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Preface

As our report in the succeeding pages details, the large goal to which the work of this Task Force seeks to contribute is student success. That theme is prominent in the institution’s current strategic plan, and it is prominent in the drafts of a modified strategic plan soon to be considered and adopted by this community. That goal is very widely shared at the university, and it was in the front of mind for President Willie J. Hagan when he convened this group in Fall 2013. Relative to that large goal, as will be seen in our report, we think that strengthened advising can be an important contributor to improving the rates at which our undergraduates succeed. We expect that the readers of this report will agree.

The scope of this report is consistent with its association with the large theme of student success. That is, we focus exclusively on undergraduates at the university, and our recommendations have in mind supporting their continuation and eventual graduation with the baccalaureate degree. We do not consider advising for graduate students; we do not review advising that is delivered to students who are enrolled in online programs; we do not assess pre-professional advising, such as pre-medical/health professions, pre-law, or similar activities and foci. These are all surely worthwhile programs, and our excluding them is not meant to imply that they are unimportant.

We are grateful to the many members of the California State University, Dominguez Hills community who contributed their time and ideas to our work. These include faculty and staff who took part in focused discussions about advising at CSUDH; professional advisers who took part in a focused discussion led by Dr. Clare Weber; faculty and staff who took part in the open hearing that was a part of our listening and learning; members of the Academic Senate who offered their views and insights in discussions held in that forum; faculty who responded to our survey on academic advising; and students who took part in the focus groups, led by advanced Sociology students under the general direction of Dr. Clare Weber. We offer our appreciation to Ms. Corina Diaz and Ms. Juliana Soto, with the collaboration of Ms. Sylvia Thomas, Ms. Elizabeth Sanchez, and Mr. James Taft, who led the focus group effort.

We are grateful as well to Dr. Lori Varlotta of California State University, Sacramento, who offered a ¾-day retreat and workshop about advising from the vantage of that sister CSU campus. We benefited from a substantial presentation on advising best practices offered by the Education Advisory Board, a membership best-practices organization based in Washington, D.C. We learned as well from one another, and in particular by a special presentation made by Division of Information Technology members of the Task Force, Mr. Chris Manriquez and Mr. Bill Chang; and by a special presentation led by Dr. Sue Borrego, Dr. William Franklin, and Ms. Brandy McLelland, Task Force members from the Division of Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. We are pleased to recognize the good work of Dr. Keisha Paxton in creating, deploying, and analyzing the results of our survey of full-time faculty. Our consultant, Dr. Joe Cuseo, posed the right questions to us at the right times, and offered useful critiques of our conclusions.
Members of the Task Force. The individuals whose names follow below were members of the Task Force, and stand as owners of the narrative and recommendations that follow. We also acknowledge the contributions of Task Force member Dr. Peter Kim, Director of the University Advising and Testing Center, whose work we appreciated until he left our university in February 2014.
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Dr. Keisha Paxton, Associate Professor of Psychology, Division of Academic Affairs
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Mr. Salvador Valdez, Academic Advisor, University Advisement and Testing Center, Division of Academic Affairs

Many logistical details for the benefit of the Task Force were handled with grace and aplomb by Ms. Susan Sanders, Confidential Assistant, Office of the President. We offer her our thanks.

Carson, California: June 17, 2014
Correspondence from

Dr. Joe Cuseo,

Special Consultant to the Task Force

[Overleaf]

(Note. Dr. Cuseo’s qualifications are briefly reviewed at the outset of Chapter One, Executive Summary.)
Signal Hills, California
June 9, 2014

Dr. Keith O. Boyum
Co-Chair, Task Force on Advising
Special Assistant to the President and

Dr. Clare Weber
Co-Chair, Task Force on Advising
Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs

California State University, Dominguez Hills
1000 E. Victoria Street
Carson, CA  90747

Dear Keith and Clare,

Let me begin by saying that I applaud the task force’s concerted effort to improve the quality of academic advising experienced by students at CSUDH. Based on 30 years of research and professional practice, it is my firm belief that academic advising is a high-impact practice whose influence has been overlooked, underestimated and under-resourced in American higher education. If our nation is serious about increasing its college completion rates, we need to take a serious look at the key role advising plays in promoting student persistence to graduation.

As indicated or intimated in the task-force report, several key contextual factors are converging to spur interest in strengthening advising at CSUDH. The confluence of the following factors leaves me optimistic that the report’s recommendations will be earnestly pursued and eventually implemented:

(a) The emphasis on and support for promoting student success throughout the CSU system.

(b) President Willie Hagan’s high-priority institutional goals of increasing student retention and reducing time to graduation at CSUDH, coupled with his recognition that academic advisement is integral to achieving these goals.

(c) The inclusion of academic advisement as a focal area in CSUDH’s current strategic plan.

(d) CSUDH’s strong ethos of student-centeredness and commitment to increasing student success.

(e) The much needed room for improvement in CSUDH’s 6-year graduation rate (currently less than 30%).
I’m also encouraged by the campus-wide involvement that the advising task force has generated in the process of soliciting broad-based feedback on the status of advising at CSUDH and incorporating that feedback into its recommendations. I’m convinced that the time taken by the task force to seek input from multiple members of the university community (via quantitative and qualitative methods), plus the care taken to vet recommendations in an open and transparent fashion, will serve to ensure campus-wide ownership of the change process. This consensual groundwork should pay future dividends in terms of sustaining support for implementing the report’s recommendations.

In short, I find the substance of the report’s recommendations to be both accurate and comprehensive. They embody the following eight powerful principles of effective student-success initiatives:

1. Mission-Centered: Effective student success programs are grounded in and guided by a well-articulated program mission that aligns with the college or university mission.

A high-quality advising program starts with a clear and consensual definition of what constitutes effective academic advising, which includes delineation of: (a) its purpose, (b) roles and responsibilities of both advisors and advisees, and (c) intended program outcomes. Failure to clearly clarify the purpose of advising often results in confusion and inconsistency with respect to the nature and quality of advising delivered to students. As the task-force report suggests, articulating an advising mission statement for CSUDH represents the critical first step toward addressing the considerable inconsistency in the nature and quality of advising currently being delivered to CSUDH students.

The reality is that academic advising on many campuses today is ill-defined and is often little more than a harried, clerical exercise in course scheduling. This falls far short of the best practices called for by “developmental academic advising” and “appreciative advising,” in which the advisor moves beyond the mechanics of class scheduling to building meaningful relationships with students, helping them identify their life goals, and supplying them with
a supportive mentor. The report’s “conception of academic advising at CSUDH” (Chapter 2, p. 6) artfully captures this more holistic, student-centered view of advising and may serve as an effective mission statement for the university’s advisement program.

2. **Intrusive**: Effective student-success programs are not offered passively on a come-find-and-use basis, waiting and hoping that students initiate contact; instead, supportive action is *initiated* by the institution—which actively *reaches out* to students and brings programmatic support *to* them—ensuring that the program reaches students who are unlikely to access it on their own.

This principle is consistent with CSUDH’s mission statement of providing services that are “by design, accessible and transformative.” The recommendations of the advising task force put this principle into practice by calling for policies and procedures that minimize the risk that students will bypass or opt out of the advising process (e.g., mandating that students receive an advisor’s electronic signature in order to register for courses).

Intrusive programming is particularly important for promoting the success of first-generation college students—who are represented in sizable numbers that CSUDH. As acknowledged in the advising report, first-generation students lack the “college knowledge” and the social/cultural capital possessed by students who have access to college-experienced family members that can help them navigate the higher education system. If the advising report’s recommendations are implemented, CSUDH’s academic advisors will be well positioned to provide first-generation students with the compensatory social capital needed to close the gap between their college-completion rates closer and those achieved by students from families with a college-going tradition.

3. **Proactive**: Effective student-success programs take *early, preventative* action—addressing students’ learning needs and developmental adjustments in an *anticipatory* fashion—*before* they eventuate in issues or problems that require reactive (after-the-fact) intervention.

Effective advising programs take preemptive action by “front-loading” support to students during their initial (and critical) transition to the university. The task-force report is replete with recommendations that resonate with this principle (e.g., identifying highly effective advisors to work with first-year students; allowing advisors earlier access to student transcripts; strengthening new-student orientation; developing an “early-alert” system for students experiencing initial difficulties). Particularly noteworthy is the report’s call for practices that help new students prepare for and engage in long-range educational planning (e.g., helping students identify “clear pathways” and develop a “multi-year plan of classes”). This is clearly congruent with CSUDH’s vision statement, which states that students are “provided the pathways and guidance to succeed.”
4. **Sustained:** Effective student-success programs maintain support for students throughout their undergraduate experience, delivering *stage-sensitive* “just in time” support when they most need it, are most receptive to it, and most likely to benefit from it.

A persistent myth in the field of student success is that student decisions about remaining or departing from campus take place during the first six weeks of their college experience. While a strong first-year experience and proactive practices are essential elements of any effective student-success program, research consistently demonstrates that student persistence to graduation is a long-distance race requiring institutional support beyond the first year.

The task-force report acknowledges this principle by calling for CSUDH to “review and continue requirements that students be required to connect with advisors at critical junctures or checkpoints in their university careers.” More specifically, it suggests that *sophomore* advising be made mandatory or be highly incentivized, and that recommends that *seniors* partake in person-to-person graduation checks or graduation audits. The report’s call for attention to *junior transfers* is particularly relevant to the university’s goal of increasing graduation rates. More new students transition to CSUDH as juniors than as freshmen, and the vast majority of these transfer students do not experience orientation or any other type of transitional support to the university. This may be a missed opportunity for CSUDH to provide timely support for junior transfers and boost the university’s graduation rates because these students have a much shorter distance to travel to degree completion than incoming high school students. The task force’s call for “a focus on students near graduation” acknowledges the need to seize this opportunity, and its recommendations to bolster transfer-student orientation and to explore the possibility of implementing a UNIV 101 course for transfer students are consistent with best practices cited in the scholarly literature.

5. **Diversified:** Effective student-success programs are *tailored (customized)* to meet the *distinctive* needs of different student *subpopulations* (undecided students, probationary students, international students, etc.)

An effective way to implement this program principle is illustrated by the report’s call for deployment of specialized advisors and specialized support for special-needs students who may be at risk for attrition. For instance, undecided students who may be at risk for attrition due to lack of academic goals or direction would clearly benefit from the report’s recommendation to develop “pre major” pathways, and students in the throes of changing majors would benefit from the report’s call for “what if analysis” technology to help them identify alternative educational pathways to degree completion.

6. **Collaborative:** Effective student-success programs are characterized by *partnerships* between different organizational units of the college/university working together in a *complementary and interdependent* manner to harness their collective power in a way that exerts synergistic (multiplicative) effects on student success.
This program-effectiveness principle reflects one of CSUDH’s core values: “Collaboration—all segments of the campus community work together to support our vision as well as our students’ success.”

It’s also reflected in the report’s call for: (a) better cross-campus communication and greater consistency in advising policies and procedures (e.g., substitutions, waivers, shared record keeping), (b) co-location of advisors in neighboring physical places to facilitate collaboration, and (c) interaction between academic advising with career services. Additional illustrations of this program principle appear in the report’s recommendation for a standing advising committee comprised of cross-departmental/cross-divisional representation and in its recommendation that departmental faculty advisors working with professional advisors as part of a “tour of duty” in the Advising Center before returning to mentor faculty advisors in their home department.

7. Systemic: Effective student-success programs take a “systems” approach that addresses interrelated aspects of the issue in an integrated (vs. isolated) manner, giving them the potential to create deep, transformative change in campus culture.

The task-force report implements this principle by addressing interrelated components of advising reform jointly rather than separately. For instance, it addresses all intersecting elements of effective advisor performance, namely:

- a) Advisor Recruitment & Incentives (e.g., highlighting the importance of advising in faculty job announcements)
- b) Advisor Orientation & Professional Development (e.g., including advising preparation as a component of new-faculty orientation, and incorporating mentoring into advisors’ professional development)
- c) Advisor Assessment & Evaluation (e.g., development of an advisor performance-evaluation system)
- d) Advisor Recognition & Reward (e.g., public awards for highly effective advisors; acknowledging advisor performance in the rank, promotion and tenure process)

The report also points out that promoting transformative change in CSUDH’s advising system will require multidirectional support from members operating at different levels of the organizational hierarchy, namely:

- a) Top-down (↓) support from high-level administrators (e.g., appointment of an Advising Dean);
- b) Side-in (↔) support from mid-level administrators (e.g., input and ownership of college deans and division heads);
- c) Bottom-up (↑) support for advisors and students. For instance, maintaining manageable advisee-to-advisor ratios by hiring additional professional advisors; using part-time faculty to augment the faculty advising corps; providing advisors with supportive material (advisor manual, e-handbook, user-friendly technology) and doing the same for students—providing them with support so they can take a more active and self-responsible role in the advising process (e.g., supplying them with user-friendly worksheets and technology-mediated tools to guide course planning and decision-making).
8. **Empirical (Evidentiary):** Effective student-success programs are supported by assessment data (both quantitative and qualitative) that are used for (a) *summative* evaluation — to “sum up” and *prove* the program’s overall impact or value, and (b) *formative* evaluation — to “shape up” and continually *improve* program quality.

The task-force advising report accommodates this principle by calling for the creation of a culture of evidence with respect to academic advising and for recruitment of an Advising Dean with strong skills in program assessment.

**Conclusion & Final Recommendations**

As I mentioned at the outset of this correspondence, I find the recommendations included in the task force’s report to be both accurate and comprehensive. I have only two additional suggestions for strengthening the comprehensiveness of the report. First, consider utilizing *peer mentors* in the advising process. Peer advisors can provide highly effective (and cost-effective) support to complement and augment the work of faculty and professional advisors. Peer advisors may be utilized in the following ways: (a) to serve as a liaison for connecting students with a faculty/professional advisor, (b) to assist students’ preparation for meetings with their advisor (particularly during peak registration periods), (c) to help students navigate the mechanics of course registration after they have consulted with an advisor, and/or (d) to serve as paraprofessionals advising assistants in a centralized advising location. Perhaps CSUDH can explore the possibility of developing a peer advising corps that builds on effective peer-mentoring practices that are already in place on campus, such as the “Encounter to Excellence Program” and the peer leadership program developed by the psychology department.

Second, if one of the major goals of high-quality academic advising at CSUDH is to increase student persistence to graduation, it would appear that advising improvement efforts should be connected to and coordinated with larger institutional efforts aimed at promoting student retention. For instance, prioritization of advising strategies and resources would benefit from institutional research on the following retention-related questions:

a) *Who* are leaving? (What specific subpopulations of students are most vulnerable to attrition at CSUDH?)

b) *When* are they leaving? (At what stage or juncture of the CSUDH experience is attrition most likely to occur?)

c) *Why* are they leaving? (Are CSUDH students leaving primarily for academic reasons, fiscal reasons, psychosocial reasons, etc.?)

d) *Where* are they going (Are CSUDH students dropping out, stopping out, or transferring out)?
Not only would data relating to these retention issues help guide advising program development, advisors themselves may play a key role in gathering and reporting data on student attrition. If advising at CSUDH moves beyond course scheduling to closer relationship building with students and mentoring, advisors should gain greater access to and understanding of the root causes of attrition among the students they advise.

The larger point and recommendation I’m trying to make here is that the relationship between advising efforts and retention efforts may be worth pursuing in subsequent iterations of the task-force report, or built into CSUDH’s eventual action plan.

Let me conclude by reemphasizing that the existing report is impressively accurate and comprehensive. If the major recommendations of the task-force report are put into practice, CSUDH will have created a model advising program worthy of emulation by other CSU campuses. Holding a statewide conference on advising effectiveness on campus (as suggested in the task-force report) would enable CSUDH to share its program-improvement efforts, highlight the importance of academic advising system-wide, and reinforce the idea that academic advising is a substantive professional endeavor worthy of rigorous reflection and scholarly inquiry.

Naturally, not all components of the task-force report can be implemented simultaneously; furthermore, implementation of some components cannot be pursued until others have been realized. Among all the recommendations cited in the report, the one that strikes me as most essential and most critical to the successful implementation of other recommendations is the hiring of a senior administrator to serve as Dean of Academic Advising. This will ensure that advising occupies a central (rather than a peripheral or marginal) place at CSUDH and that it’s institutionalized—built seamlessly into the fabric of the institution’s culture, integrated into the university’s organizational blueprint, and included in its annual budget process.

Institutionalization of advising, in turn, will preserve the program’s identity and longevity, giving it the capacity to exert perennial impact on successive cohorts of CSUDH students for many years to come. Most importantly, the presence of a senior-level Dean for Academic Advising will send a strong and visible message to all members of the campus community that effective advisement is a high institutional priority at CSUDH and essential to the university mission.

Sincerely,

Joe

Joseph B. Cuseo, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus, Psychology
Educational Consultant, AVID for Higher Education
Chapter One.

Executive Summary

Summary. In this chapter we offer a précis of the contents of the longer report that follows. If the heart of a report such as this one lies importantly in the recommendations, the reader is encouraged to review table I-1 below, and also to seek the fuller statements in Chapters Six, Seven, Eight, and Nine.

The Scene at CSUDH.

Markers of this university’s success in fulfilling its essential mission are important scene-setters in Chapter Two. Close analyses such as by WASC teams, on one hand, and data analyses run from afar such as by the Washington Monthly, on the other hand, tell a congruent tale. Faculty and staff at CSU Dominguez Hills embrace this university’s fundamental purposes, and together we foster student retention and graduation with high-quality degrees at rates that out-perform many expectations. As it were, if we had a sign affixed to our front door, it might say Student Success Happens Here.

At the same time, a positive future is never assured, never automatic. Instead, even a university that can point to evident strengths must guard against external threats that are not merely fanciful. In our SWOT analysis in Chapter Five we list four potential threats: (1) our low IPEDS graduation rate may imperil access to Cal Grants, if not improved; (2) future plunges in state funding for higher education should be anticipated when economic downturns occur, if the past is prologue; (3) serious proposals are on the table in the U.S. House of Representatives to severely cut domestic spending, very much including for higher education; and (4) there is some evidence that Americans increasingly regard higher education as a private, not a public, good, and thus not a strong candidate for continued support.

Why Advising?

This report goes on, in Chapter Two, to make the key arguments why we should expect that improved academic advising is a strategic choice in bettering our current record in fostering the success of our students. We follow the lead especially of Dr. Joe Cuseo1, who crisply makes the key arguments. Strong advising:

1 Dr. Cuseo is Professor Emeritus of Psychology at Marymount College, and a consultant to the Task Force. He has delivered hundreds of campus workshops and conference presentations across the United States, as well as
• increases student satisfaction, which is positively related to retention;
• supports improved educational and career planning, which is positively related to student desire to finish a degree;
• enhances a student’s ability to utilize campus support services, which contribute to successful pursuit of a degree;
• fosters high-touch relationships between faculty and students, leading to academic success but also to attachment to the campus; and
• encourages mentoring, a key especially for students who may not have available role models at home or in their own neighborhoods.

