on the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. The researcher created a conceptual model entitled “Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising,” to guide this study. The model incorporated concepts from Gordon’s (1992) model entitled “Building Blocks of Academic Advising,” and concepts from Weber’s (1947) theory of bureaucracy. This study consisted of two phases. Phase I consisted of a qualitative approach, and phase II consisted of a quantitative approach, with the quantitative phase having more “priority” or “weight” in the study (Creswell, 2005, p. 518). In Phase I of this mixed-method study, the researcher conducted interviews with Ohio leaders at the legislative, state agency, and committee level who were selected based on their awareness of the state higher education policies in Ohio that might have some influence on academic advising. The researcher incorporated the findings from Phase I of this study into the Ohio Advising Survey (OAS) (see Appendix C). The OAS consisted of several questions, with approval, from ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising and several questions developed by the researcher. In Phase II of this study, Ohio’s two-year public college advising administrators responded
to the OAS instrument, which the researcher designed to gather data on (a) the ways in which academic advising practices are organized and (b) the levels of influence institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio and Transfer Policy (OA&T) Policy had on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place.

Overall, this study provided research for two major areas in the field of academic advising in the two-year public college. First, this study was the first to explore the organization of academic advising solely in Ohio’s two-year public colleges by responding to NACADA’s recommendation to identify who provides academic advising and to identify where advising takes place. Second, this was the first study on the influences that budget and policy had on academic advising.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges; (b) to explore the influence budgets, institutional policies, and the OA&T Policy had on academic advising; and (3) to examine the influences that institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place.

**Research Design**

The research design used to guide this study was an exploratory mixed-method approach (Creswell, 2005) that included two sequenced phases: (a) structured phone interviews and (b) a mail questionnaire. The researcher identified participants through a process of snowball sampling (Creswell, 2005; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The researcher
used a structured interview guide to facilitate structured phone interviews with three Ohio Board of Regents administrators and two Ohio professional organization leaders (see Appendix D). The researcher used data from the interviews (Phase I) to develop the OAS, a self-administered questionnaire (Phase II) created using several questions from ACT’s Sixth National Survey on Academic Advising (see Appendix C). The researcher mailed the OAS to academic advising administrators at Ohio’s two-year public colleges. The leadership of ACT granted approval to use or to adapt any questions from the ACT survey (see Appendix E).

**Qualitative interview approach.** The researcher identified three Ohio Board of Regents administrators and two Ohio professional development organization leaders who were aware of state policies in Ohio that have potentially influenced academic advising. The researcher selected these participants through a process of snowball sampling. The first interview participant was an individual who had been closely involved with the implementation of policy related to academic advising. The researcher accomplished three objectives with these interviews. The primary objective of the interviews was to identify the specific state policies in Ohio that the participants perceived were influencing academic advising in the Ohio. The secondary objective of the interviews was to determine the influences that budgets and state policies had on the organization of academic advising in two-year public colleges in Ohio. A tertiary objective was to explore participants’ perspectives on specific aspects of the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges.

**Structured interview guide for phone interview.** The researcher created an 18-item structured interview guide to facilitate phone interviews with five Ohio leaders. The
researcher used several “rapport building questions” (Aiken-Wisniewski, 2010, p. 91) to open the interview, to ease the participants into more challenging questions, and to gather information to describe the participants. In their responses, participants explored (a) public policy they perceived to be impacting academic advising, (b) their perceptions of the ideal academic advising delivery systems and locations for academic advising, and (c) influences of budget on academic advising.

**Survey research approach.** Salant and Dillman (1994) stated that the mail survey method could be considered under the following conditions:

1. surveying people for whom a reliable address list is available and who are likely to respond accurately and completely in writing; and
2. immediate turnaround is not required. (p. 37)

This research project met these conditions. The researcher identified reliable address information via the Internet and, when necessary, confirmed the information with follow-up phone calls. Although immediate turnaround time would have been valuable, the researcher expected accurate information more so than a quick turnaround time. A mail survey allowed participants the time to reflect on the written document and their answers before responding. The mail survey option also provided participants the time to conduct the minimal research needed to complete the instrument.

**Identification of potential survey participants.** Participants in this population study included the academic advising administrators at Ohio’s two-year public colleges. The researcher identified potential participants by exploring the websites of the institutions under study. According to studies on academic advising (Leymaster, 1989; Habley, 2004b), the position title cited more often than any other title for the academic
advising coordinator was director/coordinator of advising. In most cases, director/coordinators reported to the president or to the vice president/dean of student affairs (Habley, 2004b). Therefore, the researcher reviewed the two-year college websites of potential participants to identify the individual with a title similar to that of director/coordinator of advising. If the researcher did not locate an individual with this title, then the search expanded to determine the name of the vice president/dean of student affairs. Once the researcher collected the names and titles of the academic advising administrators, the researcher contacted these individuals by phone to confirm that they in fact were the professionals on campus who had the most immediate responsibility for the oversight and direction of academic advising. The researcher then mailed the OAS to these individuals.

**ACT National Survey of Academic Advising**

This section describes the ACT Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising, the instrument on which the researcher modeled the OAS. ACT created the ACT National Survey of Academic Advising to collect data from higher education administrators about the organizational models and delivery systems in place in American colleges and universities. The ACT National Survey of Academic Advising should not be confused with the ACT Academic Advising Survey, which was designed to gather information on student perceptions of academic advising. The researcher selected questions from ACT’s Sixth National Survey on Academic Advising, which ACT had administered in 2003, for several reasons. First, ACT is an organization that is respected by the higher education community for its placement, survey, and enrollment planning services. Secondly, ACT has generated and published data on the organization of academic advising. Third, the
NACADA supports and endorses ACT’s research and findings. Fourth, several researchers have used ACT’s academic advising questions, with approval, to advance the study and understanding of academic advising; however, the comprehensive literature review that guided this study did not reveal any studies that focused on academic advising organizational models and delivery systems at Ohio’s two-year public colleges. The last national study on academic advising in two-year colleges using ACT’s National Survey of Academic Advising questions was conducted in 1989 (Leymaster, 1989); however, this study did not explore delivery systems, budgets, or policies. Fifth, the researcher incorporated ACT questions into the OAS “. . . because these survey data have become valued by many individuals interested in the improvement of academic advising” (Habley, 2004, p. 10). Sixth, and most importantly, ACT has developed questions aimed at identifying the types of organizational models and delivery systems in place in colleges and universities.

**Survey Instrument: Ohio Advising Survey**

This section describes the survey instrument used in this study. The researcher used ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising as the model for the OAS instrument. After receiving approval from ACT, the researcher incorporated several items from ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising into the OAS. The researcher incorporated concepts from interview participant responses that described the influences of institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional polices, and OA&T Policy on academic advising to create items for the OAS. The researcher also added several items to the OAS to gather quantitative data on academic advising administrator perceptions about the ideal personnel to deliver academic advising and the ideal student-to-advisor
ratios for Ohio’s two-year public colleges. The OAS consisted of 37 items and several sections: centralized advising centers (4 questions), advising in academic departments and units (3 questions), other types of academic advising units (4 questions), student-to-advisor ratios and time spent advising (4 questions), ideal delivery systems and ideal student-to-advisor ratios for academic advising in two-year public colleges (3 questions), administration of academic advising (3 questions), budget (4 questions), state and institutional policy (6 questions), and demographic information (6 questions).

**Interview Participants**

The five interview participants in this study on the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges were described in terms of positions, experiences working in higher education in Ohio, and years of experience and level of experience working with higher education public policy in Ohio.

**Position.** Three of the five interview participants currently serve or recently have served as an administrator with Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) or an agency affiliated with OBR. One interview participant retired approximately two years ago. One of these three was currently providing leadership for a closely affiliated organization; this leadership position was appointed by the chancellor of OBR. Therefore, this role will be referred to as an OBR administrative position for the purpose of this dissertation. Two participants were serving in their first year as recent executive board members of Ohio-based professional development organizations aimed at advancing and exploring matters related to academic advising in Ohio.

**Experiences working in higher education.** Three of the participants had direct experience working in an academic advising role, and two of these three had direct
experience working in an academic advising administrator role. Only one of the three, who had direct academic advising experience, was currently serving as an OBR administrator. With the exception of one OBR administrator, who had 26 years of experience working with higher education policy, all participants worked in admissions, enrollment management, or academic advising.

Years of experience and level of experience working with higher education public policy in Ohio. Participant experiences in years and level of experience working with higher education public policy in Ohio fell in a range of three years of using policy as an academic advisor and educating others about policy to 26 years of creating and implementing policy. Two participants had direct experience in policy creation and development: five and a half years and 26 years. The remaining three participants had experience using policy as an academic advisor at their campus. These participants had 3, 3, and 10 years of experience.

Survey Participants

The survey participants consisted of the academic advising administrators at Ohio’s two-year public colleges. These individuals provided oversight and leadership for academic advising on their campus. Seventeen of the 25-member population responded to the OAS.

Conceptual Model and Theory Informing this Study

The researcher created a conceptual model to guide and inform this study. The created conceptual model Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising included concepts from Gordon’s (1992) “Building Blocks of Academic Advising” model and concepts from Weber’s (1947) organizational theory of bureaucracy. Gordon advocated
that advising programs must be defined and described by responding to the following questions: (1) Why advising?; (2) What is advising?; (3) Who advises?; (4) Where is advising done?; (5) When is it done?; and (6) How is it done? (Gordon, 1992, p. 23).

Weber advocated that bureaucratic, hierarchical, and structured organizations by design achieve efficiency and effectiveness. Considering Gordon’s model and Weber’s theory in the context of NACADA’s (2006) assertion that the understanding of academic advising begins with describing and identifying individuals who advise as well as identifying the locations where advising takes place led to the development of the Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising model. This newly adapted conceptual model described the key components required to establish an infrastructure for academic advising: the titles of the academic advising administrators, the titles of these administrators’ supervisors, the area of the college to which participant supervisors’ reported, the average time spent coordinating advising, the types of advisors and average time spent advising, the student-to-advisor ratios, and the locations of advising. The conceptual model recognized the potential influences of budgets and policies on academic advising.

**Research Procedures**

This section describes the activities that occurred prior to administering the OAS. These activities included the following (a) introduction to the total design method, (b) question development, (c) panel review, and (d) pilot administration. The next major section describes the areas of survey implementation, including a (a) detailed survey administration process, (b) informed consent, and (c) ethical considerations, confidentiality, and anonymity.
Total (tailored) design method for quantitative OAS. Principles of Dillman’s (1978) total design method (TDM), later called “tailored design method” (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009) were included in the development of this mail survey methodology.

The TDM consists of two parts. The first is to identify each aspect of the survey process that may affect either the quality or quantity of response and to shape each of them in such a way that the best possible responses are obtained. The second is to organize the survey efforts so that the design intentions are carried out in complete detail. The first step is guided by a theoretical view about why people respond to questionnaires. It provides the rationale for deciding how each aspect, even the seemingly minute ones, should be shaped. The second step is guided by an administrative plan, the purpose of which is to ensure implementation of the survey in accordance with design intentions. The failure of surveys to produce satisfactory results occurs as often from poor administration as from poor design. (Dillman, 1978, p. 12)

The total design method required that attention be paid to the importance of participant trust in the researcher and to participant perceptions of the benefits to participating. The researcher managed the elements of trust and benefits to the participants through the development of a cover letter, which included that the researcher had served previously as an academic advising administrator. The letter outlined the benefits of the study and explained how the study would assist in the advancement of academic advising in two-year public colleges (see Appendix F).
**Question development.** The OAS consisted primarily of questions selected from ACT’s 2003 Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising. The researcher developed additional items by modeling these after ACT’s examples.

**Panel review of structured interview guide and OAS.** After receiving approval from the Institutional Research Board (IRB) at the University of Toledo (UT), the researcher submitted the structured interview guide and the OAS to a four-member panel of academic advising scholars, researchers, and practitioners. The panel included the following members: (a) an assistant director of the NACADA, (b) a principal associate from ACT who is involved with ACT’s National Survey on Academic Advising, (c) a professor emeritus at The Ohio State University who was former president of the NACADA and is an author and editor of several academic advising texts and (d) a chair of the NACADA Research Commission.

This four-member panel of scholars, researchers, and experienced practitioners in the field of academic advising provided feedback on the face validity and content validity of the instruments. Manning, Algozzine, and Antonak (2003) defined content validity as “a reflection of the extent to which a measurement device adequately samples the information domains it claims to measure” (p. 53). Face validity has been defined as “a reflection on the extent to which items on a measure represent the content presumed to be measured” (Manning, Algozzine, & Antonak, 2003, p. 54). Panelists provided minimal recommendations on the structured interview guide. Panelists’ recommendations on the OAS focused on two areas. The first area focused on highlighting, bolding, and shading. For example, one panelist recommended that the type of academic advisor i.e. – professional advisor and faculty advisor be italicized and bolded in the survey items.
about the ideal student-to-professional advisor ratio and ideal student-to-full-time faculty advisor ratios. The researcher incorporated these recommendations and resubmitted the OAS to the Institutional Research Board at the University of Toledo and was granted approval to administer the revised instrument. The second recommendation focused on the definitions for the organizational models of academic advising. Two of the four panelists recommended using the standard organizational model definitions used on the ACT National Survey of Academic Advising. The researcher intentionally did not use the standard definitions which are Habley’s (1983) seven definitions of organizational models because these definitions required the survey participants to respond to a forced-choice question and select one of the seven responses. The researcher received approval to modify items on ACT’s instrument; therefore, the OAS section on organizational models provided three prompts using phrasing similar to ACT’s definitions. However, participants also had the option to write in a description about how academic advising was organized at their respective institutions. The researcher determined that adding the OAS section on organizational models was a methodological improvement because it allowed participants to write in their description. Therefore, the panelists’ recommendation to use ACT’s definitions was not executed. A methodological improvement was that this Ohio study included participants who were directly responsible for academic advising at the institutions under study. In the National ACT Surveys, the participants could have included any administrator who might have some knowledge of academic advising at his/her campus but not necessarily be directly responsible for the daily operations of academic advising.
Campanelli (2008) provided several recommendations on the number of panel reviewers needed for a new questionnaire. She noted that “a small test is much better than no test at all” (p. 179). This Ohio advising study relied on only the recommendations of a few academic advising scholars, researchers, and practitioners because most of the items on this questionnaire were selected from a nationally recognized instrument developed by ACT.

**Pilot administration.** After receiving feedback on the OAS from the review panel of scholars and experienced practitioners in the field of academic advising, the researcher conducted a pilot study. The pilot study included two interview participants who were familiar with qualitative research procedures and five academic advising administrators who were not in the population under study but were working in or recently had worked in a community college advising setting. These individuals in the survey pilot consisted of assistant directors of advising and recent directors and assistant directors of advising who had moved into another role within student services. Pilot participants provided suggestions similar to those provided by the review panelist and primarily were related to bolding certain words on the OAS. For example, one panelist recommended the bolding of the advisor type in the item related to the ideal student-to-advisor ratios for full-time professional advisors and full-time faculty. One of the pilot participants recommended that the words “Select one” be bolded on the items that required the survey participants to limit their selection to one option.

**Survey Administration**

The researcher implemented Lynn’s (2008) recommendations for survey administration outlined in the *International Handbook of Survey Methodology*. The
researcher incorporated recommended strategies to address areas such as coverage, non-response, persuasion letter, social responsibility. Lynn discussed coverage, which was not a challenge in this study because contact information was easily accessible for the participants in this study. Non-response error was not a concern in this population study because the researcher did not make group comparisons. The researcher designed this study to describe the various components of the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges.

The administration phases included: confirmation of appropriate participants, introduction email/persuasion letter, mailing of the questionnaire, first follow-up email communication, second follow-up email communication, and final attempt at data collection.

**Confirmation of appropriate participants.** Prior to administration, the researcher reviewed the websites of Ohio’s two-year public community colleges to identify the email addresses, postal addresses, and phone numbers of individuals with a title similar to that of director/coordinator of academic advising. This step secured full coverage of all possible participants. If a name with a similar title was not identified, then the vice president of student affairs or similar position was identified. The researcher contacted these individuals in order to obtain the contact information of the individuals responsible for the oversight of academic advising. The researcher sent electronic mail to the appropriate individual in order to request the contact information of the best participant for this study on academic advising. The researcher organized this information into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.
**Introduction email/persuasion letter.** After receiving confirmation that the pre-selected participants were those responsible for overseeing academic advising and confirming the exact electronic and postal mailing address for these academic advising administrators, the researcher sent these individuals a detailed electronic mail message to introduce the study, to outline the purposes and benefits of the study, and to encourage involvement in the project (Dillman, 1978) (see Appendix G). This “persuasion” email introduced the survey administration timeline and indicated that participants would receive a cover letter, informed consent form, and self-administered questionnaire within the week (Lynn, 2008, p. 42). The purpose of this letter was to encourage academic advising administrators to fulfill their “social responsibility” (Lynn, 2008, p. 42) as academic advising professionals and to highlight the “relevance” of the project in assisting a colleague toward advancing the professionalism of academic advising in two-year public colleges in Ohio. In addition, the researcher designed the letter to encourage participants to help a fellow advising administrator complete his dissertation.

**Mailing of OAS.** Soon after the researcher sent the introductory email, he sent the cover letter, which was manually mailed to each of the 25 academic advising administrators in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. This mailing also included a statement about informed consent, an informed consent form, and the OAS.

**First follow-up email communication.** Approximately 7 to 10 days after the researcher mailed the OAS to the 25 participants, the researcher sent an email to participants requesting confirmation that the instrument had been received in the mail.
Second follow-up communication. Two weeks after the initial mailing, the researcher sent follow-up email reminders and made follow-up phone calls to participants encouraging them to complete the OAS.

Third follow-up communication. Within two weeks of the second follow-up communication, the researcher again sent follow-up emails and made follow-up phone calls. The researcher sent second mailings of the OAS upon request by participants.

Final attempt at data collection. After approximately eight weeks, the researcher sent another follow-up email and made another follow-up phone call to participants from whom completed questionnaires had not yet been received. Survey researchers have found increases in responses after these friendly reminders (Dillman, 1978; Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009). The researcher achieved a response rate of 68% (17/25) after initiating several follow-up communications.

Informed consent. The researcher followed requirements from the University of Toledo Institutional Research Board and incorporated recommendations from Manning, Algozzine, and Antonak (2003) into an informed consent document for interview participants and survey participants. The informed consent document included the following information: benefits of the study, potential risks, measures taken by the researcher to maintain participants’ anonymity, right to remove self from study without consequences, and measures taken to protect the identities of participants. Phone interview participants signed and faxed to the researcher an informed consent document prior to the phone interview. They approved the digital recording of the structured interviews. Survey participants received a copy of the informed consent with their survey materials and postage paid return envelope.
**Ethical considerations, confidentiality, and anonymity.** The researcher described interview participants and survey participants using general information that would not lead to their identification. Interview participants provided their position title, experience with higher education, and types of and level of experience working with public policy related to academic advising. Survey participants provided descriptions in terms of position title, supervisor’s title, percentage of time dedicated to coordinating academic advising, and area of the college to which their supervisors’ reported. The researcher organized this data in a manner to protect the identity of the respondent. Due to the limited number of participants in the population, some potential inferences might be possible based on the summarization of titles.

**Data Collection, Data Entry, Maintenance, and Storage**

The researcher collected descriptive data during the structured phone interviews and on the mailed OAS that participants used to document their responses. The researcher recorded the interviews using a digital recorder. A professional transcriptionist who had no access to higher education data or personnel signed a confidentiality agreement prior to providing verbatim transcription services. Following a system of open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Benaquist, 2008), the researcher systematically reviewed the transcripts in order to identify codes that were organized into categories. After regular review of the categories, the researcher organized the categories into themes. A theme emerged when three of the five interview participants reported a similar concept, idea, or position. The researcher entered OAS data into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet which was used to calculate frequencies, means, and modes, when appropriate. The researcher secured the digital recorder and paper questionnaires in a locked cabinet to which only
the researcher had access. The researcher secured electronic data, including digital sound bites, on a personal computer and on a personal miniature computer storage drive. Only members of the dissertation team and its designees had access to any of the raw data. Only the researcher and the dissertation committee were aware of which responses were provided by each academic advising administrator. In order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, the researcher coded each institution with a number used to represent that particular institution (Manning, Algozzne, and Antonak, 2003).

**Data Analysis**

This study was a descriptive and exploratory mixed-method study (Creswell, 2005) designed to generate qualitative and quantitative data to describe how academic advising was organized in Ohio’s public, two-year colleges and to examine the impact that institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy had on the organization of academic advising. This study included academic advising administrators serving two-year public colleges in the State of Ohio. Therefore, inferences were not made.

**Interview data analysis.** The researcher used a systematic process to review interview transcripts in order to develop themes to describe participant responses (Benaquist, 2008). The researcher used the following process to identify themes:

1. Prior to a detailed analysis of the interview data, the researcher sent the exact transcripts to the interview participants. Participants responded that they looked forward to reading the final analysis.
2. Listened to digital audio approximately five to seven times in order to obtain a
detailed and conceptual understanding of the content, concepts, and ideas captured in the
interviews

3. Read and reread verbatim transcripts to identify code words that described
larger ideas

4. Wrote notes on each transcript electronically using Microsoft Word bubbles to
capture common language and ideas among participants

5. Developed a list of code words and then merged them into larger categories;
categories emerged when several code words reappeared multiple times within an
individual interview transcript or among at least three transcripts

6. Reread transcripts to further gain contextual meaning and to validate

categories

7. Merged categories into thematic statements that captured the overall ideas
communicated by interview participants. The researcher created themes by combining
similar categories that emerged within an individual transcript and were consistent among
at least three of the five transcripts.

8. After the analysis of the transcripts and the development of four themes, the
researcher facilitated a member check with the interview participants (Creswell, 2005;
Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Participants received the thematic statements, the quotes used
to support the theme, and any other supporting text the researcher wrote about the theme.
Participants responded with confirmation that the researcher had captured the essence of
the interviews.

**OAS data analysis.** The researcher used Microsoft Excel to calculate basic
descriptive statistics to describe the data collected in this study. The researcher calculated
primarily means, frequencies, and modes when appropriate. The researcher also included item response rates when presenting findings in tables and when describing findings in text (Salant & Dillman, 1994).

**Limitations of the Methodology**

This study on the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges has a few limitations.

1. A limitation of the methodology existed in the areas of validity and reliability. Although the researcher incorporated several items from ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising questionnaire into the OAS and four academic advising scholars and researchers reviewed the instrument to provide suggestions for improvement, the researcher did not conduct validity and reliability testing with the instrument. However, ACT is a respected and professional organization focused on placement testing, assessment, and enrollment planning services and employed an experienced team of professional researchers who assisted in the development of the ACT National Survey of Academic Advising.

2. Another limitation of the study was that specific institutional policies were not identified by participants. Participants responded to a general question about board policy and how board policy impacted academic advising. Therefore, there was no opportunity to explain the impact of specific institutional policies on the organization of academic advising.

3. A limitation of the study was that interview participants received the structured interview guide in advance of the interviews, and this guide included prompts
related to various Ohio public policies the researcher perceived to be influencing academic advising in Ohio. Although scaffolding was used to build up to specific questions on academic advising-related policies, it is possible that the advanced receipt of the structured interview guide influenced participant feedback on the policies they referenced during the interviews.

Summary

Chapter three provided a detailed overview of the methodology guiding this study. The next chapter, Chapter four, consists of a presentation of the data collected during five structured phone interviews and obtained during a mailed, self-administered questionnaire. Chapter Four is organized into the following sections: overview of findings, findings, and summary of findings. Qualitative data is presented in descriptive text, and quantitative data is presented in tables.
Chapter Four

Results

Academic advising administrators, advising professional organization leaders, and advising scholars have not had access to information about the organization and delivery of academic advising in their states. It was imperative that academic advising administrators be provided with this data on academic advising in order to advance and improve their academic advising programs.

Two-year public colleges in the State of Ohio have implemented academic advising programs in order to assist in achieving degree completion goals. However, the specific problem addressed in this study is that these institutions have not had data describing how academic advising was organized and therefore have not been able to assess the role academic advising has played in meeting these completion goals. More specifically, there has been a lack of research concerning the impact of institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy (OA&T) Policy on the ways in which academic advising was organized in two-year public colleges. The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges; (b) to explore the influences budgets, institutional policies, and the OA&T Policy had on academic advising; and (c) to examine the influences that institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and the OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place. This study was guided by five primary research questions:
1. How has academic advising been organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

2. How has budget impacted academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

3. What levels of impact have institutional budgets and grant budgets had on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

4. How have institutional policies and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer policy impacted academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

5. What levels of impact have institutional policies and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer policy had on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

In order to answer these research questions, the researcher first conducted interviews with five state leaders in Ohio, who either were administrators with the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) or were leaders of professional organizations focused on academic advising, and then mailed a 37-item Ohio Advising Survey (OAS) to 25 two-year public college academic advising administrators.

Overview of Findings

The analysis of the data revealed nine findings that described the ways in which academic advising is organized as well as described the influences of policies and budgets on academic advising. First, state-level leaders interviewed for this study identified OA&T Policy as the key state policy influencing academic advising. However,
the academic advising administrators reported that OA&T Policy had not influenced decisions about academic advising. Secondly, the results indicated that two-year public colleges had allocated administrators to lead academic advising; however, these mid-level advising administrators spent less than half of their time with advising responsibilities. Third, the results revealed that academic advising administrator titles did not suggest where advising programs might be aligned within the college’s structure; however, their supervisors’ titles clearly identified their alignment with the student services area of the college. Fourth, the results demonstrated that professional advisors primarily provided advising in centralized advising centers while faculty advisors primarily advised in academic departments/units. Fifth, the results of this study revealed that academic advisors had advising caseloads that exceeded their supervisors’ preference for advising caseloads. Sixth, the results indicated that state-level leaders and academic advising administrators both held similar perceptions about the ideal advisor types who should deliver academic advising. These perceptions about the ideal advisor types matched the actual staffing patterns at the institutions under study. Seventh, the results of this study revealed that, in general, internal factors influenced academic advising more than external factors influenced academic advising. The prominent internal factor that influenced academic advising was, in fact, the faculty contract, which not only influenced who delivered advising but also influenced where faculty would advise. Eighth, the results of this study indicated that state-level leaders anticipated that budget would negatively influence academic advising; however, academic advising administrators reported that they had experienced few changes in staffing patterns and, in fact, had experienced stable budgets in the last year. Ninth, the results revealed that several
advising programs did not provide faculty advising for new students. Faculty advising was introduced later in a student’s college experience.

**Response Rates**

Five state-level leaders participated in structured phone interviews, and 17 academic advising administrators completed the OAS questionnaire. Interview participants held a current or recent position within the OBR (3 participants) or a leadership position within a professional organization in Ohio associated with academic advising (2 participants). Seventeen of the 25 (68%) academic advising administrators in Ohio’s two-year public colleges completed and returned via regular mail the OAS, a 37-item questionnaire designed to take less than one-half hour to complete.

**Research Question 1: How has academic advising been organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?**

The following section reports the findings related to the academic advising administrators (participants) at two-year public colleges.

**Academic advising administrators (participants) titles.** All 17 participants responded to a survey item about their title (see Table 1). The titles of over half of the participants (59%; n=10) included “director” – e.g. director of admissions; advising; advising and transfer; advising services; retention services; student resource center; counseling and psychological services; new student advising office, testing, and career services; and strengthening student success. About one-third (35%; n=6) of participants who responded to this question held a title with the word “advising”: director (n=4), manager (n=1), and coordinator (n=1). The next most frequently reported title was dean (18%; n=3).
The three dean titles were dean of student development, dean of students/director of admissions and enrollment services, and associate dean of enrollment and student development.

The five interview participants in this study, who were state-level leaders in Ohio involved with academic advising policy, identified the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR) OA&T Policy as the landmark policy impacting academic advising. The state’s leadership designed OA&T Policy to assist students in their achievement of certificate completion, degree completion, and transfer goals and to support college administrators and academic advisors as they guide students to these goals. Although all five interview participants only identified OA&T Policy or “credit transfer” policy as the policy impacting academic advising, only 35% (n=6) of participant titles had the word advising in the title. Only one of these titles included the phrase “advising and transfer” in the title. Therefore, the responsibility for academic advising and transfer was not evident in the titles of academic advising administrators.