**Early Conclusions.**

Even in our first substantive chapter of this report, we reach early conclusions at the close of Chapter Two. We think the university can improve advising, and thereby improve rates and probabilities of student success, by adopting these general strategies:

a. Providing strong incentives and rewards for advisors to engage in high-quality advising;
b. Strengthening advisor orientation, training, and development, and delivering them as essential components of this university’s faculty / staff development program;
c. Assessing and evaluating the quality of academic advisement;
d. Maintaining advisee-to-advisor ratios that are small enough to enable delivery of personalized advising;
e. Providing strong incentives for students to meet regularly with their advisors;
f. Identifying highly effective advisors and positioning them at the start of the college experience to work with first-year students;
g. Including advising effectiveness as one criterion for recruiting new faculty; and
h. Supporting advisors with clear policy and procedures, strong communications, effective web-enabled approaches, and other tools for success.

**Genesis of the Task Force.**

The confluence of sources that resulted in President Hagen’s request that this Task Force undertake the present work is the first theme in Chapter Three. The existing strategic plan, a new President, increasing interest systemwide in student success, anecdotes heard in the campus academic senate, a sense that the campus may be rebounding from the depths of tragic budget cuts: these and more came together to define a renewed interest in improving academic advising as a route to Canada, Europe, China, and Australia. He has authored articles, monographs, and books on effective teaching, advising, student retention and student success, the most recent of which are: *Thriving in College and Beyond: Research-Based Strategies for Academic Success & Personal Development*; *Humanity, Diversity, & The Liberal Arts: The Foundation of a College Education*; and *Peer-to-Peer Leadership: Transforming Student Culture*. 
improving student success. The interested reader is encouraged to review those circumstances, and to review Appendix A which shows the charge to the Task Force given by the President.

Who Gets What Advising at CSUDH.

Chapter Three goes on to comprehensively describe advising as we know it now at CSU Dominguez Hills. We sum up our perspective by asking who gets “the best” academic advising at this university, and we provide an answer. It is first-time Freshmen in special, grant-supported programs.

Those special programs are in turn described in good detail in Chapter Four, and we note with approval that the President has already made substantial local funding available to extend the benefits that are apparent. In effect, Chapter Four tells a story about what CSUDH does now, very well, in the way of advising and fostering student success.

How the Task Force Set About Its Work.

In Part II of Chapter Three we offer some perspective on how the Task Force went about doing its work. We drew for our Task Force membership upon persons and offices with strong experience in advising and related student support; we sought out best practices against which to measure our approaches to advising; we hired an expert consultant. In Chapter Five we take that recounting a step further, describing not only our strategy of listening to our community’s views about advising, but also laying out what we heard in summary fashion. Other summaries, and other reports of what we heard, more fine-grained than are found in the pages of Chapter Five, are displayed in Appendix E. All in all, the Task Force listened via:

- Focused conversations with deans and department chairs;
- Focused conversations with professional advisors;
- Comments at the Open Forum;
- A survey of full-time faculty;
- Comments made by students, in formal focus groups.

Four General Conclusions about Advising at CSUDH.

We came to four general conclusions about advising at CSUDH, on the basis of this listening:

First, the quantity of advising services varies remarkably, from intense and frequent for special groups of undergraduates, to casual and student-initiated for a large number of other undergraduates. For some among this large number of other undergraduates, advising services are remarkably thin.

Second, many advising needs seem even at a glance to be un-met: developmental needs for beginning lower-division students who are not selected to a special program is a sharp example.
Third, there is considerable reliance on faculty and other non-professional advisors in this system, and as will be discussed in Chapter Eight, the attention of faculty to this part of their job varies, and the capabilities of faculty in the area of advising are rarely if ever, supported by workshops or other opportunities to learn.

Fourth, elementary but important records are not well-kept. Too often archived only on paper in a departmental file cabinet, such items as substituted courses in fulfillment of degree major requirements are not available to those whose task it is to check whether a degree has in fact been earned. Too often the result is confusion: will student “X” graduate, or not? The Task Force heard many complaints about this.

**SWOT Analysis for Advising.**

As an analytic marker that we used in subsequent chapters when making specific recommendations, the Task Force concludes Chapter Five with a SWOT analysis for advising at this university. We list many weaknesses – but there are obvious strengths, too, on which to draw in moving forward. We think there are opportunities to seize, and threats against which we should make defenses.

**117 Specific Strategies, Recommendations, and Actions for Consideration.**

With all of the reporting and perspective-building from Chapters Two through Five in hand, we turn to specific ways forward that are listed and discussed in Chapters Six, Seven, Eight, and Nine. We have accumulated all of these in a series of tables, which follow overleaf. These comprise 117 items in the fourteen pages that follow.

This is, then, a “grand compilation,” offered with a posture of modesty. Especially *Actions for Consideration* will be subject to the constraints that time and budgets make inevitable; and the *Actions for Consideration* are surely the subjects for learning through piloting and assessment of programs to strengthen advising. Still, the Task Force heard persuasive arguments that such a consolidated listing might amount to a useful tool for campus senior leaders. We are pleased to provide that tool.

With that, we turn to Tables I – 1 through I - 4. Together the tables conclude this summary chapter, and we encourage the interested reader to see our analyses and arguments in the chapters that follow.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Strategy 6.1</strong>: Identify, and hire or assign, a senior administrator (for purposes of this report only: a <em>Dean of Advising</em>) to lead a process for clarifying policies; and via improved communications in a simplified business process environment, to smooth student pathways to entrance, to progress milestones, and to graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 6.1</strong>: Give strong consideration to hiring (or assigning) a senior administrator (for purposes of this report only, a <em>Dean of Advising</em>), for CSUDH. Ask the Dean of Advising, working with a suitable standing committee, to implement this report’s vision for advising at CSUDH, and to build multi-year plans for extending advising and assessing the effectiveness of advising at this university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>6.1.1 Make assessment, and a culture of evidence, central</strong> to the work of this leader for advising. This may imply that a dean should possess assessment skills, or at a minimum that his or her team include a person with that talent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>6.1.2 Create a standing CSUDH Advisement Committee</strong>, to include appropriate ex officio members (e.g., representing University Outreach, the Registrar, a college dean or experienced associate dean, an appropriate representation of professional advisors, persons representing campus success programs such as EOP and Bridge), the Career Center, Financial Aid, plus a number of faculty. This is a communications strategy, of course, but also a sounding board for policy and procedure determinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>6.1.3 Ask the Dean of Advising to ensure that support for advisors is in place</strong>. Our ideas about what may constitute suitable support (ongoing professional development, for example) are found below in this report (see especially Chapter Eight).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>6.1.4 Ask the dean to take a prominent role in creating a culture of advising effectiveness.</strong> This should include asking the dean to offer views about best practices on (a) advisor recruitment / selection; (b) new advisor orientation; (c) ongoing professional development for advisors; (d) advisor performance evaluation; and (e) advisor recognition / rewards. The natural follow-on to offering views, of course, is to propose their adoption, secure resources for, and move to implement best or recommended practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1.5 **Give the dean organizational prominence.** Do this for a period (perhaps two years) during which reforms are envisioned, initiated, piloted, assessed, and implemented. We envision, for example, asking the dean for a monthly (or twice-per semester) report to the President or to the President’s Cabinet. In this way, we think the university may encourage senior leaders to prioritize actions intended to improve advising.

**Recommendation 6.2:** Ask the Dean of Advising to lead a process that maps, and seeks efficiencies, in business processes, as different units at the university seek to articulate their work with one another: college advisors to UATC; NSO planners to UATC; articulation officers to deans and departments; UATC advisors to major advisors; and more.

6.2.1 **Co-locate, and clearly identify, physical spaces** for advising work. Among other efficiencies, this may prove efficient for students, who need not trek far across the campus to “check in” with a different office that has a neighboring responsibility. Of course, staff and faculty can more easily communicate when in proximity, as well. Compare item 6.3.3 below.

6.2.2 **Seek integration and smooth articulation via improved communications.** A dedicated advising web site can contribute to this; the standing CSUDH Advisement Committee can contribute to this; other means will also be identified in practice.

6.2.3 **Consult with the Education Advisory Board,** or a similar organization, to identify best practices in this regard.

**Recommendation 6.3:** Make a coordinated priority of engaging incoming students with strong advising – focusing on first-time freshmen.

6.3.1 **Continue to fund, and to assess the success of,** the E.T.E. and Bridge programs described in Chapter Four.

6.3.2 **Build career choices into advising visions.** Working closely with the Career Center, build programs for advising that begin with supporting and encouraging undeclared students, especially first-time freshmen, to focus on career options and choices, and to allow those options and choices to influence choices of pre-majors, of majors, and of particular courses in a particular term (semester). This should be a strong candidate for inclusion in a University 101 class [see below].
6.3.3 Encourage and support close collaboration between Career Services and Academic Affairs, particularly the UATC, to create, implement and assess programs aimed at delivering career advising to students in concert with academic advising. Compare Chapter Nine’s recommendation concerning encouraging or requiring students to have a regular (perhaps annual) interaction with the Career Center.

6.3.4 Provide career development and job placement information to students electronically, via a prominent and attractive web site, making available data on jobs landed by students in each major, careers of interest to students in each major, skills developed within majors, and similar. Note that national disciplinary associations (e.g., American Political Science Association) maintain career websites for college students who choose to major in the field.

6.3.5 Where appropriate, build “pre-major” programs to allow new students, unsure of major choice but clear about general directions, to take classes efficiently. Groupings could, for example, include STEM majors; behavioral sciences; performing arts; humanities; natural sciences. Assess.

6.3.6 Re-institute University 101, a course for first-time freshmen to include goal-setting, career and major choice support, effective approaches to study, awareness of graduation requirements, taking ownership of fulfilling such requirements, and more.

6.3.7 Via UNIV 101 and in other ways, seek to educate and empower students to assume self-responsible roles in the advising process.

6.3.8 In support of broader university goals for student success, orient students to high impact practices (HIPs) and encourage students to take courses that include HIPs.

6.3.9 In support of goals for internationalization, include orientations to global themes, topics, and involvement in international activities as HIPs. Pilot and assess.

6.3.10 Pilot and assess the utility of a similar course for incoming transfer students. (Compare Chapter Seven.) Find strong models, as above.

6.3.11 Identify and seek changes in now-very distributed policies about registration holds, seeking more uniformity, and much more clarity, about who places, who “owns” and who may lift holds. Compare Chapter Seven.

6.3.12 Seek digital means for identifying “owners” of holds on student registration. Compare Chapter Nine.
Item 25 **Strategy 6.2**: Seek low cost but effective supplements to advising by faculty and/or by professionals.

Recommendation 6.4: Build mentoring programs to supplement formal advising programs.

6.4.1 Institute, nurture and assess peer mentoring programs, such as the CSUDH Psychology department maintains. Pilot and assess this initiative.

6.4.2 Institute a program of volunteer mentors, drawing upon retired faculty and staff, and interested members of the community. Pilot and assess this initiative.

---

Table I – 2.

Strategies, Recommendations, and Actions for Consideration from Chapter Seven, Toward Improved Advising at CSUDH: 
*Serving Students Beyond the Freshman Year, Including Transfer Students*

Item 29 **Strategy 7.1**: Ensure that students whose class status is beyond Freshman, and ensure particularly that transfer students, have very clear advice about how to maintain strong progress to graduation.

Recommendation 7.1: Ensure that pathways are clear, that pathways are easy to follow, and that pathways to graduation are clearly communicated.

7.1.1 Urgently consider approaches for improving New Student Orientation (NSO) participation by transfer students. Consider initiating mandatory NSO’s for transfer students. In the NSO sessions, explain (and if necessary, emphasize) the differences between CSUDH and the community colleges from which the students have come. Even as architecture and acreage vary when comparing CSUDH to El Camino College, so also do rules, service provisions, and constraints vary. Students have a “learning curve” to surmount.
| Item | 32 | 7.1.2 Consider a Sophomore mandatory, or highly incentivized, advising encounter. A Sophomore “check-in” interaction, a kind of Sophomore NSO, is being piloted with reported success at other CSU campuses. In the alternative, consider a mandatory advisement session. Use the attainment of 30 units as a trigger. Assess. |
| | 33 | 7.1.3 Include group advising sessions as a strategy, especially for students new to a given academic major. Assess the sufficiency and success of such sessions. |
| | 34 | 7.1.4 Seek successful transfer students to mentor incoming transfers, if and when a peer mentoring program is adopted. Compare Recommendation 6.4 in the previous chapter. Pilot and assess. |
| | 35 | 7.1.5 Prioritize articulation of lower-division major requirements with offerings from feeder community colleges. Build a CSUDH campus consensus on the importance of this; engage faculty in departments. |
| | 36 | 7.1.6 As an approach to working with feeder community colleges, ask each Vice President at CSUDH to convene meetings two to four times per year with counterpart vice presidents from feeder community colleges – to seek understanding, strong articulation, and in general smooth transitions from community colleges to CSUDH. The content and the format of these meetings may vary, of course. Perhaps one of the annual meetings is one on one between the vice presidents, while another includes senior staff. |
| | 37 | 7.1.7 Initiate an annual professional conference focused on advising, to which papers and presentations from sister CSU campuses and, even more importantly, from feeder community colleges, are solicited and featured. Because this should have positive effects on the quality of academic advising delivered across the CSU system, seek system resources to support this effort. Argue that, as the CSU has supported conferences on effective teaching, so it should support conferences on effective advising. Assess. |
| | 38 | 7.1.8 Continue a strong communications program with students as intended targets / audiences; include in targeted communications “to do” lists for students in particular academic progress statuses. Begin with, and emphasize, students in a first semester transfer status. Pilot and assess; and as appropriate, extend this to students in other “classes” at the university (e.g., second semester freshman to-do lists; sophomore to-do-lists; etc.). |
| | 39 | 7.1.9 Focus on students nearing graduation. Preach and communicate proactively the “X” things students should do in their senior year in order to graduate. |
**Strategy 7.2:** With energy, seek both clarity as to the substance of policy, especially surrounding vexing issues such as registration holds and course substitutions, and clarity as to the communications of policy.

**Recommendation 7.2:** Make frequency and insistence the strong partners of policy clarity in communicating to transfer students.

7.2.1 Identify and seek changes in now-very distributed policies about registration holds, seeking more uniformity, and much more clarity, about who places, who “owns” and who may lift holds. Compare item 6.3.11.

7.2.2 Seek digital means for identifying “owners” of holds on student registration. Compare Chapter Nine.

7.2.3 Review and institute reforms in the use of course substitutions: ensure the digital archival of substitutions; identify situations where the same or similar substitutions are widespread, and encourage academic program modifications where appropriate; ensure that like students are treated alike in the matter of substituted courses for academic program requirement fulfillment.

7.2.4 Streamline the process of entering course substitutions to allow for multiple and future course substitutions, via electronic means. Assess.

7.2.5 Review and continue requirements that CSUDH students be required to connect with advisors at critical junctures or checkpoints in their university careers. Sharpen current practices, including by securing advisor signatures electronically.

7.2.6 Require advising for defined “at risk” students, especially those with GPA’s below defined thresholds. Continue and sharpen current practices.

7.2.7 Work with (and via) the Academic Senate if revised policies are needed relative to registration holds and course substitutions.

7.2.8 Include regular (perhaps annual) student interaction with the Career Center to guide the acquisition of personal, social and academic skills appropriate to career and life interests. Assess.

**Recommendation 7.3:** Seek professional advisor deployment, and faculty advisor availability, that makes it convenient for students to seek advice in the context of employment, family situation, and other competitors for university time and focus.
7.3.1 Give strong consideration to assigning UATC professional advisors to groups of “neighboring” academic programs, making them quasi-specialists in, e.g., the behavioral sciences, or STEM, or the arts & humanities. Pilot and assess this initiative. Especially as the university adds professional advisors with UATC assignments, consider – and consider again – the effectiveness of asking these “quasi specialists” to spend advising hours in a location proximate to the faculty in the programs upon which they focus. An advantage to be considered is improving dialogue between generalists (professional advisors) and specialists (faculty who know intimately their own academic programs).

7.3.2 Develop and implement a program whereby advisors are available online, via e-mail or via Skype, or via similar means, outside of 8 – 5 weekday office hours. Pilot and assess this initiative.

7.3.3 Consider a concierge approach, in which a student, dialing one number, reaches an advisor cross-trained in issues related to academic advising, financial aid, and career planning.

7.3.4 Compare the discussion of mentoring programs, found at Recommendation 6.4 in the preceding chapter.

7.3.5 Enforce GWE holds in a rich, intrusive communications environment. Assess.

Table I – 3.
Strategies, Recommendations, and Actions for Consideration from Chapter Eight, Toward Improved Advising at CSUDH: Strengthening Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strategy 8.1: Prioritize determining and hiring the right number of additional professional advisors; and train, support, lead, and deploy them well.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Recommendation 8.1: Seek strengthened leadership and support for professional advisors, in the UATC but also at the University generally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1.1 See Recommendation 6.1, above: hire (or assign) a senior leader for advising. See also items 6.1.1 to 6.1.5, in Chapter Six, concerning details of this recommendation. Let us have, at least for a period, an Advising Tsar for CSUDH.

**Recommendation 8.2:** Adopt, and follow through upon, a multi-year plan for hiring and deploying professional advisors.

8.2.1 Ask the “Dean of Advising” to propose a strong goal for improving the advisor / advisee ratio in the University Advising & Testing Center (UATC).

8.2.2 Seek opportunities to relieve professional advisors from some, or much, of the routine “mechanics” of course selection in order to free up time for bona fide student mentoring and success coaching.

**Recommendation 8.3:** Build advising plans in the colleges, which may or may not feature professional advisors – but which should feature devoting additional resources to advising.

8.3.1 Ask college deans to develop formal advising plans for their colleges, to include a strong and recurrent plan for assessment.

8.3.2 Ask the Dean of Advising to consult with college deans, and on request to supply a research-based set of suggestions / best-practices to inform the college-specific plans.

8.3.3 Ask the Dean of Advising to work with college deans and faculty to align college-specific plans with the university-wide mission and vision for advising.

8.3.4 As a part of college plan development, ask college deans to seek plans at the department / program level for advising, and for improvement in advising.