**Academic advising administrator supervisors’ titles.** All 17 participants responded to a survey item about their supervisor’s title (see Table 2). The two most frequently reported supervisor titles were dean (41%; n=7) and Vice President (41%;
n=7). Dean titles included dean of students, student affairs, enrollment and student
development, students and enrollment management, enrollment services, and financial
and enrollment services. The vice president titles included executive vice president of
academic and student affairs, vice president of enrollment and student life, student
services, academic affairs/provost, student and academic affairs, and associate vice
president of enrollment management and student development. Seventy-one percent
(n=5) of the dean titles and 86% (n=6) of the vice president titles included the word
“student” or “students” in the title. The majority of participant supervisor titles (65%;
n=11) represented the student services branch of the two-year public college.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Advising Administrator Supervisors’ Titles (n=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Vice Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant supervisors’ reporting areas. All 17 participants responded to a
survey item about the area of the college to which their supervisors’ reported (see Table
3). Participants indicated that the majority of their supervisors (53%; n=9) reported to the
student services branch of the college. Very few academic advising administrators
indicated that their supervisors reported to the president (18%; n=3), and even fewer
reported to a combination of academic and student services (12%; n=2). This finding
about reporting area was consistent with the finding about academic advising
administrator supervisor titles; the majority of these supervisor titles included the word
“student.”
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting Area</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic &amp; Student Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic advising coordination time.** All 17 participants responded to a survey item about the amount of time they spent coordinating academic advising (see Table 4). The range in reported advising coordination time was less than 1% to 100% of the participants’ time. The participant who reported spending less than 1% was in a vice president role. The most frequently reported percentage of time that participants indicated they spent coordinating advising was 40% (n=3). On average, academic advising administrators spent 53% of their time coordinating academic advising activities. More than half of the participants (59%; n=10) reported that they dedicated less than half of their time coordinating academic advising.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination Time</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% - 50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% - 100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approach to academic advising coordination.** Fifteen participants responded to a survey item about the college’s approach to the coordination of academic advising at their institution (see Table 5). The distribution of academic advising coordination approaches was nearly balanced in number of reports for each approach: centralized (40%; n=6), decentralized (33%; n=5), and shared (27%; n=4). One participant selected
“other” on the OAS and wrote in “centralized 1st year (Higher Risk) is supervised separately from decentralized academic advising.” The researcher categorized this response as “shared” for the purposes of this study, because the response represented that advising was “shared” among a centralized advising unit and decentralized departments.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach to Academic Advising Coordination (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section reports the findings related to the delivery systems of academic advising at two-year public colleges.

**Primary academic advisors in centralized advising centers.** All participants (100%; n=16) who reported a centralized advising center identified their primary advisors (see Table 6). Ninety-four percent (n=15) of primary advisors in centralized advising centers were professional advisors or licensed professional counselors – i.e., full-time professional advisors, part-time professional advisors, combinations of full-time and part-time professional advisors, full-time licensed professional counselors, and combinations of full-time and part-time licensed professional counselors. Sixty-three percent (n=10) of primary advisors in centralized advising centers were full-time professional advisors or full-time licensed professional advisors. Although nineteen percent (n=3) of primary advisors were licensed professional counselors with faculty status, the researcher categorized these licensed professional counselors into professional advisor tallies versus faculty tallies due to the duties described in supporting documentation.
Table 6

*Primary Academic Advisors in Centralized Advising Centers (n=16)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time instructional faculty who advise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time professional advisors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time professional advisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full &amp; part-time professional advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time licensed professional counselors (faculty rank)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full &amp; part-time licensed professional counselors (faculty rank)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other academic advisors in centralized advising centers. Thirty-eight percent (n=5) of participants reported having no other advisors in addition to their primary advisors in their centralized advising centers (see Table 7). Of the remaining eight participant responses who indicated having other advisors, 75% (n=6) indicated that non-faculty academic advisors more frequently than faculty advisors served as the other advisors in centralized advising centers. Sixty-three percent (n=5) of the remaining eight participants reported a combination of advising types that advised in centralized advising centers in addition to the primary academic advisors. This survey item elicited the first response from participants focused on peer advisors (8%; n=1).

Table 7

*Other Academic Advisors in Centralized Advising Centers (n=13)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No other providers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Advisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers and Paraprofessionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Professional Counselors &amp; Academic Program Managers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty who Advise and Professional Advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Professional Advisors and Paraprofessional Advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional advisors and Licensed Professional Counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary academic advisors in academic departments/units. All participants (100%; n=12) who reported that advising occurred in academic advising departments/units identified their primary advisors (see Table 8). Eighty-three percent
(n=10) of participants reported that primary advisors in academic advising
departments/units were full-time instructional faculty who advise. Combining responses
with multiple faculty types, 92% (n=11) of participants reported that faculty were the
primary advisors in departments/units.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time instructional faculty who advise</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time instructional faculty who advise, part-time instructional faculty who advise, and full-time faculty with reduced teaching load</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time professional advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other academic advisors in academic departments units. Forty percent (n=4)
of participants reported having no other advisors in addition to their primary advisors in
their academic departments/units (see Table 9). Of the remaining six participant
responses, all participants indicated instructional faculty (33%; n=2) or instructional
leaders (67%; n=4) as the “other” advisors in academic departments/units. There were no
reports of professional advisors working in academic departments/units.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No other providers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time instructional faculty who advise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time and part-time instructional faculty who advise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs/Dean/Directors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staffing changes by advisor type. Participants reported whether their advisor
types “increased,” “decreased,” remained the same (“no change”), or were “not
applicable” for several academic advisor types (see Table 10).
Table 10

*Staffing Changes by Advisor Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Type</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Instructional Faculty Who</td>
<td>4 26.67</td>
<td>7 46.67</td>
<td>4 26.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise (n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Instructional Faculty Who</td>
<td>1 6.67</td>
<td>3 20.00</td>
<td>11 73.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise (n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Professional Advisor</td>
<td>5 31.25</td>
<td>8 50.00</td>
<td>2 12.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Professional Advisor</td>
<td>7 46.67</td>
<td>3 20.00</td>
<td>3 20.00</td>
<td>3 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Licensed Professional</td>
<td>2 13.33</td>
<td>3 20.00</td>
<td>9 60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor (n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Licensed Professional</td>
<td>4 25.00</td>
<td>2 12.50</td>
<td>10 62.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor (n=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraprofessional Advisor</td>
<td>3 18.75</td>
<td>2 12.50</td>
<td>11 68.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Advisor</td>
<td>1 6.75</td>
<td>1 6.67</td>
<td>13 86.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Full-time and part-time instructional faculty who advise.* Fifteen participants responded to the survey item about full-time instructional faculty who advise. The most frequently reported response was “no change” (47%; n=7). Fifteen participants responded to the survey item about part-time instructional faculty who advise. Seventy-three percent (n=11) reported part-time instructional faculty who advise were “not applicable” in their advising program. Among the academic advisor types examined, part-time instructional faculty who advise were the second least employed advisor type in academic advising programs under study.
**Full-time and part-time professional advisors.** Sixteen participants responded to the survey item about full-time professional advisors. The most frequently reported participant response was “no change” (50%; n=8). Fifteen participants responded to the survey item about part-time professional advisors. Forty-seven percent of participants (n=7) reported that part-time professional advisors increased. In the context of all academic advisor types, the most frequently reported increase of any advisor type was in the part-time advisor category.

**Full-time and part-time licensed professional counselors.** Fifteen participants responded to the survey item about full-time licensed professional counselors. Sixty percent (n=9) of participants responded that full-time licensed professional counselors were “not applicable” in their advising program. Sixteen participants responded to the survey item about part-time licensed professional counselors. Sixty-three percent (n=10) of participants reported part-time licensed professional counselors were “not applicable” in their advising program. Among all academic advisor types examined in this study, part-time licensed professional counselors were the fourth least employed advisor type in academic advising programs.

**Paraprofessional advisors and peer advisors.** Sixteen participants responded to the survey item about paraprofessional advisors. Sixty-nine percent (n=11) of participants reported not employing paraprofessional advisors in their advising program. Fifteen participants responded to the survey item about peer advisors. Eighty-seven percent (n=13) of respondents reported that peer advisors were not providers of academic advising in their program. Participants responded with “not applicable” more frequently for peer advisors than for any other advisor type.
Ideal delivery systems for academic advising in two-year public colleges. The most frequently reported ideal advisor type or ideal combination of advisor types was “faculty and professional advisors” with 59% (n=10) (see Table 11). None of the participants reported a single advisor type as the ideal for providing academic advising in two-year public colleges; all participants reported a combination of advisor types as the ideal delivery system. The second report of paraprofessional advisors (29%; n=5) and peer advisors (18%; n=3) occurred in response to this survey item.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Type</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and professional advisors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and paraprofessional advisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combinations of all advising types</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of all advising types (minus peers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional advisors &amp; licensed professional counselors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “Combination of all advising types” included the following: faculty, professional, licensed professional counselors, paraprofessionals, and peers.

State-level leaders also recommended that professional advisors and faculty advisor serve as the delivery systems for academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. Only one state-level leader immediately focused on professional advisors as the recommended advising delivery system for two-year public colleges. “I think that it is a really good idea to have full-time professional advisors with degrees in student personnel or counseling. I think that they have the best understanding of student development theory and where students might be developmentally and what kind of advice or interventions they need . . .” (Participant B, personal communication, October 6, 2010). The remaining four participants noted that various advisor types could work for two-year public colleges; however, two of the four focused on professional advisors
combined with faculty as the recommended delivery system for two-year public colleges.

Participants C and E stated that full-time professional advisors must be included in the advising model; they also recognized the role instructional faculty members had for explaining curriculum to students in two-year public colleges. Participant C was the first and only participant to introduce the value of peer advisors in academic advising programs. Both interview participants and survey participants offered similar perceptions regarding the ideal delivery systems for academic advising.

The following section reports the findings related to amount of time advisors spent advising and student-to-advisor ratios.

**Percentage of time spent advising: full-time-instructional-faculty who advise.**

Ten participants responded to the survey item about the amount of time full-time-instructional-faculty who advise spent advising (see Table 12). The most frequently reported percentage of time full-time-instructional-faculty who advise spent with academic advising was 0-5% (40%; n=4). Sixty percent (n=6) of participants reported full-time faculty dedicated 10% or less of their time academic advising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of time spent advising: full-time professional advisors.** Fifteen participants responded to this survey item about the amount of time full-time professional advisors spent advising (see Table 13). Participants reported that the range of time
professional advisors spent advising was 60% (n=1) to 100% (n=1). The most frequently reported percentages of time that professional advisors spent advising were 80% (20%; n=2) and 90% (20%; n=2). Seventy-three percent (n=11) of participants reported that professional advisors dedicated 71% or more of their time academic advising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% - 70%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% - 80%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% - 90%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91% – 100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actual advisor ratios for full-time professional advisors.** Fourteen participants responded to a survey item about actual student-to-full-time-equivalent-professional-advisor ratios (see Table 14). Participant responses for actual student-to-full-time professional-equivalent advisor ratios ranged from 151-200:1 (7%; n=1) to 951 or more:1 (7%; n=1). Seventy-nine percent of participants (n=11) reported that professional advisors experienced student-to-advisor ratios exceeding 300:1, and 57% (n=8) indicated professional advisors experienced student-to-advisor ratios that exceeded 400:1.

**Ideal advisor ratios for full-time professional advisors.** Sixteen participants responded to the survey item pertaining to the ideal student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios (see Table 14). Participant responses for ideal student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios ranged from 100:1 (6%; n=1) to 451-500:1 (13%; n=2) students to advisor. The most frequently reported ideal student-to-full-time-professional-
Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Actual (n=14)</th>
<th>Ideal (n=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-300</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451-500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551-600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601-650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701-750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

advisor ratio was 200:1 (31%; n=5). Seventy-five percent (n=12) of participants recommended an ideal student-to-professional advisor ratio of less than 300:1. Fifty percent (n=7) of participants reported actual student-to-full-time professional advisor ratios that exceeded the largest reported ideal student-to-full-time professional advisor ratio of 451-500:1.

**Actual advisor ratios for full-time faculty advisors.** Ten participants responded to the survey item about the actual student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios (see Table 15). Participant responses for actual student-to-full-time-faculty advisor ratios ranged from 21-30:1 (10%; n=1) to 91 or more:1 (20%; n=2). One hundred percent (n=10) of participants reported student-to-full-time-faculty advisor ratios that exceeded 20:1; and eighty percent (n=8) of participants reported student-to-full-time-faculty advisor ratios that exceeded 40:1.

**Ideal advisor ratios for full-time faculty advisors.** Thirteen participants responded to the survey item about the ideal student-to-full-time-faculty advisor ratio.
Participant responses for ideal student-to-full-time-faculty ratios ranged from 30:1 (8%; n=1) to 250:1 (8%; n=1). The most frequently reported ideal student-to-faculty-advisor ratio was 50:1 (54%; n=7). Seventy-seven percent (n=10) reported an ideal student-to-full-time-faculty advisor ratio of 50 or less:1. Seventy percent (n=7) of participants reported actual student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios that exceed the most frequently reported ideal student-to-full-time-faculty ratio which was 50:1.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student to Advisor Ratios for Full-time Faculty Advisors</th>
<th>Actual (n=10)</th>
<th>Ideal (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final section on research question one reports the findings related to the locations of academic advising at two-year public colleges.

**Academic advising locations: centralized advising centers.** Seventeen participants responded to the survey item concerning centralized advising centers (see Table 16). Ninety-four percent (n=16) of the participants reported that their institution maintained a centralized advising center on campus. One participant (6%) reported not providing a centralized advising center as a component of their academic advising program, and two participants (12%) indicated only providing a centralized advising center. Therefore, 6% (n=1) of participants reported that their institution delivered
advising through a decentralized academic advising program (there was no advising center), and 12% (n=2) of participants reported that they delivered academic advising solely through a centralized advising program (i.e., academic advising does not occur in academic departments/units or other advising units).

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Advising Locations</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Advising Center</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Advising Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only (n=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Departments/Units</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>70.59</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Advising Locations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>82.35</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic advising locations: academic departments/units.** Seventeen participants responded to the survey item about academic departments/units (see Table 16). Seventy-one percent (n=12) reported that academic advising occurred in academic departments/units, and 29% (n=5) reported not providing academic advising in academic departments/units. The researcher examined the data to confirm that the two participants who reported delivering academic advising only in a centralized advising center also reported not delivering academic advising in academic departments/units. Therefore, two institutions (12%) delivered academic advising in a completely centralized model.