8.3.5 Invite college deans to work with the Dean of Advising to supply a set of best / recommended practices; and work to align departmental plans with the university-wide mission and vision for advising. Some colleges may choose to rely strongly on professional advisors, while others may rely instead on faculty with suitable training and time assignments. After choosing a strategy that appears to fit well with college curricula and culture, deans should be asked to estimate the costs of what they propose.
Where heavy reliance on professional advisors is chosen for a college strategy, find ways to ensure, nonetheless, strong opportunities for faculty-student contact outside of the classroom. (This simply takes note that faculty-student advising sessions would become less frequent.) Service learning, and participation in student/faculty research, constitute such opportunities. Making career plans is such an opportunity for faculty mentoring of students outside of a course-selection-focused routine advisement interaction.

With college-based and UATC plans and proposals in hand, encourage the Provost to bring a cumulated proposal to the President via the University Budget Committee, seeking needed resources. Such “needed resources” could include (a) support for faculty reassigned time to support their involvement in advisor orientation and development, and to incentivize/reward faculty who would like to commit significant professional time engaged in advising; and (b) investment in advising technology [discussed in Chapter 9].

**Recommendation 8.4:** Build plans for professional development and professional learning among professional advisors.

Create, and seek, professional growth opportunities for professional advisors. Compare item 7.1.7 in the preceding chapter.

Consider providing a professional Advising Manual (different from an e-handbook on policies) to facilitate the advising process and equip advisors with effective advising strategies.

**Recommendation 8.5:** Build plans for supporting the daily / weekly / semesterly / annual work of professional advisors

Create, and seek, professional growth opportunities for professional advisors. Compare item 7.1.7 in the preceding chapter. This echoes suggestions associated with Recommendation 7.1 in the previous chapter; see also below, item 8.5.7, and 8.5.8.

Seek in the professional literature an Advising Manual that lays out best or recommended practices for advising. Note this is different from an e-handbook: it would not be specific to CSUDH. It may be a source for material to support professional growth opportunities (as above). Provide to professional advisor, and if suitable also to faculty advisors.

Develop an e-handbook on policies and procedures for advising, for use by professional advisors and faculty both [two versions of a handbook can be developed, if suitable]. Include in a handbook best practices, including those related to effective advising for students of color, for women, for men, and for other defined groups.
8.5.4 Associate the e-handbook with an interactive web page for use by professional advisors as a teaching tool when interacting with students and faculty, and for use directly by students and faculty when seeking information and answers to questions. Include a Frequently Asked Questions page or pages on the site.

8.5.5 Ensure that communications strategies are strongly implemented, between and among professional advisors, and with students and other constituencies (including key faculty).

8.5.6 Ensure proper and effective working conditions for professional advisors, to include appropriate compensation and appropriate distribution of workloads.

8.5.7 Identify and consider ways in which professional advisors may receive meaningful steps toward professional advancement: faculty who proceed from assistant to associate and then to full professor status may provide a model.

8.5.8 Provide regular, recurrent workshops focused on acquiring the skills needed to successfully provide individualized academic advising [cf. student focus group recommendations]; provide recurrent workshops or other focused training on technicalities to include policy updates, electronic tools updates, the “fit” of particular academic majors with general education – ensuring that highly sequential majors are not delayed while breadth is achieved in the first two years; provide recurrent workshops or other focused training on “road maps” for particular majors.

8.5.9 Working with the standing committee on Advising, disseminate information to faculty and staff generally in addition to communications to professional advisors or designated advisors in academic programs. That is: keep the whole community informed. Assess.

8.6.1 Via focused discussions involving deans and faculty leaders in each college, and engaging the Academic Senate and the leadership of the faculty union, give strong consideration to explicitly placing faculty advising expectations, together with evaluations of performance, into guidelines for faculty performance that are referenced in retention, tenure, promotion, and any other faculty evaluations. Pilot and assess this initiative.
8.6.2 Consider required language in faculty job announcements relative to advising expectations.

8.6.3 Recognize / reward via faculty honors and awards the outstanding contributions to advising that particular faculty offer.

8.6.4 Strongly consider re-instituting a program whereby faculty can spend considerable time working alongside professional advisors: two-year “tours” in a CSU Sacramento model, following which faculty return to departments and act as advising leaders in major program context. Compare Appendix G and the description of the Sacramento State approach. This program was previously in place at CSUDH (some years ago, before falling to budget cuts). Pilot and assess this initiative.

8.6.5 Strongly consider hiring selected part-time faculty to spend an appropriate portion of their time engaged in advising (e.g., a 0.2 or a 0.1 assignment in addition to the other teaching work for which they are hired). Pilot and assess this initiative.

8.6.6 Build an expectation and readiness for all of these initiatives / expectations into the college advising plans referenced above.

8.6.7 Offer specific professional development in advising to all full-time faculty, especially in context of RTP and other evaluations.

8.6.8 Offer specific professional development in advising to part-time faculty who are hired as recommended above.

8.6.9 Set appropriate goals for faculty who are willing to take this “track” of professional development; use judicious incentives to encourage faculty to take training.

8.6.10 Make faculty advising a part of a new faculty orientation effort that extends across several weeks or months. Pilot and assess this initiative.

8.6.11 Utilize faculty who have completed a “tour” in the Advising Center [cf. item 8.6.4 above] to deliver peer / colleague professional development and orientation. Pilot and assess this initiative.

Recommendation 8.7: Seek models for strengthening the faculty role in advising from sister CSU campuses, from best-practice organizations, from other universities.
8.7.1 Reach out to the Chancellor’s Office for support. Seek financial and other support both from top system leaders, and from Academic Affairs staff in the Office of the Chancellor. Compare recommendations relative to an annual advising conference in Chapter 8.

8.7.2 Seek from the Education Advisory Board, from the AAC&U, and from other organizations, models of best practices in encouraging faculty engagement in advising.

Table I – 4.
Strategies, Recommendations, and Actions for Consideration from
Chapter Nine, Toward Improved Advising at CSUDH:
Arming Advisors with Reliable, Easy-to-Access Information and Analyses

100 Strategy 9.1: Engage division heads and senior dean-level administrators, as appropriate, to clarify policies and procedures as needed. Work with Information Technology to ensure the accurate return of current policy.

101 Recommendation 9.1: Improve and ensure the currency of information delivered via the campus general web site.

102 9.1.1 Purge “historic” (outdated) information from the web site, on the important assumption that updated and accurate information is available to replace it.
9.1.2 Ensure that the most relevant information is the first to appear on web searches.
   Specifically:
   a. Make the UATC site the first to appear.
   b. Bring GWAR information up early in web searches.
   c. Bring GWE test and registration information up early in web searches.

9.1.3 Make all relevant forms for advising readily available on the web.

**Recommendation 9.2:** Create a central repository on the CSUDH web site to house policies pertaining to advising, and to other topics. Ensure its accuracy and currency.

**Strategy 9.2:** Seek systemic improvements in modern information tools for effective advising, led by the Division of Information Technology.

**Recommendation 9.3:** Improve the accuracy and completeness of advice given – and seek a higher-order focus for all advisors at CSUDH.

9.3.1 For newly-admitted students, prioritize decreasing time from admission to posting of transcripts, in order to support and improve the accuracy and completeness of advisors’ interactions with incoming students.

9.3.2 Develop a user-friendly advising documentation system.

9.3.3 Ensure reliable data on advisor screens; seek calculated values capability as early as feasible.

**Recommendation 9.4:** Seek automated tools that reduce advisor and student time spent creating clear paths to the degree.

9.3.1 Seek automated tools that reduce advisor and student time spent creating clear paths to the degree. The Division of Information Technology anticipates implementing PeopleSoft Course Planner to allow students to create a multi-year plan of classes. An advantage is that this tool is functionally fully-integrated within both PeopleSoft Advisor and Student Centers.

**Recommendation 9.5:** Identify at-risk students as early as possible, and permit early intervention.

9.5.1 Consider wider use of the Hobson’s tool, now being used by Athletics. The tool permits early alert tracking and risk assessment.
The Division of Information Technology has joined an Education Advisory Board (EAB) Collaborative, and will be implementing their predictive analytics and advisor dashboard solution. This will identify students who are at-risk their chosen majors, and clearly prioritize students needing intervention. It should also support, where appropriate, informing students about alternative majors that might be better matches for students’ skills and academic / career goals.

Recommendation 9.6: Provide an electronic catalog.

The Division of Information Technology is at work on this. Smart Catalog is a tool of interest. Resource / Schedule 25 is a promising tool for fulfilling related class scheduling needs.
Chapter Two

Rationale for This Work: Academic Advising and Student Success

Summary. This chapter offers context and rationales for the work of the Advising Task Force. Notably, it identifies key indicators of the concern for student success that this university demonstrates; recognizes the close relationship between strong advising and student success; and employs work by Prof. Joe Cuseo to outline the empirical evidence for links between strong advising and student success. The chapter concludes with a definition of advising; a first look at advisor roles; and an outline of some general strategies for developing and maintaining strong and effective advising at any university.

I. Introduction.

California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) is a campus with many strengths. Foremost, perhaps, is the widespread, palpable, commitment to mission, to serving the community into which this university was intentionally placed. Faculty often express this commitment; not less, staff express this commitment; senior leaders speak movingly about the why of CSU Dominguez Hills. Twinned with that commitment to mission is a very-frequently expressed satisfaction with being a part of this community – comments about that again are heard from faculty, staff, students, administrators, and from community supporters.

Indicators of Success for This University. Indicators of success, and for commitment to success, for this university are easily found on the campus and in the community. These indicia include energetic teaching and deep learning, successful alumni, and acclaimed scholarly and creative activity. External evaluations also attest to success, and commitment to success.

---

2 The story of the campus founding, and of its placement in Carson, CA as a Trustees’ response to urban unrest and the urgent need to serve communities in south-central Los Angeles, is well told by Donald R. Gerth (2010), The People’s University: A History of the California State University (Berkeley Public Policy Press), pp. 154-158.
• The *Washington Monthly* in 2012 ranked CSUDH fifth in the nation among Master’s degree-granting institutions – a ranking that took social mobility (for students), research, and service as high goals. This university ranked third in the nation when comparing *predicted* undergraduate graduation rate to actual – meaning that, given preparation deficits among our entering students, CSUDH over-achieved.³

• *Time* magazine sought to set data and analysis to criteria for postsecondary education institutional success, in April 2014.⁴ Impressively, among 2,500 American universities rated, CSUDH ranked 29th in the nation – ahead of Harvard University, for example, which ranked #31. Other California State University campuses also ranked high. It is a tribute to the importance of mission, and to success with student populations that too-frequently find it challenging to complete their degree programs.

• The Western Association of Schools and Colleges, this university’s influential regional accreditor, wrote to then-President Mildred Garcia in June 2008, saying in part:⁵

> The EER site team reported a number of aspects of the institution’s work that warranted commendation. Perhaps the most evident was the dedication of the faculty to the success of each member of the very diverse student population. This was evidenced in part by the innovative academic support programs, essential in view of the high percentage of students requiring remedial attention. The team also noted that, in spite of the transitions in key leadership positions immediately following the CPR visit, the self-study leadership team revealed sufficient depth and focus to carry forward the EER report without loss of effectiveness. These sustained efforts reinforced the team’s perception that many of the activities pertaining to student learning and success were in fact embedded into the institution’s culture rather than being recent or temporary in character.

---


Numerous specialized accreditors also have found academic programs at this university to be of high quality. Thirteen such specialized accreditations are listed on the university's web site.\(^6\)

Thoughtful observers recognize that these evident strengths are accompanied by gross indicators for student persistence and graduation that are lower than anybody desires. To cite one widely-reported and –compared indicator, the CSUDH six-year graduation rate (using IPEDS conventions) for first-time freshmen who entered in Fall 2007 stood at 29.4% in Fall 2013.\(^7\)

II. Why advising?

In a context of high institutional priority upon enhancing student success and improving reported rates of student graduation, why should we pursue advising? Of course, one answer is to respond to institutional strategic priorities – full stop. But better, perhaps deeper, answers can be found on two levels.

First we can look to items that, by wide consensus in American higher education, contribute directly to student retention and graduation. These are High Impact Practices, the usual recitation of which includes ten items, as shown in Figure II -1. Our key point is this: Well-trained and well-deployed academic advisors can surely promote in general a student’s academic and social integration, and can play a vital role in encouraging students to participate in, understand the importance of, and actively choose courses that feature high impact practices.

In turn, these high impact practices are grounded in theory about student retention and graduation, one of the important progenitors of which is Vincent Tinto who initially, in 1975, argued for the importance of academic integration of the undergraduate student, and as well of the student’s social integration to campus life, and campus relationships.\(^8\)

---


\(^7\) See http://www4.csudh.edu/irap/ipeds/retentionipeds/index, retrieved April 6, 2014.

High Impact Practices: George Kuh’s Listing

1. First-Year Seminars and Experiences.
3. Learning Communities.
5. Collaborative Assignments and Projects.
6. Undergraduate Research.
8. Service Learning, Community-Based Learning.
9. Internships.

Empirical Relationships Between Student Advisement and Student Retention. We may sharpen this argument about “why advising” with arguments that the Task Force finds persuasive, about empirical relationships between student advisement and student retention. These are principally second-order empirically-demonstrated relationships; but as will be seen, they amount to evidence-based rationales for a focus on student advisement and student retention. We have five strong, even compelling, associations to consider.

First: Good Academic Advising Increases Student Satisfaction. There is a well-established empirical relationship between students’ level of satisfaction with the postsecondary institution they are attending and their rate of retention at that institution. As Cuseo puts it, it is reasonable to conclude that institutional efforts that are intentionally designed to improve student satisfaction with academic advising should serve to improve students’ level of college satisfaction and, in turn, their retention to degree completion.

---


Second: Effective Advising Supports Improved Educational and Career Planning. Cuseo outlines retention research that suggests that student commitment to educational and career goals is perhaps the strongest factor associated with student persistence to degree completion. Cuseo argues:

Thus, effective advising can exert appreciable impact on student retention through its salutary influence on students’ educational and career planning and decision-making. The need for student support in the academic planning and decision-making process is highlighted by research findings ....

Viewed collectively, the research ... points directly to the conclusion that students need support from knowledgeable academic advisors to engage in effective educational planning and decision-making, and if this support is received, they will more likely persist to degree graduation.

Third, Effective Advising Enhances a Student’s Ability to Utilize Campus Support Services. Research clearly suggests that there is a positive relationship between utilization of campus-support services and persistence to program or degree completion, according to Cuseo. He makes a crucial point:

The ... findings strongly suggest that institutions should deliver academic support *intrusively* – by *initiating* contact with students and aggressively bringing support services to *them*, rather than offering services *passively* and *hoping* that students will come and take advantage of them on their own accord. *Academic* advisors are in the ideal position to “intrusively” connect students with academic support professionals ....

Fourth, Strong Faculty / Student Advising Relationships Facilitate Student Success. Cuseo quotes the research, including this from Tinto (1987):

Institutions with low rates of student retention are those in which students generally report low rates of student-faculty contact. Conversely, institutions with high rates of retention are most frequently those which are marked by relatively high rates of such interactions.

Cuseo goes on relative to this point:

One way the colleges and universities may be able to positively influence the extent and quality of student-faculty contact is through high-quality academic advisement – delivered by faculty through out-of-class interaction with students.

---

12 Ibid., 6.
13 Ibid., 7.
14 Ibid., 8 [italics in original].
16 Ibid., p. 9.
Fifth, Mentoring Contributes to Student Retention and Success. Cuseo argues as follows:17

The availability of exemplary, caring role models is valuable for all students, but may be especially critical to the retention and success of underrepresented first-generation college students who do not have college role models at home. . . . .

Research from the perspective of students, as advisees, repeatedly points to the conclusion that they value most highly academic advisors who serve as mentors....

We conclude that CSUDH should recommit to providing its students with academic advising of the highest quality, in order to promote student retention and degree completion.

III. Advising Definition. The Nature of High Quality in Academic Advising

Because practitioners recognize that different advising practices are appropriate for different types of institutions, there is no universally accepted definition of academic advising. After careful consideration, the Task Force recommends the following conception of academic advising at CSUDH.

*Academic advising at California State University, Dominguez Hills involves a network of interactive relationships in which students work intentionally with professional, faculty and peer advisors*

- to integrate themselves into the university as an academic institution and a community;
- to identify their specific interests and needs;
- to make informed decisions regarding academic and co-curricular programs;
- to access resources necessary to achieve academic, personal and professional goals; and
- to prepare for life after graduation.

We note that advising is much more than a set of administrative functions. That is, advising is not, principally, obtaining a signature to enroll for classes, not a conference held once per term, not a paper relationship, not a “thing” that is supplementary but not integral to the educational process. Advisor is also not simply synonymous with faculty member.

Suitably, our definition focuses on students who work intentionally. Yet the other side to the relationship, the advisor side in the advisor – student dyad, bears explication as well. We identify advisors as agents, in three dimensions.18

1. **Advisors are humanizing agents:** interacting with students outside of the classroom, advisors can take a less formal, and where staffing permits a more frequent and more continuous basis, than course instructors. Whereas students’ course instructors normally vary from term to term, an academic advisor may be an institutional representative with whom each student can have continuous contact and an ongoing relationship that may endure throughout the college experience – and sometimes longer than that. Advisors thus may be well positioned to develop personal relationships with students, and thus to serve as humanizing agents for institutions that may otherwise seem to students to be large and impersonal. In the ideal, advisors know advisees by name, understand advisees’ interests, aptitudes and values, and take particular interest in students’ personal experiences, progress, and development.

2. **Advisors are counseling/mentoring agents:** an advisor is an experienced guide who helps students navigate the bureaucratic maze of institutional policies and administrative protocol, and a referral agent who directs and connects students to campus support services that best serve their needs. As well, advisors advocate for students, especially vis-à-vis policies and procedures that, woodenly enforced, may have consequences antithetical to student success in retention and graduation, and in careers and other facets of life after graduation.

3. **Advisors are educational/instructional agents:** an advisor can equip students with specific strategies for success, and can bring integration and coherence to the students’ university experiences – by promoting students’ appreciation of the university mission, the university curriculum (for example, the purpose of general education), and the co-curriculum, meaning the educational value of experiential learning outside of the classroom.