**Academic advising locations: other academic advising locations.** Sixteen participants responded to the survey item about the “other” academic advising locations on campus (see Table 16). Eighty-two percent (n=14) reported providing academic
advising in academic advising locations that were not centralized advising centers or academic departments/units. Participants provided the exact location(s) of the other advising locations on their campuses. Academic advising, or some form of specialized advising, occurred in various locations on Ohio’s two-year public college campuses: Accessibility Office, Academic Services Center, allied health and health areas, branch campuses, Career Services Office, developmental education, Hope Grant Office, Project DEgree Office, Post Secondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) advising in high schools, Student Resource Center, Title III advising office, and TRIO/Student Support Services (SSS) Office. Three participants reported the delivery of academic advising in multiple “other” locations on their campuses.

Although survey participants did not report their perceptions concerning the ideal locations for academic advising, state-level leaders reported that academic advising should be delivered in a centralized advising center as well as in locations where students are highly populated. Three of the five participants directly referenced the need for campuses to have a centralized advising center. Participant C provided a specific name for a centralized advising center. “I think that each campus should have a Student Success Center of some sort, not only for advising but for outreach to the K-12 system and to the baccalaureate system . . .” (Participant C, personal communication, October 7, 2010). Participant E (personal communication, October 8, 2010) commented, “It [academic advising center] should be at the front door, when [students] come in to apply to the program; they should be able to walk right next door to talk to an advisor to see how it is going to work.” Participant E (personal communication, October 8, 2010) responded, “Obviously, I think it is important to have a centralized advising center where
students know they can come and get help . . .” Each of these participants also perceived value in providing academic advising in locations where students are heavily populated: in classrooms, online, and in academic buildings.

Organizational model. Seventeen participants responded to the survey item about the organizational model of academic advising in place at their institutions (see Table 17). Seven participants selected from one of the three available response options on the OAS. The remaining 10 participants described the organizational models at their respective institutions. The researcher analyzed participants’ written responses, responses to other OAS questions, and supporting documentation (when provided in the OAS return envelope) in order to categorize 7 of the 10 written responses into one of the three OAS categories (see Appendix H). For example, four of these seven participants wrote a response that was similar to OAS category description 1 but added qualifying words to the OAS description. Another example, two participants replaced “centralized advising center” (OAS, Description 1) with “admissions,” which was their form of a centralized advising center. One rewrote OAS category description 1 and added the word “faculty” to the description to qualify the word “advisor” in the existing description. Three new categories emerged to describe the three responses that did not fit within one of the three OAS categories: centralized model (n=2), advising only by faculty (n=1), and professional/paraprofessional model (n=1) (See Table 17). Overall, the majority of participants (82%; n=14) reported a shared organizational model in which the responsibility for academic advising was shared among two or more locations.
Table 17

**OAS Descriptions of Organizational Models for Academic Advising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description 1 (OAS): All incoming students begin their advising with advisors in a centralized advising center and then are transferred to advisors who work in academic departments after meeting certain criteria and/or prerequisites.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description 2 (OAS): Some incoming students who need to meet certain requirements and or prerequisites receive their advising in a centralized advising center. Then these students are transferred to advisors who work in academic departments. Other incoming students who have already met certain criteria and/or prerequisites prior to enrollment begin their advising in academic departments.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description 3 (description emerged): Completely centralized model: Advising was only provided in a centralized advising location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description 4 (description emerged): Faculty model: Only faculty provide academic advising at this institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description 5 (description emerged): Professional/paraprofessional model: This institution has a centrally coordinated model of only professional and paraprofessional academic advisors who advise in a centralized advising center, in academic departments/units, and in other advising units. However, there was no reference to when a student might use the various locations. Therefore, the organizational model descriptions provided on the OAS does not apply.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2: How has budget impacted academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

Specific influences budgets had on academic advising. Participants responded to a survey item about the influences budgets in general had on academic advising (see Table 18). The survey item allowed for multiple responses. Although the data did not show a common pattern in responses, the most frequently reported responses were “staffing increased” (19%; n=4) and “grant dollars increased” (19%; n=4).

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Influences Budgets had on Academic Advising (n=17)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing increased</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing decreased</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional advising budget increased</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant dollars for advising increased</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional advising budget decreased</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant dollars for advising decreased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising coordination was centralized under one coordinator</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising coordination became more decentralized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising services were centralized into one location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising services were decentralized to more than one location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State level leaders also provided their perceptions concerning the ways in which budget might influence academic advising in two-year public colleges. Four of the five participants focused on how academic advising had become less effective due to budget cuts. However, two of these four noted that two-year college administrators may consider protecting academic advising services as funding conversations in Ohio begin to shift from enrollment to student success. These two participants commented that academic advising was a key strategy toward degree completion efforts. Interview participant responses included “We are seeing more students come into our offices requesting
assistance, and yet the budget has been shrunk and we are having to do more with less” (Participant E, personal communication, October 8, 2010). Another respondent indicated “It [budget] has lessened its effectiveness.” “The [fewer] dollars on campus, the less there will be for advising” (Participant D, personal communication, October 7, 2010). Findings in this study revealed that four of five state-level leaders who commented on budget perceived that budget was impacting academic advising in a negative way. Two of the four interview participants expressed hope in their comments that administrators might protect academic advising budget as a result of the state’s move toward funding based on student success.

**Changes in institutional and grant budgets.** Participants responded to survey items pertaining to whether institutional budgets and grant budgets had changed or remained the same over the last year (see Table 19). Seventeen participants responded to the survey item on institutional budgets, and 15 participants responded to the survey item pertaining to grant budgets. Seventy-one percent (n=12) of participants indicated that they had experienced “no change” in institutional budgets. Fifty-three percent (n=8) of participants reported that grant budgets were “not applicable” to their advising programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Institutional budgets (n=17)</th>
<th>Grant budgets (n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Decrease</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Decrease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Increase</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

*Changes in Institutional and Grant Budgets*
Although participants reported both increases and decreases in institutional budgets, there were no indications that grant budgets had decreased. Overall, institutional budgets for academic advising had remained stable over the last year, and grant budgets had not supplemented overall academic advising budgets. In light of this finding, state-level leader perceptions that budget in general might impact academic advising negatively were not confirmed by the results revealed by academic advising administrators.

Research Question 3: What levels of impact have institutional budgets and grant budgets had on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

Influences institutional and grant budgets had on decisions about who should advise and where advising should take place. Participants responded to survey items about the levels of impact institutional budgets and grant budgets had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place (see Table 20). Seventeen participants responded to the survey item in relation to institutional budget, and 15 participants responded to the survey item in relation to grant

Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Impact on Who Should Advise</th>
<th>Impact on Where Advising Should Take Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Budget (n=17)</td>
<td>Grant Budget (n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Impact</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
budget. Seventy-one percent (n=12) of participants reported that institutional budgets had influenced decisions about who should deliver academic advising, and fifty-three percent (n=9) of participants indicated that institutional budgets had influenced decisions about where academic advising should take place. Fifty-three percent (n=8) of participants reported that grant budgets for academic advising had influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising. However, more than half of the participants (53%; n=8) reported that grant budgets had not impacted decisions about where academic advising should take place. Overall, institutional budgets had impacted decisions about who should advise and where academic advising should take place; however, grant budgets only had influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising.

**Research Question 4: How have institutional policies and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer policy impacted academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?**

**Influences institutional policies and OA&T Policy had on the organization of academic advising.** Survey participants reported the “board approved institutional policies” they perceived to have impacted the organization of academic advising at their institutions (See Appendix I). Eleven participants responded to this open-ended survey item on the influences of institutional policies on the organization of academic advising. Eight of the 11 responses included an actual policy they perceived to have impacted the organization of academic advising at their institutions. The researcher organized these eight responses into three categories of policy that impacted academic advising: (a) faculty contracts (n=4), (b) policy related to who advises (n=2), and (c) policy related to student standing and quarters/semesters (n=1). The category of policy related to who
advises included two subcategories (n=1): student standing in terms of who advises these students and location of specific advising functions.

Ten participants responded to the survey item about the influence of institutional policy on certain components of the organization of academic advising, and 11 participants responded to the survey item on the influence of OA&T Policy on certain components of the organization of academic advising (see Table 21). To the survey item pertaining to institutional policy, participants most frequently reported the following responses: “staffing increased” (27%; n=3) and “academic coordination was centralized under one coordinator” (27%; n=3). To the survey item about OA&T Policy, participants most frequently reported the following responses: “staffing increased,” (21%; n=3) “grant dollars increased,” (21%; n=3) and “academic coordination was centralized under one coordinator” (21%; n=3). Common influences of institutional policy and OA&T Policy on academic advising were staffing increases and the centralization of academic advising.

Table 21

Specific Influences of Policy on Academic Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Institutional Policy (n=10)</th>
<th>Ohio Articulation &amp; Transfer Policy (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staffing increased</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing decreased</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional advising budget increased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant dollars for advising increased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional advising budget decreased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant dollars for advising decreased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising coordination was centralized under one coordinator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising coordination became more decentralized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising services were centralized into one location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising services were decentralized to more than one location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
coordination. Overall, a dominant pattern among participant responses did not emerge to suggest that institutional policy or OA&T Policy had influenced specific components of the organization of academic advising.

**Research Question 5: What levels of impact have institutional policies and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer policy had on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?**

Influences institutional policies and OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and decisions about where academic advising should take place. Fifteen participants reported levels of influence institutional policies had on decisions about who should advise, and 15 participants indicated levels of influence institutional policies had about where academic advising should take place (see Table 22). Sixty percent (n=9) of participants reported institutional policies had influenced decisions about who should advise, and 53% (n=8) reported that institutional policies had influenced decisions about advising locations.

Participants responded to survey items related to the levels of influence OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place (see Table 22). Without including those who selected “not sure,” forty-seven percent (n=8) of participants indicated that TAGS had influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising. Forty percent (n=6) of participants indicated that CTAGS had influenced decisions about who should advise, and 40% (n=6) of participants reported that CTAGS had not influenced decisions about who should deliver academic advising. More than half of participants reported that each
Table 22

Influences Institutional Policies (college policy) and Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy had on Who Should Advise and Where Advising Should Take Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>College (n=15)</th>
<th>AP (n=16)</th>
<th>TAG (n=17)</th>
<th>CTAG (n=15)</th>
<th>College (n=15)</th>
<th>AP (n=17)</th>
<th>TAG (n=17)</th>
<th>CTAG (n=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>2 13</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>2 13</td>
<td>3 20</td>
<td>3 18</td>
<td>2 12</td>
<td>3 18</td>
<td>3 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>3 20</td>
<td>2 13</td>
<td>2 12</td>
<td>3 20</td>
<td>3 18</td>
<td>3 18</td>
<td>3 18</td>
<td>3 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>4 27</td>
<td>5 31</td>
<td>5 29</td>
<td>4 27</td>
<td>5 33</td>
<td>3 13</td>
<td>2 12</td>
<td>4 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>6 40</td>
<td>8 50</td>
<td>7 41</td>
<td>6 40</td>
<td>7 47</td>
<td>11 65</td>
<td>10 59</td>
<td>9 56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than the influence of TAGS on decisions about who should deliver academic advising, OA&T Policy neither had influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising nor had influenced decisions about where academic advising should take place in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. Overall, internal college policies had more influence on decisions related to academic advising than external state policies had on decisions related to academic advising.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study indicated that Ohio two-year public college leaders had organized academic advising in the following ways: (a) mid-level administrators, who spent less than half their time in the coordination of academic advising, were responsible for academic advising efforts; (b) professional academic advisors provided advising primarily in centralized advising centers while faculty advisors provided advising...
primarily in academic departments/units; (c) the actual advising caseloads for these advisor types exceeded their supervisors’ preferences for advising caseloads; (d) while academic advising was structurally aligned within the student services area of the college, two-year public colleges primarily provided advising through a shared organizational model in which advising was offered in multiple locations; and (e) internal forces of budgets and policies had more influence on certain components of the infrastructure of academic advising than the external forces of state policy and grant budgets had on the infrastructure.

In addition, there were two key finding regarding budgets and policies. First, the findings revealed that state-level leaders perceived that budget and OA&T Policy would have influenced the organization of academic advising. In terms of budget, the findings indicated that state-level leaders anticipated that budget would be cut and impact the effectiveness of academic advising. Although this study did not explore the effectiveness of academic advising, this study revealed that budget remained stable during the past year for the participating institutions. In terms of OA&T Policy, the findings revealed that only one component of the policy (TAGS) had influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising. Budgets and state policies had not influenced the organization of academic advising in the ways in which the state-leaders anticipated. Internal college policies and internal budgets had more influence on decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place than external state policies and external grant budgets had on decisions about who should advise and where academic advising should take place. These findings will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter five.
Summary

Chapter four included a presentation of the interview findings and survey findings. Chapter five will provide the discussion, recommendations, and implications. Findings will be discussed in the context of the *Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising* conceptual model that guided this study, ACT’s 2003 Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising findings, and scholarly perspectives regarding the ideal organizational models, delivery systems, and student-to-advisor ratios for two-year public colleges in Ohio.
Chapter Five

Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges; (b) to explore the influences that budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy had on academic advising; and (c) to examine the levels of influence institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies and the OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place. The researcher designed this study to explore the organization of academic advising through the lens of a conceptual model entitled the Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising. This model integrated concepts from Weber’s (1947) bureaucratic organizational theory and Gordon’s (1992) “Building Blocks for Academic Advising” model.

Section I – Discussion about the Organization of Academic Advising and the Conceptual Model

Leadership (responsibility) for academic advising. The data regarding the leadership of academic advising in both the ACT 2003 study (Habley, 2004b) and the OAS study were similar in several areas: the titles of academic advising administrators, the titles of their supervisors, the reporting structures, and the quantity of time advising administrators had dedicated to advising. In both studies, the most frequently reported title for academic advising administrators was director. However, the types of director titles were not an exact match between ACT and OAS data. ACT data revealed the director title was “director/coordinator of academic advising” and OAS data revealed the
director titles included various other descriptors. Less than half of the OAS director titles included the word “advising.” Unlike advising administrator supervisor titles that clearly demonstrated their responsibility for student services and their reporting line within student services, advising administrator titles in Ohio had not clearly indicated responsibility for academic advising.