Fulfilling these expectations well amounts to high-quality academic advising. Later in this report, we will discuss both general strategies for enhancing the quality of academic advising, and specific recommendations for consideration. However even at this early juncture of our narrative, we can make the general strategies apparent. They include:

i. Providing strong incentives and rewards for advisors to engage in high-quality advising;

j. Strengthening advisor orientation, training, and development, and delivering them as essential components of this university’s faculty/staff development program;

k. Assessing and evaluating the quality of academic advisement;

   a. Maintaining advisee-to-advisor ratios that are small enough to enable delivery of personalized advising;

   b. Providing strong incentives for students to meet regularly with their advisors;

   c. Identifying highly effective advisors and positioning them at the start of the college experience to work with first-year students;

   d. Including advising effectiveness as one criterion for recruiting new faculty; and

---

e. Supporting advisors with clear policy and procedures, strong communications, effective web-enabled approaches, and other tools for success.
Chapter Three

Context and Background:

The CSU Dominguez Hills Context for Academic Advising; and
The CSU Dominguez Hills Experience in Academic Advising

Summary. Student success matters at this university. In Chapter Two we provided evidence for that, and made the essential argument that high-quality advisement is the handmaiden of student retention and success. In this chapter, we begin with two items that further undergird this study: these are first, the relationship of advising to the university’s strategic plan, and second, the president’s charge that established the Task Force and set goals for our work. We continue with our review of the current organization and priority of advisement at CSUDH, and with a general analysis of this university’s situation vis-à-vis advising, summarized in a SWOT analysis. This sets the stage for Chapter Four, What We Heard, in which the community offers clear support and general directions for this university to follow as it recommits to advising as a tool for promoting student retention and success.

I. The Place of Advising Among CSU Dominguez Hills Priorities.

The new president of California State University, Dominguez Hills, Dr. Willie J. Hagan, has made public his intention to have his presidency judged on the success of a high goal: to greatly improve rates of student retention, and rates of timely graduation with a high-quality degree. However, it must be said that such goals are not surprising at this campus. For evidence, we need only consider the excerpts from our most recent strategic plan, set forth in the accompanying Figure III - 1. Note that these goals are for the period 2010-2015, and were adopted prior to the new president’s arrival. The key point is that this university has long sought to serve with distinction a population of students that frequently

19 Dr. Hagan was named the 10th permanent president of California State University, Dominguez Hills in June, 2013.
arrive with educational deficits and first-in-family status relative to college-going – and such a population has a high propensity to drop out.\textsuperscript{20}

Figure III - 1 excerpts portions of the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan that bear upon advising, and seek improved advising processes and outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure III – 1. Portions of the California State University, Dominguez Hills Strategic Plan That Contemplate Improved Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twelve bulleted items under the heading \textit{Moving Forward} immediately follow a statement of \textit{Core Values} in the most recent strategic plan.\textsuperscript{21} Three of these bulleted items are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Create</strong> a clear pathway for students from admissions to graduation and career, while providing step-by-step guidance along the way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Engage</strong> students to reach their full potential by challenging them while supporting them, by recognizing their strengths while building new ones, and by providing a nurturing and safe environment to pursue their aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Support</strong> student success outside the classroom through career development, unique research and internship opportunities, and a dynamic Student Life experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And, among the eight bulleted initiatives associated with Goal 2, we find:\textsuperscript{22}

• Strengthen and enhance student career decision-making and job/graduate school attainment. |
• Enhance academic support for underserved students. |
• Enhance academic advising to increase student success. |

Evidently, the Task Force focus on advising is more than merely consonant with the university’s strategic directions: it is key to them.

\textsuperscript{20} The Task Force is aware, of course, that the 2010-2015 strategic plan is undergoing revisions as of Spring 2014. We are sure that the priority for student success will continue to be prominent in any revised document.  
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 17.
II. The Genesis of This work: the Charge of the Task Force; the Task Force Work Plan

Pursuing, then, both the university’s formal strategic plan and his own high goals for student success, President Hagan convened the Task Force for a first time on August 5, 2013. The essential Task Force mission was to evaluate and chart directions for renewal and improvements in supporting students through advising on their way to a CSUDH baccalaureate degree. Charting the work in advising that we do now was a part of this work. Listening with intensity and care was a part of this work. And obtaining best practice advice as a means for identifying possible improvements was a part of this work.

In listening to the community,

- The President named knowledgeable persons and campus advising leaders as immediate members of the Task Force;
- The Task Force:
  - Received evaluations of the state of academic advising at the university via special, focused discussion sessions convened by Task Force co-chair Clare Weber, including these:
    - Deans and their respective department chairs in separate discussions held for each of these colleges: Arts & Humanities; Business Administration & Public Policy; Education; Health, Human Services & Nursing; Natural & Behavioral Sciences;
    - Professional advisors at CSUDH (in one session, including both UATC advisors and professional advisors with college assignments).
  - Received community input via
    - A survey of full-time faculty, led by Dr. Keisha Paxton, a Task Force member;
    - Presentations and discussions at the Academic Senate;
    - A well-attended Open Hearing on March 10, 2014.
  - Received the considered views of students, via student focus groups that advanced Sociology students convened under the general direction of Dr. Clare Weber.

In seeking best practices for advising that may provide models for CSUDH, the Task Force:

- Spent most of the day on September 6, 2013 with a talented senior administrator at California State University, Sacramento – Dr. Lori Varlotta, Senior Vice President for Planning, Enrollment Management & Student Affairs;
- Spent the afternoon of March 13, 2014 in a presentation designed especially for CSUDH, delivered live via the Internet by Education Advisory Board (EAB)23 staff;
- Engaged as a consultant a national leader in the scholarship, Dr. Joe Cuseo.

---

23 EAB is a Washington D.C.-based best-practices member organization. Our thanks are due to Dr. Sue Borrego, Task Force member and Vice President, Enrollment Management & Student Affairs, for arranging both the Dr. Lori Varlotta and the EAB interactions.
In charting the advising we do now at CSUDH,

- The Task Force relied principally on members of the Task Force whose professional assignments focus on advising, plus the narrative summary found in Appendix B authored by Dr. Clare Weber.

III. Outline of Advising at California State University, Dominguez Hills, as of Fall 2013.  

In broad consonance with other universities in the United States, CSUDH lodges some advising responsibilities with faculty, and other advising responsibilities with professional advisors. While faculty are located, suitably and unsurprisingly, in department and academic program contexts and physical locations, non-faculty advisors have various contexts and physical locations on the campus. The brief overview of advising contexts and locations that follows is draws upon a lengthier and more nuanced review found in Appendix B, together with an interesting graphical lay-out of advising at CSUDH in Appendix C, which the interested reader is encouraged to access.

It may be that advising is most urgently provided to lower-division students in one of the CSUDH initiatives that target students thought to be in special need of support. These include athletes, who receive special and focused advising. These include students in the “Bridge” program, in EOPS, in Encounter to Excellence (ETE), and in the Student Support Services TRIO program. These are all intrusive advising programs, where the initiative for an encounter between student and advisor is taken by the advisor, not by the student. Especially in the instances of Bridge, EOPS, ETE, and TRIO, these are developmental advising programs wherein key goals are less focused on course registration and degree requirements completion than on offering support, guidance and encouragement to students who might otherwise have a high propensity to drop out. Specially-funded programs, using grants from the Federal government, these are programs with very advantageous advisee – advisor ratios. And, these are well-assessed advising programs that can demonstrate remarkable success. We will review their success subsequently in this report, in Chapter Four.

First-time Freshman students who are not participants in one of the special programs outlined above also receive mandatory advising in their first year. It typically begins with New Student Orientation (NSO) and an encounter there with a University Advising and Testing Center (UATC) professional advisor. The multiple approaches to these students are outlined in Appendix B, and a commendable set of options is available to students for posing questions and receiving answers, together with a PeopleSoft-based system of recording the academic advising content of encounters. We may note that this advising is surely not intrusive in nature; that developmental approaches take at best second place to solving immediate problems of term registration, degree requirement completion, and other academic milestone attainments.

It may be that advising is least urgently provided to upper-division transfer students who receive no mandatory advising delivered by the UATC, but instead are expected to work with college-based advising programs that are described in Appendix B. College-based Student Service Centers advise students on courses in the major, roadmaps, academic progress and probation, course substitutions and

\[24\] For a more detailed exposition, please see Appendix B.
transfer courses. They work closely with departments and, in some cases, may provide the bulk of the advising for a department. Students who have settled on a major—a category that includes some students in the lower division (at work on the first 60 semester units toward a baccalaureate degree that typically requires 120) and nearly all students in the upper division (both upper division transfers from community colleges and “native” students who began at CSUDH as first-time Freshmen)—are expected to take advantage of the college-based Student Service Centers. The same students, however, are also expected to seek and receive advising from faculty.

Both full- and part-time faculty advise students concerning their academic progress within the particular courses that those faculty offer, of course. Full time faculty principally focus on progress in the major, advising students on course selections within the major, roadmaps to a baccalaureate degree within the major, academic progress toward the degree, and on probation where progress is poor. Full time faculty also handle course substitutions (where it is determined that course A can take the place of the Catalog-mandated required course B for the major), transfer courses and how they count toward the major (whether fulfilling requirements, or simply unit mandates as free electives within the major), together with advising about careers and professions to which students may aspire on the basis of having completed a degree major. A problem for this university is the relative paucity of full-time faculty. As of Fall 2012, there were 267 (38.1%) full time faculty at CSUDH compared to 434 (61.9%) part time faculty. This ratio varies by department.

IV. Overview of Advising for Entering Students at CSUDH.

Figure III – 2 follows below. It means to set out in a convenient graphic the advising that undergraduates either probably, or mandatorily, experience at CSUDH. It can usefully be read in conjunction with Appendix 3-2, where we offer a prose road map to advising, meant to supplement the graphical display. Data shown are from Fall 2013.25

- The advising story is varied for first-time freshmen, based on whether they enter a specially-defined group such as EOP or Bridge. In a word, students in specially-defined groups receive much more advising attention than do first-time freshmen who are not placed in such a group.

- A simpler story is told for the other large group of new entrants to our university, upper-division transfers. Again in a word, they receive much less attention than first-time freshmen in any category.

- We also show lower-division, non-freshman transfers and graphically indicate the advising attention they receive. It will be noted that such students are few at CSUDH, as they are few at every California State University regional campus. We admit a handful of athletes in this status.

Let us imagine that advisement of the following sort is best.

- It is mandatory and it is frequent.
- It is developmental in the sense of explicit and energetic goals for students’ personal and academic engagement and learning how to learn.

---

25 Thanks are due to Dr. Mitch Maki for creating this graphical display.
✓ It is intrusive in the sense that the initiative for an advising encounter is taken by the advisor and not by the student.

So, who gets this best advisement?

Figure III – 2 teaches that it is first-time freshmen in a special program. That includes athletes, who are featured in Figures III – 3, and III – 4. To foreshadow our argument in Chapter Seven, this sort of advisement “works.” (There is no magic in defining what works, by the way: we mean that students persist (do not drop out), and graduate, at rates that remarkably exceed those posted by students who are not afforded the treatment of “best” advisement.)
## Figure III – 2
Advising for First-Time Freshmen Entering CSU, Dominguez Hills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FIRST TIME FROSH (1556)</th>
<th>Summer Prior to Enrollment</th>
<th>First Year Encounters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mandatory Advising</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Non Developmental (308)</td>
<td>New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td><strong>Mandatory</strong> Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-Mandatory</strong> Second Semester Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Developmental Non-Summer Bridge (1248)</td>
<td>Summer Bridge experience (Bridge advising)</td>
<td><strong>Ongoing Bridge Advising</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Advising due to probation hold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EOP / Summer Bridge / ETE (1248)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Athletes (39)</td>
<td>Athletic Advising New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td><strong>Mandatory</strong> Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-Mandatory</strong> Second Semester Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Athletic Advising</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Veterans (rare)</td>
<td>• Veterans Office Benefits Counseling: informal advisement New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td><strong>Mandatory</strong> Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-Mandatory</strong> Second Semester Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Departmental advising and holds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Veterans Office Benefits Counseling – informal advisement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Advising due to probation hold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>International Advisor</td>
<td><strong>Mandatory</strong> Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-Mandatory</strong> Second Semester Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Departmental advising and holds</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>- Advising due to probation hold</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student Support Serv</td>
<td>• Possible Summer Bridge experience New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td><strong>Mandatory</strong> Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>-Mandatory</strong> Second Semester Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure III – 2 – *continued*

Advising for First-Time Freshmen Entering CSU, Dominguez Hills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Year; Third Year; Beyond Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST TIME FROSH (1556)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Advising</th>
<th>Possible Advising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In years two and three for these first-time Freshmen, only two categories of students receive mandatory advising:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Athletes</em> receive mandatory advising from Athletic Advising; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>International Students</em> receive mandatory advising from their International Advisor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Veterans</em> may receive informal advisement focused on benefits counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All categories of students may experience departmental advising, or advising due to a Probation hold. In fact, checking in with a department / major advisor is typical, of course. Yet practices vary; capacities vary; incentives vary; expertise varies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond year three,
• *students on probation* are directed to a mandatory STEPS workshop.

Beyond year three,
• for *all students*, a last mandatory encounter is a Graduation Check

Beyond year three,
• for *all students*, much depends on the energy, capacity, expertise of degree-major faculty.

The *Continuation of Figure III– 2* [above, Line 9] could have – perhaps with some drama – shown a series of empty boxes for mandatory advising. Instead, we have summarized the few mandatory advising sessions that a handful of students in special categories experience. Generally, if you are not an athlete (= 39 persons), not an international student (unknown number, but exceptionally few in Fall 2013), and not on probation, your next required advising encounter depends upon the advising offered by the faculty in your degree major / department. It may well be that your next required advising encounter is at graduation check.

Find yourself in academic trouble – see an advisor. Otherwise, check in with college or department advisors.

In *Figure III –3*, we show the first year (at CSUDH) experience for lower division transfers. Most lower division, non-Freshman transfers are athletes: 21 out of 28. They get advising. They experience an
Athletic New Student Orientation in their summer prior to enrollment; and they may experience a “regular” New Student Orientation.

For this category of student, the second and third and subsequent years are the same as shown above for persons who arrived as first-time Freshman. The quality of the advising experience exquisitely depends upon faculty.

Although we do not show it graphically, the picture does not change beyond athletes’ first year at CSUDH. Beyond year three, students on probation are directed to a mandatory STEPS workshop. Beyond year three, for all students, a last mandatory encounter is a Graduation Check.

### Figure III – 3

**Advising for Lower Division Transfers (not Freshmen) at CSU Dominguez Hills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer Prior to Enrollment</th>
<th>First Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LOWER DIVISION TRANSFERS [not Freshmen] (28)</td>
<td>Mandatory Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Athletes (21)</td>
<td>Athletic NSO New Student Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>• Veterans Office Benefits Counseling: informal advisement New Student Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In **Figure III -4**, we show the advising experience for upper division transfers – which, given the mission of this university, amounted to a substantial 2604 students in 2012-2013. Most fall into the “Fully Admissible” row in Figure III – 4 (i.e., see line 14 in Figure III – 4). They don’t get much in the way of advising that is not delivered by faculty. They may, but are not required to, attend New Student Orientation (NSO) – but at a dollar cost they must bear. Unsurprisingly, few take in the NSO. Beyond that, they receive the advising treatment shown above in Figure III – 2 Continued, at Line 9. As we note in that Figure, checking in with a department / major advisor is typical, of course. Yet when it comes to faculty advising in departmental contexts, practices vary; capacities vary; incentives vary; expertise varies.
### Figure III – 4

**Advising for Upper Division Transfers Entering CSU, Dominguez Hills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13</th>
<th>UPPER DIVISION TRANSFERS (2604)</th>
<th>Summer Prior to Enrollment</th>
<th>First Transfer Year (Typically, at or near Junior status)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fully Admissible</td>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Athletes (33)</td>
<td>Athletic NSO</td>
<td>Athletic Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>• Departmental advising and holds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advising due to probation hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>• Veterans Office Benefits Counseling: informal advisement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>International Advisor</td>
<td>International Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deep reliance on faculty to advise these students is typical in American universities, of course. For CSUDH, the Task Force envisions strategies and initiatives to support faculty in this task.

Recommendations follow in Chapter 8, and are especially focused at Recommendations 8.6 and 8.7.
Chapter Four

CSUDH Successes in the Bridge Initiative

I. The Essential Program – Rationale; Description; Success Indicators.

In order to improve student success, *Encuentro Hacia El Exito (Encounter to Excellence)* was developed with one main component—the **Two-Year Bridge Initiative**. The Bridge Initiative was uniquely designed to solve the two significant problems: Academically underprepared students who qualify for admittance to CSU Dominguez Hills and 2) an oversubscribed student success services infrastructure. *Encuentro Hacia el Exito* – Encounter to Excellence has been recognized and rewarded for its unique and progressive practices for incoming freshmen. *Encuentro Hacia el Exito* – Encounter to Excellence is modeled on the highly successful best practices such as *Puente*[^26] and *Enlace*[^27] and creates an overarching structure that includes pre-college preparation and a cohort model to assist students in becoming involved in university and community life. The interdisciplinary approach provides a focused, sustained, and engaging learning environment for students.

The Puente model and approach provides students with individual, culturally competent, academic and career counseling, in partnership with faculty, administration, and staff. From 1996 to 2000, an average of 80% of Puente community college students completed their pre-transfer-level English class compared to 51% of non-Puente students, and 68% completed the transfer-level class as compared to 54% of non-Puente students.[^28] Another model investigated was Evergreen Valley College’s *Enlace* Program, which received the 2007 *Excelencia in Education Award*.

![Puente Model and Approach](http://www.puente.net/programs/)

"Unlike most programs in existence when Puente started, the Project’s programs are predicated on the idea that if students are provided with an academic program that is engaging and respectful of their culture, supported by their local community, the students will succeed in an academically accelerated, as opposed to remedial, environment."

*Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education (2002)*

[^26]: http://www.puente.net/programs/
[^27]: http://www.evc.edu/enlace/
[^28]: http://www.pathwaystocollege.net/webarticles/pdf/Puente.pdf
**Enlace** is an academic program supported by counseling, tutoring, community mentoring, and student organizations, serving underrepresented Latino students of San Jose and nearby communities. To that end, *Encuentro Hacia el Exito* – Encounter to Excellence has established a culturally congruent foundation on which CSUDH has organized and stabilized its developmental education strategies.

The program is built on **five key strategies:**

**Strategy 1: Summer Bridge Academy.** Research has shown that deliberate transition programs or Bridge experiences prepare students to engage actively with and meet the challenges of university life.\(^{29}\) The Bridge Academy’s cohort is assembled each May, after the university has received all incoming freshmen’s Entry Level Mathematics and English Placement test scores. The students and their families receive letters and engaging postcards describing the Academy. Follow up phone calls are made to the students and parents to encourage participation and to begin the personal relationship building, an essential component in student success.

The Bridge Academy provides pre-college preparation for first year students in the summer before their fall enrollment. The goal of this summer coursework is to introduce students to the academic demands as well as some practice in the basics before the start of their formal college career. Students also attend New Student Orientation (NSO) where they meet faculty and staff, receive the name of their advisor, and learn more about the smaller learning community which they will be a part, and register for Fall classes.

During the summer, students take credit-bearing courses in Math 003 and 009 and English 088 and 099. General education courses to be taken in the Fall are pre-selected by advisors and designed around math and English courses completed in the summer. In addition to pre-college coursework, the summer experience provides students with college readiness training in a number of areas, including study skills, time management, financial literacy, campus and community life, and career exploration. During the summer, students also meet with academic advisors, personal counselors, and a variety of campus professionals who introduce them to a wide range of resources available at CSUDH to help ensure a successful college experience. Lastly, during the summer students develop a sense of self in the academic community, gain the ability to navigate the campus system, and learn about the resources that will help them succeed. Summer Bridge serves as a vital component.

**Strategy 2: Supplemental Instruction.** Many colleges and universities that offer a summer experience do not continue with complementary programs throughout the academic year.\(^{30}\) With the initial support

---

\(^{29}\) The proposal development team looked at a minimum of ten summer bridge programs bridging freshman entry four-year institutions. Two in the area, UC Riverside (www.summerbridge.ucr.edu) & CSU Long Beach (www.csulb.edu/summerbridge), will serve as supportive guides during our initial development phase.

of a Title V grant and now funded by the institution, CSUDH intentionally offers a two-year program. Supplemental Instruction (SI) is one of the main pillars of the program’s success. SI is the single most well documented intervention available for improving academic performance of under-prepared students.\textsuperscript{31} SI focuses on content issues as well as learning process habits, contributing to the students’ overall learning improvement as well as decreasing their sense of isolation. SI requires an active role in providing materials for an SI session, with an experienced SI Leader, usually a student who has successfully completed the course and takes responsibility for structuring the session.\textsuperscript{32} SI leaders are trained to incorporate a number of collaborative review techniques to help students learn course material within a safe and familiar setting.\textsuperscript{33} In this way, SI programs avoid the ‘remedial stigma’ often attached to traditional academic assistance programs. SI is open to all students in the targeted course. SI is typically attached to high-risk courses that serve first and second-year students.\textsuperscript{34} During the summer, students are grouped into smaller learning cohorts of 30-35 based on their success in the summer. Their respective scores in Math and English are reviewed, and cohorts are designed around the level of math and English they are prepared for after the intense summer. In their cohorts, students experience a series of selected general education courses that balance and support the next level of math and English courses. All students are enrolled in twelve units and they travel as cohorts to math, English and two pre-selected general education courses. Summer Bridge and the corresponding cohorts are used to ensure that few students fail to progress. Performance in Math and English are evaluated to assess whether gains made during the summer result in favorable outcomes in the fall.

Research suggests that first-generation educated students, particularly those from underrepresented minority groups, have increased academic success, as measured by remediation completion rates, “good standing” or grade point sensitive metrics, and persistence rates through their second year, if they, and in some cases their families, are supported by a web of interlocking services. It is also very important to connect students to the campus community in intentional and culturally congruent ways. To this end, the remaining strategies represent an expansion and deepening of services to ensure long-term success.

**Strategy 3: Student Progress Tracking.** To address what we perceived as an “oversubscribed” student support structure that does not address the needs of a majority-first generation education student population, Enrollment Management & Student Affairs leadership at the university created the T\textsuperscript{3} System (Transition, Tracking, and Triage) that allows us to proactively diagnose and address problems early and provide support and clear pathways for students. One of the major challenges with students who are first in their families to attend the university is that many struggle in developmental English and math and wait too long before they seek help, thereby diminishing the likelihood that they will succeed in academic terms. The T\textsuperscript{3} System is an educational support network that allows all stakeholders—

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{31} Boylan, H., Bonham, White, George. (2000). Eval. of College Reading & Study Strategies Programs. In *Handbook of College Reading and Study Strategy Research* (pp. 365-402.) NJ.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Ashwin, P. (2003). Peer support: Relations between context, process, and outcomes for the students who are supported. *Instructional Science*, 31, 159-173.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} Hensen, K. & Shelley. 2008 Impact of SI. *Journal of College Student Development* 44: 250-59.
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Supplemental Instruction (SI): Review of Research Concerning the Effectiveness of SI. National Center for SI, Univ of Missouri-KC, Center for Academic Development. Retrieved 5/09/09. 
  \url{http://www.nade.net/documents/Articles/SupplementalInstruction.htm}
\end{itemize}
students, SI leaders, faculty, academic advisors and peer mentors—to have immediate access to one another in order to provide student tracking and early warning. Once students are identified and red flags are raised, a series of interventions are put in motion.

**Strategy 4: Intrusive Advising.** While *Encuentro Hacia el Exito*—Encounter to Excellence employs a variety of advising strategies depending on each individual student’s needs, the primary advising strategy used by all advisors is Intrusive Advising. Intrusive Advising was pioneered by Robert Glennan and colleagues in the seventies and is also discussed as "Proactive Advising." In this model, the professional advisors are trained to take the initiative. Advisors do not wait for students to come forward to ask for help but insist that students make frequent appointments throughout the year to check on their progress, identify crisis situations, offer options, make referrals, and motivate students toward academic success. In their efforts to apply the Intrusive Advising model to their work with students, advisors demonstrate active concern with the students’ academic preparation and success and a willingness to assist them in exploring services and programs that can improve their skills and motivate them to complete their degree. Advisors also take an interest in them personally and approach students with an open and caring attitude. This ethic of care helps to establish rapport and build trust between the student and advisor and improves the likelihood that students will seek guidance and support from their advisor and others, when needed.

Students are required to meet with their advisor at least twice each semester for a one-on-one meeting where a variety of topics are discussed. The purpose of these meetings is for advisors to both collect information from the student to determine where additional guidance or referral may be needed, and to disseminate important information about deadlines, campus policies, campus events, etc. During mandatory one-on-one advising sessions advisors also provide guidance on academic course-taking, matters related to majors and careers, as well as support for personal/social issues. Students are also required to attend one Advising Workshop each semester where they are provided information about campus policies, programmatic matters, and guided through the course registration process. Students may be required to visit their advisor for additional one-on-one meetings and/or workshops if they demonstrate particular academic risk factors. In addition, students are assigned a peer mentor. Peer mentors have a caseload of 40-45 students and it is their responsibility to stay connected throughout the academic year with their students. By design, peer mentors are upper division students who are former participants in the Encounter to Excellence program. They must have at least a 3.2 grade point average to serve as peer mentors.

**Strategy 5: Family Outreach & Community Building.** A core strength of CSUDH is our vibrant cultural diversity. In order to achieve our campus goals and increase student success, we harness the strengths and vibrancy of many cultures, especially the Hispanic culture. The integrity, self-reliance, and closeness of the family are among the greatest assets that Hispanic students bring with them to the university. Among values that characterize many cultures, most notably Hispanic and African-American cultures,
are those of hard work, self-improvement, and respect for learning. Too often the strengths of the family are frustrated or ignored by schools and school systems at all levels\textsuperscript{35}.

Recent research suggests that when low socio-economic status (SES) parents are involved in their children’s college education, students are more likely to be successful in graduating.\textsuperscript{36} Low-SES minority, particularly African-American and Hispanic, parents are committed to their children’s success, but, having been disenfranchised themselves, often lack “college knowledge” that is vital to their children’s ultimate success at the university. One model project that Enrollment Management & Student Affairs leadership investigated during our research on successful strategies is from El Centro College in Dallas. El Centro College has a tradition of special outreach activities planned to encourage family involvement in the college process.

The family outreach initiatives we have designed blend an “institution-centered” approach in favor of one that is “family-centered” and more appropriate for the large number of first generation education African-American and Hispanic students at CSUDH. Specific tasks related to family and community outreach include ensuring that key materials (financial aid, advising, orientation, etc.) are culturally and linguistically appropriate and creating orienting activities that are sensitive to language, culture, and work-related constraints.\textsuperscript{37}

\section*{Outcomes for Encuentro Hacia el Exito – Encounter to Excellence}

Non-Bridge students who begin with two semesters of math and/or English remediation required have a much lower chance of progression toward a degree. But students in the Bridge program, who begin with two semesters of math and/or English remediation required, have a much stronger chance of persistence.

- Over the last four years, Bridge students are generally 10-20 percentage points higher in retention and they are persisting at much higher rates than their non-Bridge cohorts. In fact, retention rates, grade point averages, and time to degree are all stronger when the two groups are compared.

The intentional focus on high impact practices, quality student learning, and outcome assessment have helped us secure the future of the program. One of the unexpected outcomes of the program’s success is student employment on campus. The Encounter to Excellence program has become one of the largest student employers on campus. After being with us for one or two years, and maintaining a GPA of 3.2 and higher, students can apply to serve as peer mentors or supplemental instruction facilitators. Since 2010, the program has employed over 400 students.

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{36} Cabrera & La Nasa 2001; Smith, Michael J. "Low SES African American Parents: Playing the College Choice Game on an Unlevel Field." 171 (Spring 2001): 16-21.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
II. Assessments of Success.

A. *Retention is Positively Affected by Bridge Program Participation.* Recent measurements of retention – an absolutely necessary item in any appraisal of success in a program such as this one – provide strong evidence that the program is making a strong and positive difference. In Table IV – 1 below, we observe a thirty percent positive difference when comparing Fall 2010 first-time Freshmen in the Bridge program with students who had comparable academic credentials but who did not participate in the Bridge initiative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Initiative</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. *Rates at Which Students Completed Needed Developmental Course Work.* The key retention measure is accompanied by other measures of success for the same students who in Fall 2010 were First-time Freshmen. In Table IV – 2, we display the rates at which students in similar academic circumstances completed developmental work in English and/or Mathematics across a first year at the University. It will be seen that the Bridge participants did remarkably better at achieving this milestone in comparison to students who did not take part in the Bridge program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Complete by Next Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Initiative</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. **Retention Rates for a Second Cohort.** Impressive results continue to a different, later, cohort of First-time Freshmen. In Table IV – 3 we look again at retention, but this time for a cohort that entered the University in Fall 2011, and compares the retention rates achieved by Bridge program participants to a fourth term, and compares their statistics to similar students who did not take part in the Bridge program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Initiative</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. **A Second Cohort: Rates at Which Students Completed Needed Developmental Course Work.** Table IV – 4 continues the story from Table IV – 2. In Table IV -4, we again review the numbers concerning successful completion of needed developmental courses. The results are positive, as will be seen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Complete by Next Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Initiative</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. **A Third Cohort: Retention Rates for Students Entering the University in Fall 2012.** Positive results continue to a third cohort of First-time Freshmen. In Table IV – 5 we look again at retention, this time for a cohort that entered the University in Fall 2012, and compares the retention rates achieved by Bridge program participants to a second term to similar students who did not take part in the Bridge program. As will be seen, the Bridge program participants showed positive differences when compared to students who did not participate in the Bridge program.
Table IV-5

Retention Rate Differences, by Bridge Program Participation:
Fall 2012 Freshmen Retention to Second Term – Fall 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Initiative</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. **A Third Cohort: Rates at Which Students Completed Needed Developmental Course Work.**

Table IV – 6 continues the story from Tables IV – 2 and IV - 4. In Table IV -6, we again review the numbers concerning successful completion of needed developmental courses. The results are positive, as will be seen.

Table IV-6

Rates at which Fall 2012 First-Time Freshmen Completed Developmental English and/or Mathematics Across a First Year at the University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Complete by Next Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Initiative</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. **A Fourth Cohort: Retention Rates for Students Entering the University in Fall 2013.** Early results show small but positive differences in retention rates to a first term – the rates at which students continued from Fall 2013 to Spring 2014. Differences are small, and of course we would prefer to see students continuing at 90% rates or higher. More consequential evidence remains to be arrayed as of this writing: we will watch with interest the results when measured across an a second or a fourth term.
### Table IV-7
Retention Rate Differences, by Bridge Program Participation:
Fall 2013 Freshmen Retention to *First* Term – Spring 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Retained</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Initiative</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we were to display a Table IV-8, concerning rates at which Fall 2013 First-time Freshmen had completed their developmental course work by Fall 2014, the results would be pending, as of this writing. The interested reader can inquire with the Division of Enrollment Management & Student Affairs for an update after the Fall 2014 semester is underway.

#### H. Conclusions
The tables above offer highlights, of course. This is an intensively-assessed program, and we can generally report that grade point averages vary positively by Bridge program participation, as does the number of units completed. Other measures are also in hand – but the key points are made.

#### I.
- The Bridge program appears to be a strong success, and something in which this university can take justifiable pride.
- The persistent interventions with first-time Freshmen, and the best-practice engagement of these students in advising and mentoring interactions, can only be judged a success.

We conclude with a brief review of noteworthy recognitions that the Bridge program has achieved.

#### J. The program’s noteworthy recognitions include these:

- Since 2010, over 1,500 students have participated in the Bridge Initiative.
- The results from the program, led to the campus receiving one of the largest Gilbert Foundation awards of $250,000 in 2012-13, enabling the university to expand interventions provided to students requiring developmental work even further. Gilbert also awarded the program $50,000 in 2010-11 and the same 2011-12.
- The university not only matched Gilbert’s generous award of $250,000, the President approved an additional $500,000 to expand the program. As a result, the 2013-14 cohort was the largest in the history of the campus, with 650 new freshmen.
- Another $750,000 has been committed for 2014-15. The funding will allow us to exceed the numbers and we expect to work with over 800 freshmen.

47
As a result of our work over the past five years to accelerate student success, California State University, Dominguez Hills was selected as a finalist for *Examples in Excelencia* at the Baccalaureate level. The program was recognized at the Celebración de Excelencia, held at the Capitol Building in Washington, DC. *Examples of Excelencia*, is a national initiative that systematically identifies and honors programs boosting Latino enrollment, performance and graduation with evidence of effectiveness.

The program was featured in the 2012-13 and 2013-14 Compendium of *What Works for Latino Students in Higher Education*. 
Chapter Five

What We Heard;
Preliminary Conclusions;
Analytical Ways Forward – SWOT Analysis

**Summary.** This chapter is an interim summing-up, and a “global” charting of analytical ways forward. In Part I we summarize what we heard concerning advising from multiple sources at CSUDH. In Part II, we offer interim conclusions that draw upon our charting of advising that is found in Chapter Three and Appendices B and C. In Part III, we offer a SWOT analysis that will be an important tool for anchoring our recommendations, which follow in Chapters 6, 7, 8, and 9.

I. The Task Force heard that CSU Dominguez Hills has work to do in advising.

That is the essential distillation of what we have heard about advising at the university – and we have listened with care and energy. Five broad areas are discussed in moderate detail in the balance of this section. Still further information grouped by theme and sub-theme is available to the interested reader in Appendix E.

The key sources, in addition to “local knowledge” brought to the Task Force by individual members, were these:

1) A ninety-minute open forum hosted by the Task Force for the purpose of listening in a large group setting to the voices of any and all in the community who wished to make themselves heard;
2) A survey of the full-time faculty (who, due to full-time status, have advising as a part of their expected professional work at the university), led in particular by Dr. Keisha Paxton: Please see Appendix F for a summary of the findings;
3) Focused discussions, completed in particular by Task Force co-chair Clare Weber, who intensively interviewed department chairs as they sat with deans in college chairs’ councils;
4) A focused discussion facilitated by Dr. Weber when she convened professional advisers at CSUDH;
5) Focus groups of students, seeking opinions, evaluations, and recounting of experience with advising. This was done by advanced Sociology students under the general supervision of Dr. Clare Weber. Please see Appendix D for their fuller report.
The five broad areas in which we have work to do are these.

1. **Communications.** The university should work to improve communications between and among professional advisers, and between and among professional advisers and faculty. Our communications to students, especially to new students but including as well our communications to current students beyond a first year at the campus, also need review and improvement. In a nice credit to CSUDH advisers, students in our focus groups reported more overall positive advising experiences than negative.

   The Task Force heard this from these sources:
   - Focused conversations with deans and department chairs;
   - Focused conversations with professional advisers;
   - Comments at the Open Forum;
   - Comments made by students, in formal focus groups.

2. **Ensuring accuracy and quality in advice that is given.** Some approaches to ensuring accuracy and quality will involve training. Other approaches will involve the presentation, archival and retrieval of information, especially via the Internet. The goal should be to ensure that advice-givers possess current and accurate knowledge about the topics on which they advise. Key domains are student-specific information, and general policies and procedures.

   Consider general policies and procedures. Accuracy in advice given is not usually a matter of an adviser’s counsel being incongruent with what the catalog says. Rather, what we heard was focused on approved deviations from apparent or stated requirements, the best example of which is substitutions for required courses within the major. The central issue is that substitutions allowed for student #1 are not known, not public, and not made available for student #2.

   Consider also student-specific information. In some instances, we heard, students allegedly were told by faculty advisers in the majors / departments that they were ready for graduation, but in fact some all-university requirements outside of the major were not met. An important example is the fulfillment of the English language graduation requirement; but we heard also that students may lack an upper division general education distribution requirement, something not perceived by faculty advisers.

   Relatedly, especially via the survey of full-time faculty, we heard that about half of our faculty respondents had had no formal training in advising, although they surely were dispensing academic advice to students. Again via the survey of full-time faculty, we learned that faculty report the most knowledge where requirements are specific to the major.

   A need for training is an apparent implication, as is a need for systematic posting, noting and making available, approved deviations from catalog-mandated major requirements. And, of course, making the catalog and other academic policies easily available via the web would equip all advisers, and students too.

   There is another quality issue to name, related to time and workload constraints. Students in particular let us know that time spent with an adviser can feel rushed and too brief. They thought that degree major road maps should be made the subject of discussion, rather than merely handed-out.
The Task Force heard this from these sources:

- Focused conversations with deans and department chairs;
- Focused conversations with professional advisers;
- Comments at the Open Forum;
- Survey of full-time faculty.
- Comments made by students, in formal focus groups.

3. **Ensuring clarity and accuracy in policies and procedures** pertaining to advising. As discussed above, improving our archival and retrieval of information is a focus in this broad area. So too is ensuring wider understanding of who makes policy, where policy may be found, how procedures are specified within the contours of policy, and how one may know with assurance just what is policy and just what procedure should be followed. This is related, of course, to communications (item 1 above): it is hard to communicate something that is not clear. It is related as well to content of advice given (item 2 above): if answers are unclear, then unwelcome variability in advice given is a predictable result. On its own, however, clarity of policy and procedures has several dimensions.