Another similarity between ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b) and OAS data was in terms of the quantity of time academic advising administrators dedicated to advising, which was less than half their time. The quantity of time advising administrators dedicated to advising suggests that advising administrators have taken on more responsibilities in addition to their roles with advising. These additional responsibilities may account for the diversity of advising administrator titles in Ohio.

**Delivery systems for academic advising.** Delivery systems represent the personnel who provide academic advising.

*Primary academic advisors and additional (secondary) academic advisors in centralized advising centers and academic departments/units.* Both the OAS data and the ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b) revealed similar staffing patterns for primary academic advisors who worked in centralized advising centers and for primary academic advisors who worked in academic departments/units. That is, professional advisors were the primary advisors in centralized advising centers and faculty advisors were the primary advisors in academic departments/units.

OAS data and ACT data (Habley, 2004b) did not reveal similar staffing patterns for those who served as secondary advisors in centralized advising centers and for those who served as secondary advisors in academic departments/units. For example, OAS data
indicated that professionals were secondary advisors for centralized advising centers while ACT data indicated that several advisor types were the secondary advisors in centralized advising centers. Also, OAS data indicated that faculty advisors were secondary advisors in academic departments/units while ACT data revealed that various advisor types were secondary advisors in academic departments/units.

Although these staffing patterns in Ohio were consistent with state-level leader recommendations pertaining to the ideal delivery systems for two-year public colleges, Ohio was not aligned with scholarly recommendations for delivery systems included in an ideal model. Rather, scholars recommended employing a diversity of delivery systems in the ideal model for advising, including counselors, paraprofessionals, and peers (King, 1993, 1996; King & Kerr, 2005; O’Banion, 2009).

**Staffing pattern changes of various delivery systems.** Studies on the organization and delivery of academic advising have not explored changes in academic advising staffing patterns. As a result, OAS findings have provided baseline data in this area. Of all advising delivery systems, participants in this study most frequently reported that part-time professional advisors increased and most frequently reported that full-time professional advisors had not changed. Ohio data also revealed that two-year public college leaders had not incorporated several delivery systems that advising scholars recommended for inclusion in the ideal model for advising, such as licensed professional counselors, paraprofessional advisors and peer advisors (Crockett, 1982; King, 1993, 1996; King & Kerr, 2005; O’Banion, 2009).

Ohio’s advising programs have committed to certain delivery systems more than other delivery systems. The increase in part-time professional advisors and the stability of
full-time professional advisors suggests that Ohio two-year public colleges valued the expertise of professional advisors. On the other hand, Ohio two-year public colleges had not maximized the talents of other advisor types: full-time licensed professional counselors, part-time licensed professional counselors, paraprofessional advisors, and peer advisors. The lack of diverse types of advising providers in Ohio’s two-year public colleges indicates that advising administrators might not understand the value these other advising providers might bring to the advising program in terms of increasing student success (King & Kerr, 2005).

**Time advisors dedicated to academic advising.** OAS participants reported the quantity of time advisors had dedicated to delivering academic advising for full-time-instructional-faculty who advise and for full-time-professional advisors. According to OAS findings, the majority of full-time-instructional-faculty who advise had dedicated less than 10% of their time to academic advising. According to ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b), full-time faculty spent on average 9.8% of their time. OAS requested participants to report faculty advising time in ranges, and ACT requested participants to indicate advising time by reporting exact percentages of time. Consequently, direct comparisons between OAS data and ACT data on time spent advising should be made with caution.

According to both OAS data and ACT data, full-time faculty members had dedicated less than a quarter of their time with activities related to academic advising. Ten percent of a faculty member’s time might seem to be minimal, but in the context of a faculty member’s responsibilities for advising and teaching, 10% equates to 10 hours per week. Faculty who had advised 10 hours per week may have been able to advise seven to 10 students in one-hour appointments per student. Therefore, in order to determine
whether 10% of a faculty member’s time is adequate for advising, student-to-faculty advisor ratios must be taken into account.

ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b) had not explored the amount of time full-time professional academic advisors had dedicated to academic advising. OAS participants reported that full-time professional advisors had dedicated at least 60% of their time delivering academic advising. On average, full-time professional advisors in this Ohio study had dedicated 82% of their time to academic advising. Crockett (1982), King (1993, 1996), and King and Kerr (2005) asserted that full-time professional advisors be included in the ideal delivery model for academic advising. Scholarly recommendations did not translate full-time employment in terms of percentages of time. Interpretation of these recommendations would lead most readers to agree that these scholars expected that full-time professional advisors would dedicate all of their time to the function of academic advising. Following this interpretation suggests that Ohio had not met the scholarly recommendation that full-time professional advisors be included in every academic advising program.

Advising administrators reported that on average full-time professional advisors had dedicated 82% of their time providing advising. Advising administrators may not have considered activities related to advising when responding to this survey item. For example, academic advising appointments often require preparation, documentation, and follow-up communications. A typical, scheduled advising appointment might include the following: review of a student’s electronic or paper file prior to the meeting and documentation, either electronically or on paper, after the advising appointment. In addition, advisors frequently attend meetings with academic departments and other
student services offices in order to maintain current knowledge of curriculum and awareness of the institution’s academic policies, practices, and procedures. Therefore, advisors may be dedicating more than 82% of their time to advising when taking into account the time needed to prepare for advising appointments, to accurately document student interactions, and to engage in meetings related to advising matters.

**Student-to-advisor ratios.** Habley (2004a) was the only advising scholar to provide a numeric recommendation for ideal student-to-advisor ratios. Along with his recommendation for ideal student-to-advisor ratios, he provided suggestions to consider while developing advisor caseloads. Habley asserted that the content of advising, the preparedness and developmental needs of the students being advised, and the use of technology should be considered when developing student-to-advisor ratios. For example, very prescriptive types of curriculum having few electives may allow for larger student-to-advisor ratios. Underprepared or undecided students should be advised by an advisor with a low student-to-advisor ratio. Institutions that have implemented user-friendly technology for advising may be able to support larger student-to-advisor ratios, pending that students have appropriate guidance and support while using the advising technology.

Habley recommended that student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios not exceed 20:1. Each OAS participant reported an actual student-to-full-time-instructional-faculty-member-who advises ratio that exceeded Habley’s recommendation (e.g, from 21-30:1 to 91 or more:1). The most frequently reported ideal student-to-full-time-instructional-faculty-member who advises ratio was 50:1. Both actual student-to-full-time-
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[690x682]recommendation. According to ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b) the national average for student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios in two-year public colleges was on average 37.3:1, which also exceeded Habley’s recommendation (Habley, 2004a). Generally, Ohio participants reported actual student-to-full-time-faculty-member-who-advises ratios and ideal student-to-full-time-faculty-member-who-advises ratios that exceeded both the national average and Habley’s ideal recommendation. For example, 80% of OAS participants reported actual student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios that had exceeded the national average. Ninety-two percent of OAS participants reported ideal student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios that had exceeded the national average.

Participant responses related to student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios suggest that academic advising leaders might not be aware of the national average for student-to-full-time-faculty advisor ratios or the scholarly recommendation for ideal student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios for two reasons: (a) all OAS participants reported actual student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios that had exceeded both the national average and the scholarly recommendation and (b) over half of the OAS participants reported actual student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios of 50:1, which had exceeded the national average by 13 students and had exceeded the ideal recommendation by 30 students.

The Ohio Board of Regents (2009b) generated a report on the percentage of student credit hours taught by full-time faculty teaching in community colleges for five fall semesters, fall 2005 through fall 2009. The percentage of credit hours taught by full-time faculty in community colleges has been decreasing while the percentage of credit
hours taught by part-time faculty has been increasing. In fall 2009, full-time faculty members taught 45% of the student credit hours while part-time faculty taught 55% of student credit hours in community colleges. In fall 2009, 37% of student credit hours taken by first-time students were taught by full-time faculty, and 63% of student credit hours taken by first time students were taught by part-time faculty in two-year public colleges. Although this data had not included the exact number of full-time faculty teaching in two-year public colleges, the data revealed that two-year public colleges may not have adequate numbers of full-time teaching faculty to offer student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios within Habley’s ideal recommendation.

In terms of student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios, almost 80% of OAS participants reported an actual student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratio that exceeded 300:1. Habley (2004a) recommended that student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios not exceed 300:1. The majority of OAS participants reported an ideal student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratio of less than 300:1, which was lower than Habley’s recommendation.

According to ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b), the national average for student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios was on average 375.4:1, which exceeded Habley’s (2004a) recommendation. Over half of OAS participants reported actual student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios that exceeded the national average. Less than one-quarter of OAS participants reported an ideal student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratio that exceeded the national average. Generally, participant responses related to ideal student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios suggests that (a) academic advising leaders had valued or were familiar with the importance of low student-to-full-
time-professional-advisor ratios or (b) academic advising administrators were familiar with the recommendation for ideal student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios.

**Locations of academic advising.** Both ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b) and OAS data revealed that academic advising had been provided in centralized advising centers and in academic departments/units. Compared to 82% of participants in the ACT study, more than 90% of OAS participants reported that they had incorporated a centralized advising center as a feature of their academic advising program. State-level leaders in Ohio had recommended that a centralized advising center was an ideal location for academic advising. Unlike other studies on the organization of academic advising that focused on advising centers and academic departments/units only, the results of this Ohio study indicated that the majority of two-year public colleges had provided advising in locations in addition to centralized advising centers and academic departments/units. Whether intentional or not, Ohio’s advising practices aligned with the ideal model for delivering academic advising in terms of locations (Crockett, 1982; King, 1993, 1996; King & Kerr, 2005).

**Section II - Discussion about the Influences of Budgets and Policies on Academic Advising**

Other research studies on the organization of academic advising had not explored the influences of budgets or policies on academic advising. This Ohio study provided information about the influences of budgets and policies on academic advising.

**Influences of budgets on academic advising.** Internal organizational budgets more than external grant budgets influenced decisions regarding academic advising. State-level leaders in Ohio anticipated that budget cuts would negatively influence
academic advising; however, academic advising administrators did not confirm this perspective and reported that advising budgets and staffing patterns had remained stable during the last year. The condition of academic advising budgets in Ohio’s two-year public colleges suggests that Ohio’s two-year public college leaders valued and placed a priority on academic advising. These leaders allocated budgets to human resources for advising in terms of leadership and delivery and maintained advising budgets. Although enrollments grew in the past year and budgets had not increased to account for increased enrollments, advising programs had avoided budget cuts while higher education institutions in general had experienced budget reductions from the State.

Unlike internal organizational budgets that influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising and where academic advising should take place, external grant budgets influenced only decisions about who should provide advising. Even though grant budgets influenced decisions about who should advise, grants were not a factor in the overall advising budgets. A general understanding of the expectations for the typical structure of grant-funded advising programs provides an explanation related to the influence of grants on who should advise. Often grant-funded, student success programs like the Department of Education’s (DOE) TRIO Student Support Services (SSS) program place more expectations on the hiring of certain professionals than place expectations on the locations where the program is housed. For example, SSS programs require the employment of professionals who have understanding of and technical expertise related to working with underserved students. The DOE grant applications for SSS require applicants to provide information about where the program will be aligned
within the college’s organization structure; however, DOE does not require SSS programs to be housed in a specific location.

**Influences of policies on academic advising.** Internal organizational policies more than external state policies influenced decisions related to academic advising. The most prominent institutional policy reported by participants was the faculty contract. Although some advising leaders may not recognize the faculty contact as a board-approved policy, Ohio academic advising administrators identified faculty contracts as a policy that in general had influenced the organization of academic advising. Taking into consideration the purposes of the faculty contract provides one possible explanation regarding the influences of institutional policies on decisions about academic advising. For example, faculty contracts often outline the specific details concerning responsibilities for academic advising and outline expectations about where these advisors would conduct their academic advising sessions. Therefore, advising administrators who had the faculty contract in mind while responding to the survey items about the influences of institutional policies might have considered the faculty contract as a policy impacting decisions about staffing and about locations.

State-level leaders identified OA&T Policy as the key policy influencing academic advising; however, according to academic advising administrators OA&T Policy had minimal to no influence on decisions regarding academic advising. The only component of OA&T Policy found to have influenced any decision related to academic advising was Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGS). Participants reported that TAGS had influenced decisions about who should deliver academic advising. However, OAS participants had not indicated the delivery system they perceived should provide
academic advising related to TAGS or the delivery system that had been providing academic advising related to TAGS. Taking into account the perspectives of academic advising administrators about the perceived knowledge faculty might have about TAGS provides a possible interpretation pertaining to the influence of TAGS on decisions about who should provide academic advising. Faculty members have guided the development, review, and approval of TAGS courses. Academic advising administrators have not been involved in the TAG development process but have been responsible for educating academic advisors about the OA&T Policy. Therefore, faculty may be providing advising related to TAGS as a result of academic advising administrator observations that faculty were the most familiar with how TAGS were developed and approved.

Conclusions About the Organization of Academic Advising

Leadership (responsibility) and the conceptual model. The foundational block of the Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising conceptual model was leadership. Dedicated leadership is a required component in the infrastructure for academic advising and to the success of academic advising. Ohio’s two-year public college leaders demonstrated their commitment to academic advising by investing the funds necessary to employ a mid-level administrator to lead academic advising efforts. OAS data more frequently than ACT 2003 data (Habley, 2004b) indicated that academic advising programs employed a dedicated administrator/ coordinator.

There are two areas of concern regarding the leadership of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges: (a) the majority of Ohio’s two-year public college academic advising administrators had dedicated less than half their time to academic advising and (b) only one-third of advising administrator titles had included the word
“advising.” Although advising administrators had faced stable budgets and stable staffing patterns, they also faced increasing student enrollments. Advising administrators may need to be relieved of non-advising related responsibilities. This will allow them time to focus on developing the infrastructure for academic advising needed to respond to increasing student enrollments. In terms of advising titles, the title of an individual is of lesser importance than the amount of time an advising administrator spends coordinating academic advising. However, two-year public colleges have an opportunity to strengthen the bureaucratic structure of academic advising, to create a better awareness of academic advising, and to validate the legitimacy of academic advising by creating titles that more accurately reflect the duties, activities, and responsibilities of academic advising administrators.

**Delivery systems and the conceptual model.** Ohio two-year public college leaders have recognized academic advising as a priority on campuses by investing funds into the human resources necessary to deliver academic advising. Professional advisors, the most costly delivery system, were the primary academic advisors in the most common advising locations, centralized advising centers. State-level leaders in Ohio, academic advising administrators, and advising scholars recommended that the ideal model for academic advising should include full-time professional advisors along with other less expensive delivery systems (e.g., peers and paraprofessionals) (Crockett, 1982; King 1993, 1996; King & Kerr, 2005). The condition of staffing patterns in Ohio’s two-year public colleges suggests that the State of Ohio has opportunities to maximize fiscal resources, the talents of students, and the retention benefits of incorporating students as peer advisors. Peer advisors are the least expensive delivery system (Self, 2008), and
researchers have found that peer-to-peer relationships positively influenced retention (Astin, 1993).

Incorporating professional advisors into academic departments and introducing faculty advisors into centralized advising centers will strengthen the infrastructure of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. Information sharing will increase when advisors work in a common location. This transfer of knowledge will benefit students and will serve as a form of professional development for each advisor type.

**Time advisors dedicated to advising, student-to-advisor ratios, and the conceptual model.** Ohio was not aligned with scholarly recommendations for an ideal advising model in terms of the following: the amount of time professional advisors dedicated to advising and student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios. Staffing recommendations for the ideal advising model included full-time professional advisors (King 1993; 1996; King & Kerr, 2005). On average, full-time professional advisors spent 82% of their time advising. Although King and Kerr did not qualify full-time in terms of a percentage, likely their expectation was that full-time professionals dedicate 100% of their time to advising. Professional advisors in this Ohio study had not dedicated 100% of their time to advising and had experienced student-to-full-time-professional advisor ratios that exceeded both the national average (Habley, 2004b) and the ideal average (Habley, 2004a).

The desired amount of time faculty advisors should advise and student-to-full-time faculty-advisor ratios were not discussed in the literature on ideal models for academic advising. However, actual student-to-full-time-faculty-who-advises ratios and ideal student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios exceeded Habley’s recommendation for
ideal ratios (Habley, 2004a) and the national average (Habley, 2004b). In terms of faculty advisors, responsibilities for teaching and for other tasks must be considered while assigning advising caseloads. For example, as teaching assignments increase student-to-faculty-advisor ratios should decrease in order to allow faculty time to manage their advising caseloads. Overall, academic advising administrator responses about student-to-advisor ratios indicated more familiarity with ideal student-to-advisor ratios for full-time professional advisors than with ideal student-to-advisor ratios for full-time faculty.

**Locations and the conceptual model.** The conceptual model guiding this study included that academic advising programs should incorporate dedicated locations for the delivery of academic advising as a component of the academic advising infrastructure. Two-year public college leaders have identified academic advising as a priority by providing physical space for academic advising. The majority of the two-year public colleges in this study incorporated a centralized advising center, academic departments/units, and in some cases, additional advising locations. Decisions to incorporate centralized advising centers and academic departments/units into the advising models in Ohio’s two-year public colleges aligned Ohio with the scholarly recommendations for the ideal advising model for two-year colleges (Crockett, 1982; King 1993, 1996; King & Kerr, 2005).

**Conclusions About the Influences of Budgets and Policies on Academic Advising**

**Influences of budgets on academic advising.** Two-year public college leaders have recognized academic advising as an institutional priority by allocating budgets for academic advising. By funding mid-level administrators and professional advisors, these leaders have made a financial investment in terms of human resources that provides
leadership and allows delivery of academic advising. State-level leaders, academic
advising administrators, and advising scholars have recommended professional advisors
as an ideal delivery system for two-year public colleges. Therefore, two-year public
college leaders, most likely with intention, have employed the most costly delivery
system (professional advisors) and the type of delivery system recommended in ideal
models for academic advising (O’Banion, 1972; Crockett, 1982; King 1993, 1996; King
& Kerr, 2005). These leaders have maintained advising budgets during times of budget
uncertainty in spite of institutional budget cuts. Although two-year public college leaders
have maintained institutional budgets for advising, these leaders may also want to
consider grant-funded advising programs in order to supplement institutional advising
budgets.

Influences of policies on academic advising. Internal organizational policies
more than external state policies influenced decisions regarding who should deliver
academic advising and where academic advising should take place. This suggests that
academic advising administrators may have more opportunity to influence the
infrastructure of academic advising by developing institutional policy than by developing
external, state policies. Although the OA&T Policy had not influenced decisions about
academic advising in terms of the variables examined in this study, the OA&T Policy
may have influenced other variables related to the organization of academic advising that
were not explored in this study.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future research. Several recommendations for future
research are based on the results of this study. This Ohio study described the organization
of academic advising in terms of leadership, delivery systems, time dedicated to advising, student-to-advisor ratios, and advising locations. This study also examined the influences of budgets and policies on academic advising. Ohio’s two-year public college administrators will benefit from additional research that provides a more comprehensive description of the ways in which academic advising is organized and examines the influences of budgets and policies on academic advising. Future research should be conducted using a variety of methodologies in order to explore components of the organization of academic advising that were not covered in this study and to increase the research base on academic advising.

*Longitudinal design.* Future studies on the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges should include a longitudinal design using an instrument similar to the OAS. A longitudinal design will allow future researchers the opportunity to explore two important trends: (a) the trends in the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges and (b) the trends related to the influences budgets and policies have on components of the organization of academic advising. New Ohio public policies and new campus polices created to influence academic advising should be included into these future studies. A longitudinal study using the OAS, or similar instrument, will provide an opportunity to make comparisons across time about the ways in which academic advising is organized among two-year public colleges in the state. In addition, data generated from a longitudinal study will provide academic advising administrators and scholars with information related to the ways in which academic advising budgets operate and exert influence in the context of budget fluctuations.
Qualitative approach. Researchers should also consider conducting a qualitative study on the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges, which would serve as the first qualitative study on the organization of academic advising. This recommended study may perhaps be guided by the Fundamentals of Organizing Academic Advising conceptual model. In this Ohio exploratory mixed-methods study on the organization of academic advising, academic advising administrators responded to specific survey items regarding the influences grant budgets, institutional budgets, institutional policies, and the OA&T Policy had on certain components of the infrastructure of academic advising. However, this study did not provide academic advising administrators with the opportunity to use their words to describe their perceptions about the influences budgets and policies had on other areas associated with the conceptual model guiding this study. Therefore, academic advising administrators in two-year public colleges should be interviewed to document their perceptions regarding the influences of budgets and policies on decisions about (a) who should provide leadership for academic advising programs, (b) the amount of time leaders dedicate to the coordination of academic advising, (c) who should deliver academic advising, (d) student-to-advisor ratios, (e) where academic advising takes place, and (f) certificate completion, degree completion, and transfer. Also, these administrators should respond to interview questions about their perceptions on (a) the ideal location(s) for the delivery of academic advising and (b) the ideal organizational model for academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. The findings of this recommended study will provide academic advising administrators and practitioners with additional research related to the influences budgets and policies have on academic advising, ideal delivery systems for academic
advising, ideal locations for academic advising, and ideal student-to-advisor ratios for academic advising.

**Research about faculty involvement in academic advising.** Research should explore the perceptions that faculty and advising administrators hold regarding faculty involvement in the delivery of academic advising for two reasons. First, according to the findings of this study faculty had dedicated less than 10% of their time with academic advising and had experienced student-to-advisor ratios that had exceeded the national average (Habley, 2004b) and had exceeded the ideal recommendation (Habley, 2004a). The amount of time faculty dedicated to advising combined with their student-to-advisor ratios suggests that they had not been provided with adequate time to manage their caseloads. Taking into account the OBR (2009b) data on the percentage of scheduled credit hours taught by full-time faculty along with student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios and time dedicated to advising suggests that two-year public colleges may not have adequate numbers of full-time faculty numbers to allow for faculty advising.

Secondly, advising administrators might perceive that faculty should be involved in the delivery of transfer advising because faculty members, in general, have been involved in the development, review, and approval of TAGS courses. TAGS are a component of the OA&T Policy, which has been a key state policy influencing transfer students. However, all faculty members may not have been involved in these state-wide transfer committees therefore relying on faculty advisors in general to provide transfer advising may not be viable. Consequently, research should be designed to explore faculty perceptions and advising administrator perceptions about how faculty should be involved in transfer advising and in advising in general.
**State-level research on academic advising.** OBR should conduct a state-wide study of academic advising in two-year public colleges to examine the relationships between the variables that make up the infrastructure of academic advising and student progress, transfer, and completion. The variables incorporated into the infrastructure of academic advising might include the following: leadership of advising, delivery systems, technology related to advising, student-to-advisor ratios, time dedicated to leading and providing academic advising, availability of full-time faculty advisors, advising budgets, and policies related to academic advising. The State of Ohio has invested in the OA&T Policy and has developed the student success points’ component of funding in order to influence student progress and completion. Academic advising has been incorporated into OA&T Policy as a strategy to assist students with successful transfer. Also, technology has been a key feature in the implementation of the OA&T Policy and in the administration of academic advising programs. Further, social networking has been a key communication strategy for all age groups and usage has increased among these populations (Madden, 2010; Smith, Rainie, & Zichuhr, 2011). This research should include multiple regression analysis in order to identify the variables associated with academic advising that correlate with student progress and completion. The findings of this type of study will advance advising as a strategy for assisting students and the State of Ohio in meeting their goals of transfer and degree completion.

**Recommendations for practice.** The findings of this study led to six recommendations for practice. First, academic advising administrators should create opportunities for instructional faculty to provide academic advising in centralized advising centers and for full-time professional advisors to provide academic advising in
academic departments/units. According to this Ohio study, professional advisors worked in centralized locations and faculty advisors worked solely in their academic departments/units. Integrating faculty with professional advisors into centralized advising centers will benefit transfer students as well as benefit professional advisors in terms of professional development pertaining to curriculum. These proposed benefits will increase as academic advising administrators are able to identify and employ faculty members on campus who are heavily involved in the TAGS and CTAGS processes. In addition, the OA&T Policy has provided a bureaucratic transfer structure which ensures students “guaranteed transfer.” Incorporating faculty knowledge of the transfer structure and faculty expertise with curriculum into the overall infrastructure for academic advising will strengthen academic advising programs at two-year public colleges in Ohio.

Secondly, academic advising administrators should consider incorporating peers and paraprofessionals as academic advisors in order to maximize the budget by using low-cost talent and to increase student retention by creating meaningful peer-to-peer relationships. In the results of this study, several types of academic advisors were not represented in the advising staffing patterns in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. Although academic advising administrators reported minimal change in their institutional budgets or grant budgets allocated for academic advising, administrators must strategically monitor their advising budgets and increasing enrollments. Two types of academic advisors in particular, peer advisors and paraprofessional advisors, were rarely employed in the advising programs examined. These types of academic advisors typically represent the least expensive advising delivery systems and have received positive student evaluations (Self, 2008). Also, these types of academic advisors have been recommended
for inclusion into the “ideal” advising delivery models for two-year colleges (O’Banion, 1972; King, 1993, 1996; King & Kerr, 2005). Advising administrator have the opportunity to employ peer advisors and paraprofessional advisors as a strategy to reduce high student-to-advisor ratios, which exceeded national averages (Habley, 2004b) and Habley’s (2004a) scholarly recommendations.

Third, academic advising administrators should explore grant funding in order to supplement advising programs. The majority of academic advising administrators participating in this study reported that grant funding was non-existent in their programs as well as reported that peer advisors and paraprofessional advisor were not utilized. Advising administrators might consider writing grant proposals for the purposes of studying and employing peer advisors and paraprofessional advisors in advising programs at two-year public colleges. Completing a focused-grant application may be supported with the following rationale (a) peer advisors and paraprofessional advisors were not delivering academic advising at the colleges examined, and most grant-funding agencies require an institution to propose a new initiative in order to secure funding; (b) grant budgets were almost non-existent in current advising programs; and (c) the literature reported in Chapter Two provided a scholarly description of the ideal model for academic advising, which recommended the use of peers and paraprofessionals as academic advisors.

More specifically, academic advising administrators should explore TRIO Student Support Services (SSS) grants that are federally funded through the Department of Education (DOE). DOE initiated these grant-funded academic advising programs for students who are (a) from low-income families, (b) first-generation students, and (c) with
some type of academic need, including a learning disability (Tinto, 2004). Less than five Ohio two-year public colleges in this study had received grant funding for SSS or grant funding for other student success programs. Therefore, academic advising leaders should strategically explore Vincent Tinto’s recommendation, which was specifically addressed to two-year public college leaders. Two-year public college leaders should apply for SSS grants in order to supplement advising budgets and to deliver a grant-funded strategy designed to improve student success.

In terms of the infrastructure of academic advising, the DOE will provide a specific structure for the delivery of SSS academic advising. This structure includes designated, well-trained leadership and designated, well-trained academic advisors. SSS programs maintain manageable advising caseloads that ensure students have access to their academic advisor and are often strategically located among other services designated for underserved students. The overall bureaucratic structure and professional development opportunities provided through an SSS program will strengthen the college’s current infrastructure for academic advising.

Fourth, Ohio must reevaluate the high student-to-advisor ratios for both professional advisors and faculty advisors. The majority of student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios reported had exceeded national averages (Habley, 2004b) and had exceeded scholarly recommendations (Habley, 2004a), and all of the student-to-full-time-instructional-faculty-member-who-advises ratios had exceeded national averages and had exceeded scholarly recommendations. Therefore, academic advising leaders must prioritize advising workload for faculty.
Fifth, the OBR should consider creating an incentive grant program to provide professional development on OA&T Policy and the technology supporting OA&T Policy for two-year public college employees who work with transfer. Stable budgets for advising combined with increased student enrollments requires advising administrators to carefully administer budgets. These budget situations often lead advising administrators to limit or cut professional development opportunities. Incentive grants for professional development on OA&T Policy and the technology that supports transfer advising will provide advising professionals with the education they need to assist students in the achievement of their certificate and degree completion goals, which also supports the State of Ohio’s goals for increased degree completion.