   First, we heard complaints that a reliable (up to date and accurate) handbook on policies and procedures is not now available to either professional advisers or faculty advisers. In a later chapter, we will recommend that CSUDH write / establish such a handbook.

   Second, we heard from Task Force members and others about too-frequently finding outdated (and thus wrong) policy statements when doing a simple web search on CSUDH.edu. In a later chapter, we will have a recommendation about this.

   Third, we heard in Dr. Weber’s focused conversations that policies concerning such things as graduation requirements, and procedures including dates and deadlines, are not always consistently enforced. Please note that we report hearing this, and make no judgment concerning whether the complaint was accurate. This seems to call for training and reminders.

The Task Force heard this from these sources:

- Focused conversations with deans and department chairs;
- Focused conversations with professional advisers;
- Comments at the Open Forum.

4. **Clarifying work roles.** We will discuss this below, and we will have specific recommendations to enumerate in chapter ten relative to work roles. We mean to discuss both faculty, as they act in adviser capacity, and professional advisers.

In our survey of full-time faculty, we heard about dissatisfaction with the definitions of faculty advising roles. Faculty felt that advising is not rewarded, and largely not considered in retention, tenure and promotion decisions. As well, in the survey of full-time faculty, we heard that there were workload issues for faculty who engage in advising. Faculty survey respondents reported a belief that there were too many students per faculty to do a good job in advising.

We heard about needs for role definitions for professional advisers, on one hand, and on the other hand about the incorporation of advising into faculty roles and responsibilities. Especially
as to the latter, we heard extensive comments about how faculty are only technically evaluated for retention, tenure and/or promotion on their capabilities and performance in advising. A telling comment was that “it’s like checking a box.” The Education Advisory Board and others let us know that this is common, by the way, at American universities.

The Task Force heard this from these sources:

- Survey of full-time faculty;
- Comments at the Open Forum.

5. **Ensuring the utility and user-friendliness of web tools.** Improvements to be sought, and in some instances already under development, are the focus here and in Chapter Eleven. We encourage improvements for the benefit of faculty, of professional advisers, and of students.

We heard this especially via the survey of full-time faculty; but we also heard about it at the open forum. In the survey, the issue came up directly: two thirds of our full-time faculty respondents reported that they use PeopleSoft, but half reported minimal to moderate comfort with the tool. In the open forum, the topic came up as a training issue associated with a complaint, or set of complaints. Many faculty dislike the PeopleSoft tools now available.

The Task Force heard this from these sources:

- Survey of full-time faculty;
- Comments at the Open Forum.

The interested reader is invited to see Appendix D (specific to student focus groups), and Appendices E and F (specific to survey findings) for further details of themes discerned in “what we heard” as a Task Force.

II. **Preliminary Conclusions**

Immediately below we offer a handful of large-overview preliminary conclusions. These draw principally upon our Chapter Three outline and analysis of current advising systems and procedures at CSUDH; but crucial contexts include advising models that we describe in Chapter Four, drawn from CSU Sacramento and as described by the Education Advisory Board, and what we heard, as described above in Part I of this chapter. These are given vigorous and specific further pursuit in chapters 6 through 9 of this report.

The Task Force offers four general conclusions.

First, the quantity of advising services varies remarkably, from intense and frequent for special groups of undergraduates, to casual and student-initiated for a large number of other undergraduates. For some, at least, among this large number of other undergraduates, advising services are remarkably thin.
Second, many advising needs seem even at a glance to be un-met: developmental needs for beginning lower-division students who are not selected to a special program is a sharp example.

Third, there is considerable reliance on faculty and other non-professional advisers in this system, and as will be discussed in Chapter Eight, the attention of faculty to this part of their job varies, and the capabilities of faculty in the area of advising are rarely if ever, supported by workshops or other opportunities to learn.

Fourth, elementary but important records are not well-kept. Too often archived only on paper in a departmental file cabinet, such items as substituted courses in fulfillment of degree major requirements are not available to those whose task it is to check whether a degree has in fact been earned. Too often the result is confusion: will student “X” graduate, or not? The Task Force heard many complaints about this.

Let us be clear, however, as we seek strengthened advisement. In the beliefs by many in our community that advising is in need of renewal and upgrading, we are in the company of most universities in the United States.  

III. Overview of Advising Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

With nearly all of the input described above, in the preceding chapters and in Parts I and II of the current chapter, in hand, it was time to crisply sum it up. This meant a SWOT analysis for CSUDH advising, which the Task Force spent most of a two hour meeting (on April 28, 2014) to develop. As readers may recognize, the exercise seeks “about 3 to 5” entries in each of four categories: Strengths; Weaknesses; Opportunities; Threats. Immediately below we list the factors identified for each category.

38 See The University Leadership Council (2012), Next Generation Advising: Elevating Practice for Degree Completion and Career Success. Washington, The Education Advisory Board. At page X, in a section entitled Top Lessons From Our Study, item number [i.e., lesson number] five is: Most institutions believe that their current advising system is sub-optimal, with substantial room for improved performance. One take-away among others from that observation should be that where this Task Force calls for renewal and/or change, our implicit criticisms do not mean that very well-motivated and very hard-working advisers have been remiss or lacking commitment to student success.
Five Strengths (Internal)

1. **Student Success is a Keen Faculty Interest, and the University Out-Performs Expectations.** *The Washington Monthly* lists CSUDH as graduating students at rates exceeding what statistical formulas predict; CLA results are strong, demonstrating “value added.”

2. **Well-Identified Successes in Advising at CSUDH:** advising for special groups that is intrusive, frequent, at a desired ratio of advisers to advisees: Bridge programs; EOP programs; programs for athletes.

3. **Placement of Student Success in CSUDH Strategic Plan.** It’s in the current plan, and will continue to be in the renewed / revised plan. Advising is strongly associated with student retention, graduation, and is likely to win support. CAH has an advising plan.

4. **Embrace of & Affection for this University, by Students, Faculty, Staff, and the Community.** Importantly attracted by campus mission, students, faculty and staff and CSUDH administrative leaders all want to be here. The community cherishes the university and wants CSUDH to succeed in welcoming, educating, and graduating our students.

5. **Regular State Support (Marginal Cost Subvention) Is Growing,** making possible new resources for student support and advising.

---

**Source**
- Survey of full-time faculty; Open Forum; *Washington Monthly*; general campus info.
- Many reports on the successes of advising efforts
- General campus information; Office of the President
- General campus information; external observers (e.g., WASC visiting team)
- General campus information; Office of the President
Five Weaknesses (Internal)

1 Student and Student Guidance Deficits Bearing Upon Advisement: Needs; Communications

(A) **CSUDH students need more academic support** because they too frequently lack strong preparation in secondary school, substantial economic means; and as first-generation students, many lack role models. Transfer students often lack knowledge about the difference between general education advising and major advising.

(B) **Communication with incoming students is not clear enough**, including information about registration holds that must be cleared by advising.

(C) **Lack of strong incentives for students to fulfill graduation requirements in a timely manner**, such as the Writing Requirement (GWE). Too frequently, students do not “own” their requirements.

(D) **Too few convenient times, locations and online modalities for advising**: not enough evening / weekend availabilities for advising; some college advising centers are remotely located; Skype / e-mail and other online advising are not widely available.

2 Professional Adviser Deficits:

(A) **CSUDH may have too few professional advisers** – contrast the apparent success of the grant-funded advising with the limited indicators of success available for professional advisers – who by many accounts do strong and good work. Compare recommended ratios with CSUDH ratio.

(B) **Professional advisers desire stronger support as a means of fulfilling their professional functions.** Improved communications and training are desired; clarity about roles and functions is sought.

(C) **Communication** between and among professional advisers, and between and among professional advisers and department-based advisers, is weak, inconsistent, and often absent.
3 Faculty Deficits Bearing Upon Advising:

(A) Although we are hiring, **CSUDH has a very low proportion of full-time faculty**: note that full-time faculty have advising as part of their performance expectations; but **part-time faculty** are generally not expected to advise.

(B) **Incentive structure for faculty to do advising** is poorly-defined, not a strong part of retention / tenure / promotion decisions.

(C) **Faculty are not trained in advisement**, and thus have knowledge gaps – e.g., general education requirements.

Source

Task Force first-hand knowledge

Survey of full-time faculty; Open Forum comments

4 Lack of Policy Clarity, and Policy Deficits:

(A) **Ordinary Google searches on CSUDH.edu often return outdated, incorrect information.** Outdated information posted on the site means that relying on the local web site may mislead as to what is current policy relative to advising procedures, graduation requirements, and more.

(B) **Archiving of policy at CSUDH is largely paper-bound, unsystematic, inadequate, and not widely distributed.**

(C) **Faculty and professional advisers report confusion about registration holds, confusion about calendars, required procedures, and priorities.**

Source

Task Force first-hand knowledge; Focused discussions

Open forum; Focused discussions

5 Modern Information Tools for Effective Advising Need Upgrades

(A) **Faculty report discontent with the PeopleSoft tools available now.**

(B) **Technical issues with current PeopleSoft capabilities, e.g., whether certain features have been “turned on,” whether some capabilities in PeopleSoft as deployed correspond to CSUDH business practices**

(C) **Receipt of transcripts via electronic means for both students arriving from high schools, and from community colleges, is hard to accomplish, and only slowly increasing:** lack of this tool delays advisers’ ability to confidently counsel students.

Source

Faculty survey

Task Force first-hand knowledge; Focused discussions
Three Opportunities (external)

1. **New potential opportunities for funding:** CSU internal $50 million directed to programs for student success; $50 million being discussed as additional to CSU budget at the legislature; Student Success Fee locally; increases in private support may be possible, especially as the permanent CSUDH Vice President for Advancement builds staff & programs.

2. **CSUDH Information Technology is leading an effort to bridge functional and technical outcomes for student success.** We anticipate a proposal to provide easier-to-use, stronger information tools.

3. **The Value of a Baccalaureate Degree, Relative to High School Only, or Some College, Continues High, and May Increase.** If we can produce high-quality graduates, they can succeed, and support their communities. Support for our work should be strong.

---

Four Threats (external)

1. **Low graduation rate per IPEDS may endanger access to Cal Grants:** CSUDH risks being swept up in punitive regulations & statutes aimed, really, at for-profits who don’t graduate anybody but profit from tuitions, often paid by government grants and loans.

2. **Future plunges in state funding:** Experience teaches that state support for higher education is cyclical, and will decline again when the economy declines.

3. **Decreases in Federal grants and loans to students; and in grants to fund focused student support programs (e.g., EOP).** Documents including the proposed U.S. House (Republican) budget drafted by Rep. Paul Ryan call for freezes, lower spending, on many domestic social programs, including support for higher education.

4. **Public understanding of higher education as essentially a private good, not a public good, may be growing.** Although California public opinion still rates higher education as a cherished good, willingness to pay through taxes for its success is very limited.40

- We will make use of these SWOT elements in Chapters Seven, Eight, Nine, and Ten, where our recommendations will be found, “anchored” by identified strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities.

---

Chapter Six

Toward Improved Advising at CSUDH: Serving First-Time Freshmen

In this chapter we shall:

- **Evoke key circumstances** of which we believe this university should take notice, derived from our SWOT analysis of advising at CSU Dominguez Hills;
- **Propose two over-arching strategies** that we believe this university should embrace, in response to the key circumstances;
- **Offer three recommendations** for realizing the proposed strategies; and
- **Identify particular actions**, associated with each of the strategies, that the Task Force commends to university advising leadership.

**Key Circumstances.** In Table VI -1 we nominate four key circumstances that we believe are consequential for any strategy that this university might adopt for serving first-time freshmen. As will be observed, we identify three key weaknesses and one key strength.

**Table VI -1**

*From the Task Force SWOT Analysis:*

- **CSUDH undergraduates need more academic support than many other undergraduates.**
- **Communication with incoming students is not clear enough.**
- **Unclear policy, and policy deficits, including confusion about registration holds, are reported at CSUDH.**
- **Student success is a keen faculty interest.**

The key strength is that student success is a keen interest at CSUDH, among faculty, and also among staff and administrative leadership. With that remarkable strength, we can do much. Furthermore, to set a context for the “weaknesses” that we will evoke, let us remind ourselves and the reader of the successes in serving first-time freshmen that were described in chapter four. Table 6-2 highlights a few of these successes – which in fact provide important background for the work, and the recommendations, of the Task Force.

The three weaknesses in Table VI -1 reflect, first, a circumstance of the communities we serve, which offer few role models for success at the university: many of our rising freshmen are the first in their extended families to begin a college education. Expectations, setting goals, balancing academics with other life obligations, and more are all challenges that our students face in greater frequency and greater intensity than at most of the nation’s universities.
A second weakness we identified principally through focused discussions with students: the university’s communications with incoming students are presently judged to be not clear enough. Unsurprisingly, some of the recommendations that follow are animated by that apparent deficit.

A third weakness is more general and extends to areas beyond those that offer advice to incoming students. It is a perceived lack of clarity, principally a lack of clear communications, about policy at the university. We heard this from various focused discussions, including with professional advisors; we heard it again at our open forum. An important manifestation of this, as reported to the Task Force, is confusion about registration holds, and the policies that govern registration holds (which intend to require students to have an advisement session before they are allowed to register for classes in an upcoming term).

Mindful of the strength and the weaknesses set out in Table VI -1, the Task Force proposes Strategy 6.1, found in Table VI -3.

Securing the right leadership is a place to begin, and Strategy 6.1 contemplates identifying and hiring (or assigning) a senior administrator to respond to the interest in this chapter in serving well our first-time freshmen. Please see Recommendation 6.1 and the associated particular actions, set out below.

Strategy 6.1 goes on, as will be seen, to identify certain directions that the Task Force believes a “Dean of Advising” should pursue. We think that clarifying policies is an early and important direction for consideration, and that a simplified business process should also be a goal. With policy clarity and an efficient process for student admission, advisement, registration, and progress to the degree, fresh initiatives aimed at improved communications should complete the “package.”

With that, we may turn to particular recommendations and associated particular actions.

| Table VI-2 |
| Lessons from Chapter 4: |
| CSUDH has programs for incoming first-time freshmen that have been well assessed and in which the Task Force and the university should take pride. These programs have evidently succeeded in promoting student retention and progress to the degree. They include |
| • Summer Bridge Academy |
| • Supplemental Instruction and |
| • Intrusive Advising. |
| Please see Chapter 4 for fuller descriptions. |
Table VI -3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY 6.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify, and hire or assign, a senior administrator (for purposes of this report only: a Dean of Advising) to lead a process for clarifying policies; and via improved communications in a simplified business process environment, to smooth student pathways to entrance, to progress milestones, and to graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 6.1: Give strong consideration to hiring (or assigning) a senior administrator (for purposes of this report only, Dean of Advising) for CSUDH41. Ask the Dean of Advising, working with a suitable standing committee, to implement this report’s vision for advising at CSUDH, and to build multi-year plans for extending advising and assessing the effectiveness of advising at this university.

Recommendation 6.1 will be evoked again in Chapters Seven and Eight, where we discuss strengthening the university’s advisors, both professionals and advising faculty.

The crucial basis for recommending that a senior leader be identified begins with our view of the importance of strong advising. That is, strong advising is fundamental to the achievement of the university’s high goals for student retention, progress, and timely graduation with a high-quality baccalaureate degree. (We detailed that connection between advising and success in Chapter Three of the present report.) Beyond that, we think a second reason for identifying a senior leader is the keen desire for support for the advising function that we heard from the community, in focused discussions and in our open hearing. As we will discuss especially in Chapter Eight, professional advisors were particularly persuasive on this point. Third is the number and significance — and frankly, the difficulty — of things that need to be envisioned, planned, and implemented in an environment in which very busy people will not always, or easily, see improvements in advising as the next item on a lengthy “to do” list.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 6.1:

6.1.1 Make assessment, and a culture of evidence, central to the work of this leader for advising. This may imply that a dean should possess assessment skills, or at a minimum that his or her team include a person with that talent.

6.1.2 Create a standing CSUDH Advisement Committee, to include appropriate ex officio members (e.g., representing University Outreach, the Registrar, a college dean or experienced associate dean, an appropriate representation of professional advisors, persons representing campus success programs such as EOP and Bridge), the Career

---

41 Note job descriptions for such a position available from the Education Advisory Board, an organization with whom the Task Force had a fruitful interaction. See, Meeting Student Demand for High-Touch Advising: Strategies and Implementation Tools for Elevating the Student Experience (Washington: The Advisory Board Company, 2009). Job descriptions are on page 62ff.
Center, Financial Aid, plus a number of faculty. This is a communications strategy, of course, but also a sounding board for policy and procedure determinations.

6.1.3 **Ask the Dean of Advising to ensure that support for advisors is in place.** Our ideas about what may constitute suitable support (ongoing professional development, for example) are found below in this report (see especially Chapter Eight).

6.1.4 **Ask the dean to take a prominent role in creating a culture of advising effectiveness.** This should include asking the dean to offer views about best practices on (a) advisor recruitment / selection; (b) new advisor orientation; (c) ongoing professional development for advisors; (d) advisor performance evaluation; and (e) advisor recognition / rewards. The natural follow-on to offering views, of course, is to propose their adoption, secure resources for, and move to implement best or recommended practices.

6.1.5 **Give the dean organizational prominence.** Do this for a period (perhaps two years) during which reforms are envisioned, initiated, piloted, assessed, and implemented. We envision, for example, asking the dean for a monthly (or twice-per semester) report to the President or to the President’s Cabinet. In this way, we think the university may encourage senior leaders to prioritize actions intended to improve advising.

**Recommendation 6.2:**

Ask the Dean of Advising to lead a process that maps, and seeks efficiencies, in business processes, as different units at the university seek to articulate their work with one another: college advisors to UATC; NSO planners to UATC; articulation officers to deans and departments; UATC advisors to major advisors; and more.

The Task Force heard frequent testimony that easy articulation between among these, and still other, units has been a challenge. Some particulars to pursue include the following.

---

42 See discussion below. The literature supports close collaboration between career centers and advisement centers.

43 The literature teaches that a cardinal feature of effective student success initiatives is that they are centralized, occupying a central place in the university’s organization structure.
Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 6.2:

6.2.1 **Co-locate, and clearly identify, physical spaces** for advising work. Among other efficiencies, this may prove efficient for students, who need not trek far across the campus to “check in” with a different office that has a neighboring responsibility. Of course, staff and faculty can more easily communicate when in proximity, as well. Compare item 6.3.3 below.

6.2.2 **Seek integration and smooth articulation via improved communications.** A dedicated advising web site can contribute to this; the standing CSUDH Advisement Committee can contribute to this; other means will also be identified in practice.

6.2.3 **Consult with the Education Advisory Board,** or a similar organization, to identify best practices in this regard.

**Recommendation 6.3:**

**Make a coordinated priority of engaging incoming students with strong advising – focusing on first-time freshmen.**

Recommendation 6.3 will be evoked again in Chapter Seven, where we discuss improvements in advising services for transfer students – who after all, are not less “incoming” than first-time freshmen.

The literature teaches, and the CSUDH community understands, that first-time freshmen are vulnerable to threats of poor outcomes. The same literature and the same community understand that first-time freshmen in need of remediation are especially vulnerable to these threats. Poor outcomes can include low grades, failure to “connect” socially, unclear goals (which can make the value of academic work seem low), and more.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 6.3:

6.3.1 **Continue to fund, and to assess the success of, the E.T.E. and Bridge programs** described in Chapter Four.

6.3.2 **Build career choices into advising visions.** Working closely with the Career Center, build programs for advising that begin with supporting and encouraging undeclared students, especially first-time freshmen, to focus on career options and choices, and to allow those options and choices to influence choices of pre-majors, of majors, and of particular courses in a particular term (semester). This should be a strong candidate for inclusion in a University 101 class [see below].
6.3.3 Encourage and support close collaboration between Career Services and Academic Affairs, particularly the UATC, to create, implement and assess programs aimed at delivering career advising to students in concert with academic advising. Compare Chapter Nine’s recommendation concerning encouraging or requiring students to have a regular (perhaps annual) interaction with the Career Center.

6.3.4 Provide career development and job placement information to students electronically, via a prominent and attractive web site, making available data on jobs landed by students in each major, careers of interest to students in each major, skills developed within majors, and similar. Note that national disciplinary associations (e.g., American Political Science Association) maintain career websites for college students who choose to major in the field.

6.3.5 Where appropriate, build “pre-major” programs to allow new students, unsure of major choice but clear about general directions, to take classes efficiently. Groupings could, for example, include STEM majors; behavioral sciences; performing arts; humanities; natural sciences. Assess.

6.3.6 Re-institute University 101, a course for first-time freshmen to include goal-setting, career and major choice support, effective approaches to study, awareness of graduation requirements, taking ownership of fulfilling such requirements, and more.

6.3.7 Via UNIV 101 and in other ways, seek to educate and empower students to assume self-responsible roles in the advising process.

6.3.8 In support of broader university goals for student success, orient students to high impact practices (HIPs) and encourage students to take courses that include HIPs. For a convenient listing of High Impact Practices, see https://www.aacu.org/leap/hip.cfm Retrieved May 9, 2014. The ten most frequently listed practices are shown in Figure II – 1 in Chapter Two.

6.3.9 In support of goals for internationalization, include orientations to global themes, topics, and involvement in international activities as HIPs. Pilot and assess.

6.3.10 Pilot and assess the utility of a similar course for incoming transfer students. (Compare Chapter Seven.) Find strong models, as above.

6.3.11 Identify and seek changes in now-very distributed policies about registration holds, seeking more uniformity, and much more clarity, about who places, who “owns” and who may lift holds. Compare Chapter Seven.


45 For a convenient listing of High Impact Practices, see https://www.aacu.org/leap/hip.cfm Retrieved May 9, 2014. The ten most frequently listed practices are shown in Figure II – 1 in Chapter Two.
6.3.12 Seek digital means for identifying “owners” of holds on student registration. Compare Chapter Nine.

In the context of Recommendation 6.3, the Task Force raised the question of whether CSUDH students should have a personally-assigned advisor. In a thoughtful discussion, the Task Force recognized that some campus departments do that now; but in the end, the Task Force decided to rely on the more general recommendation that this university ensure that students are, in fact, provided with strong advisement.

We turn now to evoke a fresh set of key circumstances that arose in our SWOT analysis. Table VI-4 begins the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VI -4 From the Task Force SWOT Analysis:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CSUDH may have too few professional advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CSUDH has very low proportion of full-time faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentive structure for faculty to do advising is poorly-defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty are not trained in advisement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future plunges in state funding seem likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decreases in Federal grants to fund focused student support programs are actively sought in the U.S. House of Representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The communities we serve embrace, and show affection for, CSUDH.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VI -5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 6.2 Seek low cost but effective supplements to advising by faculty and / or by professionals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Circumstances.** In Table VI-4 we identify seven key circumstances that we believe are consequential for developing advisement programs that can endure. The initial four weaknesses are internal, emerging from what the Task Force heard and identified, and have been discussed previously. Two external circumstances are threats associated with these perceived weaknesses – one arising from state government, another from the Federal government. A third external factor is a strength, and references the sentiments of the communities that we serve. Taken together, we see a need to shore up our programs that reach students, particularly first-time freshmen, in a context where volunteerism may be called upon to supplement governmental support for the university. Nobody desires a circumstance where such support would supplant governmental support. Advocacy seems a suitable response.

**Strategy 6.2.** These circumstances lead to the indicated Strategy 6.2. None on the Task Force think that we should welcome, or in any way encourage either explicitly or implicitly, the withdrawal of public governmental support for the university and its advising (and other success-oriented) programs. Yet realism beckons. Supporters of public funding for public universities are not fore-ordained to win every
political fray; and we should thoughtfully provide for opportunities for volunteer efforts. We are mindful that recruiting, training, deploying and assessing volunteers does not amount to a free program. However, mentoring programs, to take the example outlined below, can be low-cost.

**Recommendation 6.4:**

Build mentoring programs to supplement formal advising programs.

As we have previously noted, mentoring programs are not appropriate for supplanting advising programs, but instead can be strong supplements.

**Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 6.4:**

6.4.1 Institute, nurture and assess peer mentoring programs, such as the CSUDH Psychology department maintains. Pilot and assess this initiative.

6.4.2 Institute a program of volunteer mentors, drawing upon retired faculty and staff, and interested members of the community. Pilot and assess this initiative.
Chapter Seven

Toward Improved Advising at CSUDH:
Serving Students Beyond the Freshman Year, Including Transfer Students

As we did in Chapter Six, in this chapter we shall again:

- Evoke key circumstances of which we believe this university should take notice, derived from our SWOT analysis of advising at CSU Dominguez Hills;
- Propose two over-arching strategies that we believe this university should embrace, in response to the key circumstances;
- Offer three recommendations for realizing the proposed strategies; and
- Identify particular actions, associated with each of the strategies, that the Task Force commends to university advising leadership.

Key Circumstances. In Table VII -1 we identify four key circumstances that we believe are consequential for any strategy that this university might adopt for serving any and all of our undergraduate students, including transfer students (the focus of this chapter), and also including first-time freshmen, as was discussed in Chapter 6. In fact, these are the same key circumstances evoked in Chapter 6, although our narrative in the current chapter will have transfer students in mind. As will be observed, even as we did in Chapter 6, for the current analysis we identify three key weaknesses and one key strength.

Table VII -1

From the Task Force SWOT Analysis:

- **CSUDH undergraduates need more academic support than many other undergraduates.**
- **Communication with incoming students is not clear enough.**
- **Unclear policy, and policy deficits, including confusion about registration holds, are reported at CSUDH.**
- **Student success is a keen faculty interest.**

The key strength is that student success is a keen interest at CSUDH, among faculty, and also among staff and administrative leadership. With that remarkable strength, we can do much. Furthermore, to set a context for the “weaknesses” that we will evoke, let us remind ourselves and the reader of the successes in serving first-time freshmen that were described in Chapter Four. Table VI-2 in the preceding chapter highlights a few of these successes – which in fact provide important background for the work, and the recommendations, of the Task Force.

The three weaknesses in Table VII -1 reflect, first, a circumstance of the communities we serve, which offer few role models for success at the university: many of our incoming transfer undergraduates, while they have succeeded at a standard sufficient to make the transfer from community college, are yet the first in their extended families to begin a college
education. Our transfer students still struggle— if less than some freshmen—with expectations, setting goals, balancing academics with other life obligations, and more are all challenges that our students face in greater frequency and greater intensity than at most of the nation’s universities.

A second weakness we identified principally through focused discussions with students: the university’s communications with incoming students are presently judged to be not clear enough. Unsurprisingly, some of the recommendations that follow seek to directly address that apparent deficit.

A third weakness is more general and extends to areas beyond those that offer advice to incoming students. It is a perceived lack of clarity, principally a lack of clear communications, about policy at the university. We heard this from various focused discussions, including with professional advisors; we heard it again at our open forum. An important manifestation of this, as reported to the Task Force, is confusion about registration holds, and the policies that govern registration holds (which intend to require students to have an advisement session before they are allowed to register for classes in an upcoming term). Specific to transfer students are struggles with articulation with courses completed, and requirements met (or not met) while at community college for the CSUDH baccalaureate degree.

Mindful of the strength and the weaknesses set out in Table VII -1, the Task Force proposes Strategy 7.1, found in Table VII - 2.

Strategy 7.1 states in general terms our over-arching objective, which is to ensure that students, beyond the Freshman year, have very clear advice. We may also evoke once again Strategy 6.1, offered in the previous chapter in Table VI – 3, that a “Dean of Advising” seek to simplify and clarify business practices, communications, and policies in general. These are surely related to the high goal of ensuring clarity of advice given.

With that, we may turn to particular recommendations and associated particular actions.

| Table VII - 2 |
| STRATEGY 7.1 |
| Ensure that students whose class status is beyond Freshman, and ensure particularly that transfer students, have very clear advice about how to maintain strong progress to graduation. |

| Recommendation 7.1: |
| Ensure that pathways are clear, that pathways are easy to follow, and that pathways to graduation are clearly communicated. |

Our narrative can sensibly follow the student from point of transfer entry to CSUDH through to graduation.
Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 7.1:

7.1.1 Urgently consider approaches for improving New Student Orientation (NSO) participation by transfer students. Consider initiating mandatory NSO’s for transfer students. In the NSO sessions, explain (and if necessary, emphasize) the differences between CSUDH and the community colleges from which the students have come. Even as architecture and acreage vary when comparing CSUDH to El Camino College, so also do rules, service provisions, and constraints vary. Students have a “learning curve” to surmount.

7.1.2 Consider a Sophomore mandatory, or highly incentivized, advising encounter. A Sophomore “check-in” interaction, a kind of Sophomore NSO, is being piloted with reported success at other CSU campuses. In the alternative, consider a mandatory advisement session. Use the attainment of 30 units as a trigger. Assess.

7.1.3 Include group advising sessions as a strategy, especially for students new to a given academic major. Assess the sufficiency and success of such sessions.

7.1.4 Seek successful transfer students to mentor incoming transfers, if and when a peer mentoring program is adopted. Compare Recommendation 6.4 in the previous chapter. Pilot and assess.

7.1.5 Prioritize articulation of lower-division major requirements with offerings from feeder community colleges. Build a CSUDH campus consensus on the importance of this; engage faculty in departments.

7.1.6 As an approach to working with feeder community colleges, ask each Vice President at CSUDH to convene meetings two to four times per year with counterpart vice presidents from feeder community colleges – to seek understanding, strong articulation, and in general smooth transitions from community colleges to CSUDH. The content and the format of these meetings may vary, of course. Perhaps one of the annual meetings is one on one between the vice presidents, while another includes senior staff.

7.1.7 Initiate an annual professional conference focused on advising, to which papers and presentations from sister CSU campuses and, even more importantly, from feeder community colleges, are solicited and featured. Because this should have positive effects on the quality of academic advising delivered across the CSU system, seek system resources to support this effort. Argue that, as the CSU has supported conferences on effective teaching, so it should support conferences on effective advising. Assess.

7.1.8 Continue a strong communications program with students as intended targets / audiences; include in targeted communications “to do” lists for students in particular academic progress statuses. Begin with, and emphasize, students in a first semester transfer status. Pilot and assess; and as appropriate, extend this to students in other
“classes” at the university (e.g., second semester freshman to-do lists; sophomore to-do-lists; etc.).

7.1.9 Focus on students nearing graduation. Preach and communicate proactively the “X” things students should do in their senior year in order to graduate.

In the context of Recommendation 7.1, the Task Force raised the question of whether CSUDH students should have a personally-assigned advisor. In a thoughtful discussion, the Task Force recognized that some campus departments do that now; but in the end, the Task Force decided to rely on the more general recommendation that this university ensure that students are, in fact, provided with strong advisement.

Table VII-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY 7.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With energy, seek both clarity as to the substance of policy, especially surrounding vexing issues such as registration holds and course substitutions, and clarity as to the communications of policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 7.2:

Make frequency and insistence the strong partners of policy clarity in communicating to transfer students.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 7.2:

7.2.1 Identify and seek changes in now-very distributed policies about registration holds, seeking more uniformity, and much more clarity, about who places, who “owns” and who may lift holds. Compare item 6.3.11.

7.2.2 Seek digital means for identifying “owners” of holds on student registration. Compare Chapter Nine.

7.2.3 Review and institute reforms in the use of course substitutions: ensure the digital archival of substitutions; identify situations where the same or similar substitutions are widespread, and encourage academic program modifications where appropriate; ensure that like students are treated alike in the matter of substituted courses for academic program requirement fulfillment.

7.2.4 Streamline the process of entering course substitutions to allow for multiple and future course substitutions, via electronic means. Assess.
7.2.5 Review and continue requirements that CSUDH students be required to connect with advisors at critical junctures or checkpoints in their university careers. Sharpen current practices, including by securing advisor signatures electronically.

7.2.6 Require advising for defined "at risk" students, especially those with GPA’s below defined thresholds. Continue and sharpen current practices.

7.2.7 Work with (and via) the Academic Senate if revised policies are needed relative to registration holds and course substitutions.

7.2.8 Include regular (perhaps annual) student interaction with the Career Center to guide the acquisition of personal, social and academic skills appropriate to career and life interests. Assess.

Recommendation 7.3:

Seek professional advisor deployment, and faculty advisor availability, that makes it convenient for students to seek advice in the context of employment, family situation, and other competitors for university time and focus.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 7.3:

7.3.1 Give strong consideration to assigning UATC professional advisors to groups of "neighboring" academic programs, making them quasi-specialists in, e.g., the behavioral sciences, or STEM, or the arts & humanities. Pilot and assess this initiative. Especially as the university adds professional advisors with UATC assignments, consider – and consider again – the effectiveness of asking these "quasi specialists" to spend advising hours in a location proximate to the faculty in the programs upon which they focus. An advantage to be considered is improving dialogue between generalists (professional advisors) and specialists (faculty who know intimately their own academic programs).

7.3.2 Develop and implement a program whereby advisors are available online, via e-mail or via Skype, or via similar means, outside of 8 – 5 weekday office hours. Pilot and assess this initiative.

7.3.3 Consider a concierge approach, in which a student, dialing one number, reaches an advisor cross-trained in issues related to academic advising, financial aid, and career planning.
7.3.4 Compare the discussion of **mentoring programs**, found at Recommendation 6.4 in the preceding chapter.

**Items for consideration may include offering incentives, strong advice and strong communications relative to graduation**, such as these:

7.3.5 **Enforce GWE holds** in a rich, intrusive communications environment. Assess.

7.3.6 **Revise denial of graduation letters** to include instructions on how to obtain a degree audit and how to understand it. The letter should include a link to information on how to run a degree audit. Seek connections for this process / function with a course that students commonly take during their senior year (capstone or other): consider making a graduation check / audit into a course-integrated assignment, mandating a direct, person-to-person contact with the senior student and an advisor. Assess.
Chapter Eight

Toward Improved Advising at CSUDH: *Strengthening Advisors*

As in chapters eight and nine, in the present chapter we shall begin by:

- **Evoking key circumstances** of which we believe this university should take notice, derived from our SWOT analysis of advising at CSU Dominguez Hills;
- **Proposing two over-arching strategies** that we believe this university should embrace, in response to the key circumstances;
- **Offering six recommendations** for realizing the proposed strategies; and
- **Identifying particular actions**, associated with each of the strategies, that the Task Force commends to university advising leadership.

**Key Circumstances: Strengthening Professional Advisors.** In Table VIII -1 we identify key circumstances that we believe are consequential for any strategy that this university might adopt for strengthening the capacity of professional advisors. As will be observed, we identify one strength, three weaknesses, and two opportunities in the familiar SWOT approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VIII -1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the Task Force SWOT Analysis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CSUDH may have too few professional advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UATC professional advisors desire stronger support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communications between and among professional advisors, and others, is weak, inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CSUDH has well-identified successes in advising for special groups, which feature desirable ratios of advisors to advisees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regular state support (marginal cost) is growing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New potential opportunities for funding, including from CSU system-wide funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong potential for private support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although we do not formally evoke it in Table VIII – 1, it is worth preliminary mention that in both Chapters Six and Seven we made explicit reference to the high priority that student success merits among faculty, staff and administrative leaders at this university. Since contests for priority and among proposed priorities is endemic to any organization (we might say, endemic to life), this is key background.

However, the strength of special interest as we build recommendations for bolstering professional advisors may be the fact that we have local successes to learn from, which rely upon professional advisors. These are detailed in Chapter
Four. The short of it is that CSUDH knows from local experience the worth of professional advisors in supporting students through advisement and other interactions.

Our own local experience thus raises the issue of whether CSUDH now has too few professional advisors. Pointing to the successes described in Chapter Four, some on the Task Force reach that conclusion. However, a simple judgment is elusive.

One may reasonably ask whether there is a “right,” a normative, ratio for professional advisors to students. The apparent answer, following a review of information from the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) is that there is none. There are comparisons that can be made, including by institution type; and on that basis it would seem possible to say whether our institution, or any institution, is at par, above, or below par when compared to other institutions. Yet the issues are many, and in some respects thorny; and strong assessment seems called for.

Display VIII – 1 provides a substantial quotation from a lead article.

The second identified weakness is lack of support, or in another frame, a need for leadership. The professional advisors who met with Dr. Clare Weber in a focused discussion were clear that they desired policy clarity, communications, recognition of successes, and more.

Professional advisors in the same session saw major communications deficits, and we heard that also at the Task Force open hearing, from professional advisors and others present at that meeting.

The leadership and support sought, and the option of hiring more professional advisors, arise in a context of opportunity. We identify three such opportunities in our listing of key circumstances. There may be possibilities for funding new efforts with the goal improved advising.

---

Display VIII – 1

Some Words About Advisor Loads

Based on NACADA 2011 National Survey of Academic Advising (Carlstrom, 2013), the median case load of advisees per full-time professional academic advisor is 296, or a ratio of 296 students to one full-time advisor. By institutional size, the median individual advisor case loads are 233, 333, and 600 advisees for small, medium, and large institutions, respectively. The data show that the median numbers of advisees per advisor by institutional type are as follow: 441, 2-year; 260, public bachelor; 100, private bachelor; 300, public master; 179, private master; 285, public doctorate; 200, private doctorate; and 225, proprietary institutions.