Sixth, the Ohio Association of Community Colleges (OACC) should considering infusing language about the importance of academic advising into future policy recommendations related to the success points’ component of the funding formula. This policy recommendation is supported by decisions OA&T Policy authors made while crafting the state transfer policy. The OA&T Policy includes a section that highlights the importance of academic advising for transfer students. Higher education institutions must provide transfer advising, and institutions have been encouraged to collaborate in the development of transfer advising materials. Success points include a funding component related to successful student transfer from one Ohio higher education institution to another. Therefore, including language about the importance of academic advising in the funding recommendations and funding policy may encourage community college leaders to ensure that the infrastructure for academic advising supports their roles in increasing student success.
Summary

The purposes of this study were (a) to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges; (b) to explore the influences of budgets, institutional policies, and the Ohio Articulation and Transfer (OA&T) Policy had on academic advising; and (c) to examine the levels of influence institutional budgets, grant budgets, institutional policies, and OA&T Policy had on decisions about who should deliver academic advising and where academic advising should take place.

This was the first study designed to describe the organization of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges and the first to explore the influences that budgets and policies had on the ways in which academic advising is organized. Academic advising scholars have commented frequently that academic advising is a key retention strategy and often the only structured connection a student has with an agent of the institution. Language in the OA&T Policy concerning the role of academic advising and interviews with state-level leaders in Ohio revealed that state leaders also had valued academic advising as a strategy to increase certificate completions, degree completions, and successful college-to-college transfer rates. The findings of this study revealed that (a) Ohio’s two-year public colleges are in line with scholarly recommendations for ideal delivery in terms of the locations where academic advising takes place; (b) Ohio has opportunities to maximize academic advising budgets and to expand the employment of more diverse types of delivery systems to include low cost personnel such as peer advisors and paraprofessional advisors; (c) both actual student-to-full-time-professional-advisor ratios and actual student-to-full-time-faculty-advisor ratios had exceeded the national average for advising caseloads and had exceeded the scholarly recommendation.
for advisor caseloads (d) institutional policies had influenced decisions about who should advise and where academic advising should take place; (e) Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGS) was the only component of the OA&T Policy that had influenced decisions about who should advise; (f) institutional budgets had influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising and where advising academic advising should take place; and (g) grant budgets had influenced decisions about who should provide academic advising but had not influenced decisions about where academic advising should take place.

The major conclusion of this study was that Ohio two-year public colleges valued academic advising as an institutional priority by investing in the infrastructure of academic advising in four ways. First, two-year public college leaders had made a financial investment into the human resources of academic advising by providing funding for leadership, delivery systems, and budgets for academic advising. This financial investment was further noticed in the types of delivery systems in place at two-year public colleges; professional advisors, the most costly delivery system, were the primary providers of academic advising in centralized advising centers. Secondly, two-year public college leaders had employed professional advisors and faculty advisors. State-level leaders in Ohio, academic advising administrators, and advising scholars recommended these advisor types be included in the ideal model for academic advising. Third, two-year public college leaders had allocated space for academic advising in terms of centralized and decentralized advising locations, which were the types of locations recommended by state-level leaders in Ohio and advising scholars. Finally, two-year public college leaders more frequently implemented the total-intake organizational model than any other...
organizational model. This organizational model included a centralized advising center, academic departments/units, professional advisors, and faculty advisors. According to state-level leaders in Ohio and advising scholars, the total-intake model was the ideal model for delivering academic advising because it maximized the talents of professional advisors and faculty advisors in various locations and addressed students’ developmental needs as they occurred (King, 1993, 1996; King & Kerr, 2005). In closing, this study added to the research on the ways in which academic advising was organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges, presented baseline data on the influences that budgets and policies had on the organization of academic advising, recommended areas for future research for scholars of advising, and offered practical suggestions for academic advising professionals.
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Appendix A

Approval letter from Dr. Virginia Gordon

Virginia N. Gordon
2924 Wellesley Drive
Columbus, Ohio 43221

To: Verne Walker
Assistant Dean of Students
Owens Community College
3200 Bright Road
Findlay, Ohio 45840

You have my permission to use Figure 2.1, “The Building Blocks of Academic Advising” from my 1992 book, Academic Advising Handbook.

Virginia N. Gordon

Virginia N. Gordon
Appendix B

Ohio Board of Regents Definitions: Two-Year Public Colleges in Ohio

Community College

A community college is a two-year college which may be established at the initiative of one or more county governments, or by a referendum vote, with the approval of the Board of Regents. A board of trustees governs the college and all members must reside in the district. Six board members are appointed locally and three are appointed by the Governor. The college district is empowered and is strongly urged to secure a local property tax levy for operation much as a city, exempted village, or local board of education may do in operating elementary and secondary schools. Because the college can receive local tax support as well as state support, most community colleges are able to keep student fees lower than can other kind of two-year campuses. Community colleges offer pre-baccalaureate/transfer degree programs, career/technical education programs, developmental education, workforce training, adult continuing education, and community service activities. All community colleges are members of the EnterpriseOhio network. (Reference: Ohio Revised Code 3354.) (Operating Manual for Two-Year Campus Programs, p. 201.01).

State Community College

A state community college is a two-year college which may be established with the approval of the Board of Regents at the initiative of a technical college, a state university operating a regional campus in a district, one or more county governments, or the electorate of a district. The college is governed by a local board of trustees, with all nine members being appointed by the Governor. Ohio's state community colleges have no legal power to propose a local tax levy and must, therefore, operate without the advantages of local financing. A state community college offers pre-baccalaureate/transfer degree programs, career/technical degrees, developmental education, workforce training, adult continuing education, and community service activities. All state community colleges are members of the EnterpriseOhio network. (Reference: Ohio Revised Code 3358.) (Operating Manual for Two-Year Campus Programs, 1998, pp. 201.01-201.02).

Technical College

A technical college is a two-year college which may be established with approval of the Board of Regents upon the initiative of a city school district or a county, or by two or more contiguous city, county, local, or exempted village school districts or counties. Once established, however,
the technical college district becomes an independent political subdivision governed by a board of trustees. The board shall have either five or six board members appointed locally and two or three appointed by the Governor. Technical colleges receive support from the state and student fees. Current law provides that technical colleges may propose property tax levies to local electorates. Technical colleges specialize in offering career/technical education programs, adult continuing education programs, community service activities, workforce skills enhancement, and developmental education. Technical degree programs are frequently transferable into baccalaureate degree programs. Additionally, many of them may be articulated with four-year institutions for the completion of baccalaureate degrees. Further, technical colleges participate in the state approved transfer module. All technical colleges are members of the EnterpriseOhio network. In a single instance, that of the Agricultural Technical Institute at Wooster, an academic unit within Ohio State University has been established under the general authority of the University board of trustees to function in a manner similar to other technical colleges and institutes insofar as technical programs in agricultural and natural sciences are concerned. (Reference: Ohio Revised Code 3357.) (Operating Manual for Two-Year Campus Programs, 1998, pp. 201.02).
Appendix C

Ohio Advising Survey of Two-Year Public Colleges

Ohio Advising Survey of Two-Year Public Colleges

According to the National Academic Advising Association (2006), higher education leaders who want to understand academic advising on their campuses must begin their education by describing how academic advising is organized. Organization refers to the locations, distribution of various types of advisors in these locations, and the coordination of academic advising. The purpose of this study is to describe how academic advising is organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges and to examine the impact budget and select state and institutional policies might have on the organization of academic advising at these colleges.

As a fellow advising administrator and doctoral candidate, I ask that you please take approximately 30 minutes to complete the attached survey in order to help me learn more about how academic advising is organized in Ohio’s two-year public colleges. You will also be asked to send additional documents that describe how academic advising is organized at your institution. Prior to completing this instrument, please complete the enclosed informed consent form. Please understand that your personal identity will not be disclosed during the course of this research project and that you have the right to remove yourself as a participant at any time.

Your support of this project is greatly appreciated and will contribute to the field of academic advising. I will provide a summary of findings upon your request at the completion of this study. Please note select questions were used with permission from ACT’s Sixth National Survey of Academic Advising (2003).

Please read each prompt and respond accordingly.

Centralized Advising Centers

1. Do you have a centralized advising center at your institution?
   ___ Yes ___ or ___ No ___
   If Yes, please respond to question 2, 3, and 4. If No, go to question 5.

2. Who are the primary providers of academic advising in your centralized advising center? Select one.
   □ Full-time instructional faculty who advise
   □ Part-time instructional faculty who advise
   □ Full-time professional advisors
   □ Part-time professional advisors
   □ Peer Advisors (current students at your institution)
   □ Other: _________________________________________
   □ No other providers
   □ Full-time licensed professional counselors
   □ Part-time licensed professional counselors
   □ Paraprofessional advisors (graduate students, practicum student volunteers, and staff hired for peak times)
   □ Other: _________________________________________

3. Who else provides academic advising in the centralized advising center? Select as many of the advisor types you have from the list below.
   □ No other providers
   □ Full-time instructional faculty who advise
   □ Part-time instructional faculty who advise
   □ Full-time professional advisors
   □ Part-time professional advisors
   □ Peer Advisors (current students at your institution)
   □ Other: _________________________________________

4. Do students receive academic advising only from advisors in the centralized advising center?
   ___ Yes ___ or ___ No ___
   If Yes, go to question number 12, Student-to-Advisor Ratios and Time Advisors Spend Advising.

Advising in Academic Departments/Units

5. Do you have academic advisors who work in academic departments/units?
   Yes ___ or ___ No ___
   If Yes, please respond to question 6 and 7. If No, go to question 8.
6. Who are the **primary providers** of academic advising in your academic departments/units? **Select one.**
   - [ ] Full-time instructional faculty who advise
   - [ ] Part-time instructional faculty who advise
   - [ ] Full-time professional advisors
   - [ ] Part-time professional advisors
   - [ ] Peer Advisors
   (current students at your institution)
   - [ ] Other: _________________________________________

7. Who else provides academic advising in your academic departments/units? Select as many of the advisor types you have from the list below.
   - [ ] No other providers
   - [ ] Full-time instructional faculty who advise
   - [ ] Part-time instructional faculty who advise
   - [ ] Full-time professional advisors
   - [ ] Part-time professional advisors
   - [ ] Peer Advisors
   (current students at your institution)
   - [ ] Other: _________________________________________

**Other types of Academic Advising Units**

8. Do you have academic advising in other types of advising units? Yes _____ or No _____
   *If Yes, please respond to question 9, 10, and 11. If No, please go to question 12.*

9. Identify the specific offices and/or locations of your other advising units.
   - [ ] TRIO/Student Support Services Office
   - [ ] Title III Advising Office
   - [ ] Other grant funded advising office: explain
     _______________________________________________________
     _______________________________________________________
   - [ ] Other location: explain
     _______________________________________________________
     _______________________________________________________
   - [ ] Other location: explain
     _______________________________________________________
     _______________________________________________________

10. Who are the **primary providers** of academic advising in your other advising units? **Select one.**
    - [ ] Full-time instructional faculty who advise
    - [ ] Part-time instructional faculty who advise
    - [ ] Full-time professional advisors
    - [ ] Part-time professional advisors
    - [ ] Peer Advisors
    (current students at your institution)
    - [ ] Other: _________________________________________

11. Who else provides academic advising in your other advising units? Select as many as you have from the list below.
    - [ ] No other providers
    - [ ] Full-time instructional faculty who advise
    - [ ] Part-time instructional faculty who advise
    - [ ] Full-time professional advisors
    - [ ] Part-time professional advisors
    - [ ] Peer Advisors
    (current students at your institution)
    - [ ] Other: _________________________________________
**Student-to-Advisor Ratios and Time Advisors Spend Advising**

If you DO NOT have FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL FACULTY WHO ADVISE, then please go to question 14.

12. What is the full-time faculty member who advises to-student advisor ratio? Select one option from below.

- 1 faculty to 0 - 10 students
- 1 faculty to 11 - 20 students
- 1 faculty to 21 - 30 students
- 1 faculty to 31 - 40 students
- 1 faculty to 41 - 50 students

Please add the exact ratio if you have that information (e.g., 40:1) __________

13. On average, what percentage of time do full-time instructional faculty members who advise spend advising?

- 0 – 5 %
- 6 – 10 %
- 11 – 15 %
- 16 – 20 %
- 21 – 25 %

If you DO NOT have PROFESSIONAL ADVISORS, then please go to question 16.

14. What is the full-time equivalent professional advisor-to-student ratio? Full-time equivalent is determined by identifying the number of hours worked in total by full and part-time professional advisors and dividing that number by 40 hours? Select one option from below.

- 1 advisor to 0 - 50 students
- 1 advisor to 51 - 100 students
- 1 advisor to 101 - 150 students
- 1 advisor to 151 - 200 students
- 1 advisor to 201 - 250 students
- 1 advisor to 251 - 300 students
- 1 advisor to 301 - 350 students
- 1 advisor to 351 - 400 students
- 1 advisor to 401 - 450 students
- 1 advisor to 451 - 500 students

Please add the exact ratio if you have that information (e.g., 1,000:1) __________

15. On average, what percentage of time do full-time professional advisors spend advising?

- ________% of their time

**Ideal Delivery and Ratios for Academic Advising in Two-Year Public Colleges**

16. In your opinion, what is the ideal full-time faculty member advisor to student ratio at two-year public colleges?

Insert number of students in sentence below.

- _______ students per 1 full-time faculty member advisor

17. In your opinion, what is the ideal full-time professional advisor to student ratio for two-year public colleges?

Insert number of students in sentence below.

- _______ students per 1 full-time professional advisor
18. In your opinion, what is the ideal type of advisor or combination of advisors for providing academic advising in two-year colleges? (Select only one option below)

- Faculty advisors only
- Professional advisors only
- Licensed professional counselors only
- Paraprofessional advisors only
- Peer advisors only
- Combination of Faculty and Professional Advisors
- Combination of Professional Advisors and Paraprofessional advisors
- Combination of Faculty and Peers
- Combination of Professional Advisors and Peer Advisors
- Combination of all advising types in the advising model (e.g., faculty, professional, licensed professional counselors, paraprofessionals, peers)
- Other combination of advisors:
  ________________________________________________________________

- Other advisor type: _____________________________________________

Administration of Academic Advising

19. Identify one statement from the statements below that best describes academic advising at your institution.

- All incoming students begin their advising with advisors in a centralized advising center, then are transferred to advisors who work in academic departments after meeting certain criteria and/or prerequisites.
- Some incoming students who need to meet certain requirements and/or prerequisites receive their advising in a centralized advising center. Then, these students are transferred to advisors who work in academic departments. Other incoming students who have already met certain criteria and/or prerequisites prior to enrollment begin their advising in the academic departments.
- All incoming students are assigned an advisor in the centralized advising center and are assigned an advisor in an academic department.
- None of the statements above describe academic advising at my institution. Explain:
  ________________________________________________________________
  ________________________________________________________________

20. Identify one statement from the statements below that describes the coordination of academic advising at your institution.

- Coordination of academic advising at my institution is centralized. All advising services report to one individual.
- Coordination of academic advising at my institution is decentralized. All academic departments and advising units report to separate individuals.
- Coordination of academic advising at my institution is shared among a director/coordination of a centralized advising center who assists coordinators of advising in academic departments/units and/or other advising units.
- None of the statements above describe the coordination of academic advising at my institution. Explain:
  ________________________________________________________________
  ________________________________________________________________
  ________________________________________________________________

21. Indicate whether your types of advisors for academic advising has increased or decreased over the last year? Make one response per row below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Type</th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time instructional faculty who advise:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time instructional faculty who advise:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time professional advisors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time professional advisors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time licensed professional counselors:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part-time licensed professional counselors:  
Paraprofessional advisors (graduate assistants, practicum student volunteers, and staff hired during peak times):  
Peer Advisors:  
Other type of advisor:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increased</th>
<th>Decreased</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other type of advisor:</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget**

22. Indicate whether your academic advising budget has increased or decreased over the last year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Some Decrease</th>
<th>Little Decrease</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Little Increase</th>
<th>Some Increase</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>institutional funds in the last year</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grant funds in the last year</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What level of impact has budget had on *where* you choose to provide academic advising (e.g., centralized location, decentralized locations, both)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional budget</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant budget</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. What level of impact has budget had on decisions about *who* provides academic advising at your institution (e.g., types of advisors)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional budget</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant budget</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State and Institutional Policy**

25. What level of impact has credit transfer policy had on *where* you choose to provide academic advising (e.g., centralized location, decentralized locations, both)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement Policy Transfer Assurance Guides</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TAGs)</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Transfer Assurance Guides (CTAGS)</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other policy/initiative</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Great Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other policy/initiative</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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26. What level of impact has credit transfer policy had on your decisions about who should provide academic advising at your institution (the types of advisors who provide advising)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Initiative</th>
<th>Great Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sure Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Transfer Assurance Guides (CTAGS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other policy/initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other policy/initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. List and provide a few word description of your institution’s board approved policies that you believe impact the organization of academic advising at your institution.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

28. What level of impact has your board’s institutional policies had on your decisions about who should provide academic advising and where you provide academic advising at your institution (the types of academic advisors who provide advising and the locations of academic advising)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Great Impact</th>
<th>Some Impact</th>
<th>Little Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Sure Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board policy impact on who should provide academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board policy impact on where academic advising should be provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Indicate how state policies in Ohio have impacted the organization of academic advising at your college. (e.g., AP policy, Transfer Assurance Guides, Career Transfer Assurance Guides, Ohio Transfer Module, etc.) Check all that apply.

- Staffing increased
- Staffing decreased
- Institutional advising budget increased
- Institutional advising budget decreased
- Grant dollars for advising increased
- Grant dollars for advising decreased
- Advising coordination was centralized under one coordinator
- Advising coordination became more decentralized
- Advising services were centralized into one location
- Advising services were decentralized to more than one location
- Other:

30. Indicate how board policies at your institution have impacted the organization and delivery of academic advising at your college.

- Staffing increased
- Staffing decreased
- Institutional advising budget increased
- Institutional advising budget decreased
- Grant dollars for advising increased
- Grant dollars for advising decreased
- Advising coordination was centralized under one coordinator
- Advising coordination became more decentralized
- Advising services were centralized into one location
- Advising services were decentralized to more than one location
- Other:
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31. Indicate how the **budget at your institution** has impacted the organization and delivery of academic advising at your college. Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____ Staffing increased</td>
<td>_____ Advising coordination was centralized under one coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Staffing decreased</td>
<td>_____ Advising coordination became more decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Institutional advising budget increased</td>
<td>_____ Advising services were centralized into one location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Grant dollars for advising increase</td>
<td>_____ Advising services were decentralized to more than one location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Institutional advising budget decreased</td>
<td>Other: ____________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____ Grant dollars for advising decreased</td>
<td>Other: ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advising Administrator/ Institution Demographics**

32. What is your title?

____________________________________________________________________________

33. What is your supervisor's title?

____________________________________________________________________________

34. To what area of the college does your supervisor report?

- __Academic Services
- __Student Services
- __Other

35. What percentage of your time do you spend coordinating academic advising?

__________ % of my time spent coordinating advising

36. What was your Fall 2010 headcount enrollment? __________

37. Does your institution have a local tax levy? ________

- Yes
- No

**Additional Information**

Please share anything else you would like to contribute for a better understanding of how academic advising is organized at your institution.
Appendix D

Structured Interview Guide

Organization of Academic Advising in Ohio’s 23 Two-Year Public Colleges
Structured Interview Guide

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study on the organization and delivery of academic advising in Ohio’s 23 two-year public colleges. For the purposes of this study, I am defining academic advising as a developmental, student-to-advisor relationship that sometimes emerges informally and other times is created through structured programs and practices for the purpose of helping students maximize their college experience toward goal attainment.

Please understand you have the opportunity to remove yourself from this study at any time. Are you comfortable with me recording your responses for my review later? Yes _____ or No _____

1. My research uncovered that your current title is

__________________________________________________________________

Please confirm that this information is accurate.

2. Please tell me about the experiences you have had working with higher education in the State of Ohio?

3. What specific experiences do you have working with public policy related to higher education in Ohio?

4. How many years have you worked with public policy related to higher education in Ohio?

5. What specific higher education policies or initiatives have you assisted in creating and/or developing?

6. What do you believe was expected from two-year college administrators as a result of these higher education policies?

   Probe- from academic advising administrators?

7. What specific changes or developments did you observe or learn about in two-year public higher education as a result of these higher education policies?
8. What specific higher education policies in Ohio do you believe are impacting or might be impacting academic advising in the two-year public colleges?

Prompts to consider:
- Advanced Placement Policy
- Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGs)
- Career Transfer Assurance Guides (CTAGS)
- Seniors to Sophomore Initiative
- Internship/Coop Initiative
- Other policy/initiative
- Other policy/initiative

9. How do you think each of these policies is impacting academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?

Prompts to consider:
- Advanced Placement Policy
- Transfer Assurance Guides (TAGs)
- Career Transfer Assurance Guides (CTAGS)
- Seniors to Sophomore Initiative
- Internship/Coop Initiative
- Other policy/initiative
- Other policy/initiative

10. What do you believe is expected from the two-year college administrators as a result of these higher education policies?

Probe- from academic advising administrators?

11. What changes or developments did you observe or learn about due to these specific higher education policies?

12. What suggestions do you have for two-year academic advising administrators toward implementing public policy related to academic advising?

13. In your opinion, are there specific state policies that should be developed to impact academic advising in the two-year college?

14. What recommendations do you have on where (the location(s)) advising should take place on a two-year college campus?
15. What recommendations do you have on who should provide academic advising on a two-year college campus?

16. How do you think the state budget has impacted academic advising in the two-year college?

17. How do you see your role impacting academic advising at the two-year college institutional level?

18. What else would you like to contribute related to the organization and delivery of academic advising in Ohio’s two-year public colleges?
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Approval letter from Dr. Wes Habley, ACT

January 3, 2009

Vince Walker
3630 Ross Road
Wilmington, DE 48914

Dear Mr. Walker:

Your request for permission to use results and materials of ACT's National Survey of Academic Achievement (NSAA) for your dissertation research is granted. Please make sure that ACT is appropriately acknowledged in your work.

I would also be very interested in the findings of your study if you would be willing to share them with me.

Sincerely,

Wesley T. Habley, EdD
Principal Investigator
ACT Educational Services
Appendix F

Cover Letter for Ohio Advising Survey

Date

Name
Address
City, State, Zip

Dear {Insert Participant’s Name}

My name is Verne Walker, and I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration program at the University of Toledo. Also, I work full-time as the Director of Teaching and Learning Success at Owens Community College.

Approximately one week ago I sent you an email requesting your participation in my dissertation study, the Organization of Academic Advising in Ohio’s 23 Two-Year Public Colleges. At that time I indicated that you would be receiving a follow up mailing. Enclosed you will find the following items:

1. Adult Research Subject – Informed Consent Form
2. Ohio Advising Survey of Two-Year Colleges
3. Postage-paid return envelope

I appreciate your support in helping me to gather the needed data to describe how academic advising is organized in Ohio’s two-year Public Colleges.

Please contact me with any questions you might have about this study. I look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire and supporting documents in the near future. If you are not serving as the Director/Coordinator of Academic Advising at your institution, then please forward these materials to that individual.

Thank you in advance for helping me to complete my dissertation and for helping to advance academic advising as a key strategy in creating student success.

Sincerely,

Verne Walker
Graduate Student; University of Toledo, Higher Education Administration Program
Director of Teaching and Learning Success; Owens Community College
567.661.2037 (office) or 419.575.3335 (cell)
verne_walker@owens.edu
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Persuasion Letter for Ohio Advising Survey

Date

Name
Address
City, State, Zip

Dear {Insert Participant’s Name}

My name is Verne Walker, and I am a doctoral student in the Higher Education Administration program at the University of Toledo. Also, I work full-time as the Director of Teaching and Learning Success at Owens Community College.

The purpose of my letter is to make you aware of a great opportunity to help a fellow advising administrator, who is a graduate student, advance the professionalism of academic advising in two-year, public colleges in Ohio. Soon you will receive a mail questionnaire designed to gather information about how academic advising is organized in Ohio’s two-year, public colleges and to collect data on the influences of budget and public policy on the organization of academic advising at your institution.

The literature is rich with information about the importance of academic advising in facilitating student success. By completing this survey, you will help advance academic advising in Ohio. A major assumption of this study is that academic advising is a key strategy in the implementation of the Ohio Chancellor’s Ten-Year Strategic Plan. In order to support this assumption, I have developed a study to address National Academic Advising Association’s (NACADA) recommendation that to better understand academic advising, institutions must describe how academic advising is organized.

I appreciate your support in helping me to gather the needed data to describe how academic advising is organized in Ohio’s Two-Year Public Colleges.

Please contact me with any questions you might have about this study. Within the week you will receive a cover letter, informed consent document, and questionnaire in the mail. I look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire in the near future.

Thank you in advance for helping me to complete my dissertation and for helping to advance academic advising as a key strategy in creating student success.

Sincerely,

Verne Walker
Graduate Student; University of Toledo, Higher Education Administration Program
Director of Teaching and Learning Success; Owens Community College
567.661.2037 (office) or 419.575.3335 (cell)
verne_walker@owens.edu
Appendix H

Analysis of Question 19 on Ohio Advising Survey

OAS participants had the opportunity to select one of the following or to write in a description:

1. All incoming students begin their advising with advisors in a centralized advising center, and then are transferred to advisors who work in academic departments after meeting certain criteria and/or prerequisites.

2. Some incoming students who need to meet certain requirements and or prerequisites receive their advising in a centralized advising center. Then, these students are transferred to advisors who work in academic departments. Other incoming students who have already met certain criteria and/or prerequisites prior to enrollment begin their advising in academic departments.

3. All incoming students are assigned an advisor in the centralized advising center and are assigned an advisor in an academic department.

4. None of the statements above describe academic advising at my institution. Explain:

Seven participants selected from the available prompts: prompt 1 (n=3); prompt 2 (n=3), and prompt 3(n=1). The remaining ten participants opted to describe the organizational model at their institution. Seven of the ten written responses were able to be categorized into one of the three OAS categories. These seven included slight modifications to the available prompts. For example, one participant included the word “faculty” prior to the word “advisors” in prompt 1. “All incoming students begin their advising with advisors in a centralized advising center, then are transferred to faculty advisors who work in academic departments after meeting certain criteria and/or prerequisites.”

The participant responses the researcher was unable to categorize into an existing OAS description were reviewed in the following context. The researcher reviewed
several OAS responses and participant supporting documentation returned with the OAS return envelope, when available.

The following questions were reviewed during the analysis of question OAS question 20 aimed at the organizational model of academic advising:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of Question 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OAS Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Option 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Option 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis of Question 27 on Ohio Advising Survey

Participant responses to OAS question 27: List and provide a few word description on your institution’s board approved policies that you believe impact the organization of academic advising at your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Participant Statement</th>
<th>Codes/Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Advising is part of faculty contract - which is approved by board.</td>
<td>Faculty contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 None - except for union contract</td>
<td>Faculty contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Counselors are faculty and belong to the A.A.U.P. They work 180 days like instructional faculty. They also work 42 days in the summer for pro-rate pay.</td>
<td>Faculty contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Our faculty association union contract requires office hours to include full-time faculty program advising and their salary includes compensation.</td>
<td>Faculty contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Academic advising is performed by full &amp; part time non-instructional counseling faculty (tenured and tenure-track). Instructional faculty may provide advising in their academic discipline only.</td>
<td>Policy related to who advises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Currently about 35% of new students receive 1st year advisor. This % has grown over the years. The college would like to serve 50% in the future.</td>
<td>Policy related to who advises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Issues with academic standing are all handle in advising center not by faculty advisors.</td>
<td>Policy related to who advises, process/student standing, and location of academic advising for particular process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Academic standing procedures and quarters to semesters conversion policy</td>
<td>Policy related to process: student standing and quarters/semesters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Student services are fairly well supported. New emphasis placed on retention and completion will drive some changes in policy.</td>
<td>Statement not related to policy; statement anticipating policy changes due to completion agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 We provide (at COTC) a 1-stop &quot;Gateway&quot; department that incorporates: advising, admissions, student records, access &amp; retention and customer service. The Gateway is the &quot;hub&quot; of the college for new students, returning</td>
<td>Statement not related to policy; statement related to location of academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students, transfer students and "access" efforts.  

11 Advising ties into Board goal of Student Success.  

advising  

Statement not related to policy