These survey responses reflect important data, but they do not inform an ideal or recommended case load for advisors because the level of work for each case is relative. Although frequently asked of NACADA, meaningful case load comparisons remain elusive because too many factors affect advising delivery. In other words, there is no objective recommended case load for advisors ....

---

Mindful of the strength, and of the weaknesses, set out in Table VIII – 1, the Task Force proposes Strategy 8.1, found in Table VIII – 2. Strategy 8.1 goes on, as will be seen, states in general terms our over-arching objective. We may also evoke once again Strategy 6.1, offered in Chapter Six in Table VI – 3, that a “Dean of Advising” seek to simplify and clarify business practices, communications, and policies in general. These are surely related to the high goal of ensuring clarity of advice given.

With that, we may turn to particular recommendations and associated particular actions.

**Table VIII - 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY 8.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prioritize determining and hiring the right number of additional professional advisors; and train, support, lead, and deploy them well.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation 8.1:**

Seek strengthened leadership and support for professional advisors, in the UATC but also at the University generally.

**Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 8.1:**

8.1.1 See Recommendation 6.1, above: hire (or assign) a senior leader for advising. See also items 6.1.1 to 6.1.5, in Chapter Six, concerning details of this recommendation. Let us have, at least for a period, an Advising Tsar for CSUDH.

**Recommendation 8.2:**

Adopt, and follow through upon, a multi-year plan for hiring and deploying professional advisors.

**Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 8.2:**

8.2.1 Ask the “Dean of Advising” to propose a strong goal for improving the advising / advisee ratio in the University Advising & Testing Center (UATC).

8.2.2 Seek opportunities to relieve professional advisors from some, or much, of the routine “mechanics” of course selection in order to free up time for bona fide student mentoring and success coaching.
Recommendation 8.3:

Build advising plans in the colleges, which may or may not feature professional advisors – but which should feature devoting additional resources to advising.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 8.3:

8.3.1 Ask college deans to develop formal advising plans for their colleges, to include a strong and recurrent plan for assessment.

8.3.2 Ask the Dean of Advising to consult with college deans, and on request to supply a research-based set of suggestions / best-practices to inform the college-specific plans.

8.3.3 Ask the Dean of Advising to work with college deans and faculty to align college-specific plans with the university-wide mission and vision for advising.

8.3.4 As a part of college plan development, ask college deans to seek plans at the department / program level for advising, and for improvement in advising.

8.3.5 Invite college deans to work with the Dean of Advising to supply a set of best / recommended practices; and work to align departmental plans with the university-wide mission and vision for advising. Some colleges may choose to rely strongly on professional advisors, while others may rely instead on faculty with suitable training and time assignments. After choosing a strategy that appears to fit well with college curricula and culture, deans should be asked to estimate the costs of what they propose.

8.3.6 Where heavy reliance on professional advisors is chosen for a college strategy, find ways to ensure, nonetheless, strong opportunities for faculty-student contact outside of the classroom. (This simply takes note that faculty-student advising sessions would become less frequent.) Service learning, and participation in student / faculty research, constitute such opportunities. Making career plans is such an opportunity for faculty mentoring of students outside of a course-selection-focused routine advisement interaction.

8.3.7 With college-based and UATC plans and proposals in hand, encourage the Provost to bring a cumulated proposal to the President via the University Budget Committee, seeking needed resources. Such “needed resources” could include (a) support for faculty reassigned time to support their involvement in advisor orientation and development, and to incentivize / reward faculty who would like to commit significant professional time engaged in advising; and (b) investment in advising technology [discussed in Chapter 9].
Recommendation 8.4:

Build plans for professional development and professional learning among professional advisors.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 10.2:

8.4.1 Create, and seek, professional growth opportunities for professional advisors. Compare item 7.1.7 in the preceding chapter.

8.4.2 Consider providing a professional Advising Manual (different from an e-handbook on policies) to facilitate the advising process and equip advisors with effective advising strategies.

Recommendation 8.5:

Build plans for supporting the daily / weekly / semesterly / annual work of professional advisors.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 8.2:

8.5.1 Create, and seek, professional growth opportunities for professional advisors. Compare item 7.1.7 in the preceding chapter. This echoes suggestions associated with Recommendation 7.1 in the previous chapter; see also below, item 8.5.7, and 8.5.8.

8.5.2 Seek in the professional literature an Advising Manual that lays out best or recommended practices for advising. Note this is different from an e-handbook: it would not be specific to CSUDH. It may be a source for material to support professional growth opportunities (as above). Provide to professional advisor, and if suitable also to faculty advisors.

8.5.3 Develop an e-handbook on policies and procedures for advising, for use by professional advisors and faculty both [two versions of a handbook can be developed, if suitable] Include in a handbook best practices, including those related to effective advising for students of color, for women, for men, and for other defined groups.

8.5.4 Associate the e-handbook with an interactive web page for use by professional advisors as a teaching tool when interacting with students and faculty, and for use directly by students and faculty when seeking information and answers to questions. Include a Frequently Asked Questions page or pages on the site.
8.5.5 Ensure that communications strategies are strongly implemented, between and among professional advisors, and with students and other constituencies (including key faculty).

8.5.6 Ensure proper and effective working conditions for professional advisors, to include appropriate compensation and appropriate distribution of workloads.

8.5.7 Identify and consider ways in which professional advisors may receive meaningful steps toward professional advancement: faculty who proceed from assistant to associate and then to full professor status may provide a model.

8.5.8 Provide regular, recurrent workshops focused on acquiring the skills needed to successfully provide individualized academic advising [cf. student focus group recommendations]47; provide recurrent workshops or other focused training on technicalities to include policy updates, electronic tools updates, the “fit” of particular academic majors with general education – ensuring that highly sequential majors are not delayed while breadth is achieved in the first two years; provide recurrent workshops or other focused training on “road maps” for particular majors.

8.5.9 Working with the standing committee on Advising, disseminate information to faculty and staff generally in addition to communications to professional advisors or designated advisors in academic programs. That is: keep the whole community informed. Assess.

Focus on the Faculty. Our focus has to this point primarily been upon professional advisors. Yet like most universities, CSU Dominguez Hills places great reliance upon faculty to deliver effective advising, especially as fulfillment of the degree major becomes the key goal for the student approaching graduation. With that in mind, we turn our focus to the faculty.

We thus evoke a new suite of descriptions of weaknesses and strengths. These follow in Table VIII -3, below.

47 Note resources available from the Education Advisory Board. See, e.g., Ibid., Section IV, Advising Toolkit, which includes recommended approaches to training sessions and workshops.
From the Task Force SWOT Analysis:

- CSUDH may have too few professional advisors.
- Student success is a keen faculty interest.
- CSUDH has very low proportion of full-time faculty.
- Incentive structure for faculty to do advising is poorly-defined.
- Faculty are not trained in advisement.

Weaknesses, however, include this university’s low proportion of full-time faculty, to whom advising duties normally fall. Beyond that, the incentive structure for faculty to do advising is poorly-defined, a situation common in American universities. There is no real training available for faculty when it comes to advising, in the Task Force scan of our environment. Yet, college plans as discussed above may very well, and suitably, rely on faculty.

The short of it is this: CSUDH must engage its faculty in advising, in order to achieve better retention and graduation to a high quality baccalaureate for our students. We formalize this in Strategy 8.2, as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VIII - 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY 8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen both the advising function among faculty generally, and in specific strengthen and support designated specialists in advising among the faculty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 8.6:

Provoke campus discussion – and seek resolution concerning – how advising fits within the faculty role, including as a consideration for hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion.

Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 8.6:

8.6.1  Via focused discussions involving deans and faculty leaders in each college, and engaging the Academic Senate and the leadership of the faculty union, give strong consideration to explicitly placing faculty advising expectations, together with evaluations of performance, into guidelines for faculty performance that are referenced in retention, tenure, promotion, and any other faculty evaluations. Pilot and assess this initiative.

8.6.2  Consider required language in faculty job announcements relative to advising expectations.
8.6.3 Recognize / reward via faculty honors and awards the outstanding contributions to advising that particular faculty offer.

8.6.4 Strongly consider re-instituting a program whereby faculty can spend considerable time working alongside professional advisors: two-year “tours” in a CSU Sacramento model, following which faculty return to departments and act as advising leaders in major program context. Compare Appendix G and the description of the Sacramento State approach. This program was previously in place at CSUDH (some years ago, before falling to budget cuts). Pilot and assess this initiative.

8.6.5 Strongly consider hiring selected part-time faculty to spend an appropriate portion of their time engaged in advising (e.g., a 0.2 or a 0.1 assignment in addition to the other teaching work for which they are hired). Pilot and assess this initiative.

8.6.6 Build an expectation and readiness for all of these initiatives / expectations into the college advising plans referenced above.

8.6.7 Offer specific professional development in advising to all full-time faculty, especially in context of RTP and other evaluations.

8.6.8 Offer specific professional development in advising to part-time faculty who are hired as recommended above.

8.6.9 Set appropriate goals for faculty who are willing to take this “track” of professional development; use judicious incentives to encourage faculty to take training.

8.6.10 Make faculty advising a part of a new faculty orientation effort that extends across several weeks or months. Pilot and assess this initiative.

8.6.11 Utilize faculty who have completed a “tour” in the Advising Center [cf. item 8.6.4 above] to deliver peer / colleague professional development and orientation. Pilot and assess this initiative.

**Recommendation 8.7:**

Seek models for strengthening the faculty role in advising from sister CSU campuses, from best-practice organizations, from other universities.

**Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 8.7:**

8.7.1 Reach out to the Chancellor’s Office for support. Seek financial and other support both from top system leaders, and from Academic Affairs staff in the Office of the Chancellor. Compare recommendations relative to an annual advising conference in Chapter 8.

8.7.2 Seek from the Education Advisory Board, from the AAC&U, and from other organizations, models of best practices in encouraging faculty engagement in advising.
Chapter Nine

Toward Improved Advising at CSUDH: *Arming Advisors with Reliable, Easy-to-Access Information and Analyses*

**Part I. Basic Improvements To Improve Advising Processes.** In listening to the community, the Task Force learned that many in the community – faculty advisors, in particular – desired tools for accessing student data and analytics that are easy to use. The tools now provided in PeopleSoft, they testified, are not easy to use. These sentiments were accompanied by other wishes that we may term elementary, or basic: please make the right information easy to access and to rely upon.

In Part II we will offer a broader vision for technological support for advising, and for student success. Let us begin, however, with a recommendation that we improve our housekeeping.

We may begin by evoking key portions of our SWOT analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table IX-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From the Task Force SWOT Analysis:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● CSUDH features unclear policies and procedures, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◇ Google searches on CSUDH.edu often return outdated, incorrect information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◇ Archiving of policy is largely paper-bound;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◇ Advisors report confusion about registration holds, calendars, required procedures, &amp; priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a direct manner, we can associate an appropriate strategy, and recommendation, as follows.
**Recommendation 9.1:**

Improve and ensure the currency of information delivered via the campus general web site.

From our listening to the community, we offer the following specifics for consideration.

**Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 9.1:**

9.1.1 Purge “historic” (outdated) information from the web site, on the important assumption that updated and accurate information is available to replace it.

9.1.2 Ensure that the most relevant information is the first to appear on web searches.

Specifically:

d. Make the UATC site the first to appear.

e. Bring GWAR information up early in web searches.

f. Bring GWE test and registration information up early in web searches.

9.1.3 Make all relevant forms for advising readily available on the web.

**Recommendation 9.2:**

Create a central repository on the CSUDH web site to house policies pertaining to advising, and to other topics. Ensure its accuracy and currency. [Compare Table IX – 1.]

**Part II. Broader Strategies and Recommendations.** We turn now to broader strategies and associated recommendations, many of which are underway with commendable Information Technology leadership, which the Task Force endorses and welcomes.

We may begin with reference to some elements of the Task Force SWOT analysis of advising at CSUDH.
Table IX -3

*From the Task Force SWOT Analysis:*

- Modern information tools for effective advising need upgrades.
  - Faculty report discontent with the PeopleSoft tools available now;
  - Technical issues exist with current PeopleSoft capabilities, including whether certain features have been “turned on,” and whether some capabilities in PeopleSoft as deployed correspond to CSUDH business practices;
  - Receipt of transcripts via electronic means is hard to accomplish and only slowly increasing.

We associate Strategy 9.2 with the SWOT elements identified. The Strategy is shown in Table IX-4.

Table IX -4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY 9.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek systemic improvements in modern information tools for effective advising, led by the Division of Information Technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 9.3: Improve the accuracy and completeness of advice given – and seek a higher-order focus for all advisors at CSUDH.

- Recommendation 9.2 is animated by a particular vision for advising at CSUDH. It is set out in Table IX – 5.

Table IX - 5

*A Vision for Advising at CSU Dominguez Hills*

- By 2017, faculty and professional advisors alike engage much less in assisting individual student course selections, and much more in assisting CSUDH undergraduates with the development, and the pursuit, of their academic, career, and personal development goals.

In pursuit of this vision, arming advisors and students with reliable, easy-to-access information and analyses will be key – which explains why this vision occurs in the present chapter of this report. We have some ideas to offer about ways forward.
Consider These Actions Relative to Recommendation 9.2:

9.3.1 For newly-admitted students, prioritize decreasing time from admission to posting of transcripts, in order to support and improve the accuracy and completeness of advisors’ interactions with incoming students.

9.3.2 Develop a user-friendly advising documentation system.

9.3.3 Ensure reliable data on advisor screens; seek calculated values capability as early as feasible.

Recommendation 9.4:

Seek automated tools that reduce advisor and student time spent creating clear paths to the degree.

In important part, the goal is to empower students to take fuller control of their own term course scheduling by taking full advantage of the soon to be-implemented Student Planner, and Multi-Year Planner and Roadmap. The University has already implemented College Scheduler, to integrate with the student enrollment functions in My CSUDH. It allows students the ability to block out times they are unavailable to take classes, and the tool with find a class schedule with the classes a student wishes to take, at the times the student can take them. Additionally, providing easier access for advisors and faculty to enter substitutions and notes from advising sessions will ensure students more accurate advising data.

9.4.1 Seek automated tools that reduce advisor and student time spent creating clear paths to the degree. The Division of Information Technology anticipates implementing PeopleSoft Student Planner to allow students to create a multi-year plan of classes. An advantage is that this tool is functionally fully-integrated within both PeopleSoft Advisor and Student Centers.

9.4.2 Install enhancements to ease faculty use of information tools. This includes easy entry of substitutions / exceptions, advisor notes, and online degree audit. Offer training / professional development, probably via online means, for faculty in using these tools.

Enhancing the easy with which substitutions / exceptions for degree-major course requirements can be entered via modern information technology will ensure that faculty and advisors enter this information early in a student’s career, thus allowing students better information via their degree audit as to what requirements have been met, and which classes still need to be taken. Facilitating the addition of departmental advisors’ notes to a student’s file will ensure an accurate record of each advising session, and provide students and others who may offer advice easy access.
Recommendation 9.5:

Identify at-risk students as early as possible, and permit early intervention.

9.5.1 Consider wider use of the Hobson’s tool, now being used by Athletics. The tool permits early alert tracking and risk assessment.

9.5.2 The Division of Information Technology has joined an Education Advisory Board (EAB) Collaborative, and will be implementing their predictive analytics and advisor dashboard solution. This will identify students who are at-risk their chosen majors, and clearly prioritize students needing intervention. It should also support, where appropriate, informing students about alternative majors that might be better matches for students’ skills and academic / career goals.

Recommendation 9.6:

Provide an electronic catalog.

9.6.1 The Division of Information Technology is at work on this. Smart Catalog is a tool of interest. Resource / Schedule 25 is a promising tool for fulfilling related class scheduling needs.

We endorse the plans already underway to identify, acquire, install, train and use advising technology supports, led by the Division of Information Technology. We can cumulate them in general terms, and add them to our vision for 2017. The continuation of Table IX – 5 offers this.
**A Vision for Advising that is Well-Supported by Information Tools at CSU Dominguez Hills**

By 2017, CSUDH will feature and use with confidence:

- Fully functional degree audits for all programs and all students. *This will feature quick what-if analysis to see how course work may apply to different career or program goals.*
- A schedule optimizer, either as a stand-alone tool, or as part of a suite of planning tools that are easy to access and easy to use.
- Fully functional multi-term planning tools, for use by students, by faculty and deans who plan by-term course offerings, and by advisors who interact with students.
- E-advisor or student dashboards. Predictive analytics will be supplied where appropriate.
Appendix A
The Charge of the Task Force

CHARGE from President Hagan

The Task Force to Seek Best Practices and Improved Outcomes from Advising will:

A. **In a context of considering alternatives, adopt a definition for advising** that understands options in delineating boundaries for “advising,” and that appreciates CSUDH history and future, and the needs and characteristics of CSUDH students, focusing centrally on undergraduates both matriculated and, as appropriate, prior to matriculation. Consider, among other resources, work available from NACADA [http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/](http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/), a professional association focused on advising: see, e.g., *The Concept of Advising*, [http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Concept-of-Academic-Advising-a598.aspx](http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Concept-of-Academic-Advising-a598.aspx); and work produced by the University Leadership Council, an arm of the Education Advisory Board, in reports such as *Next Generation Advising: Elevating Practice for Degree Completion and Career Success* (2012).

B. **Map and Evaluate current CSUDH advising** activities, charting, among other things:
   1. formal advising offices, staffing, resources, and success; and
   2. practices in colleges and departments, and faculty advising practices both modal and innovative. In developing a map, consider consulting assistance, such as via an audit undertaken by a NACADA-provided consultant. See [http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Consultant-Speaker-Service.aspx](http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Consultant-Speaker-Service.aspx)

C. **Craft a bold vision** for effective advising for CSUDH that
1. reflects national best practices as reported by professional associations and scholarship, including, e.g., reports from the Education Advisory Board;
2. draws upon exemplary practices in The California State University, using reports from the Chancellor’s Office and other sources: see, e.g., http://graduate.csuprojects.org/campus_collaboration/search-focus-area; and
3. includes definitions of success that can be operationalized.

D. **Generate a series of goals and objectives** that proceed from vision and seek to implement programs and activities designed to achieve the campus vision for effective advising.

E. **Recommend** pilot projects to be launched in the short run whereby CSUDH advising systems can develop experience in new modes and approaches to advising.

F. **Build a plan for assessing** the success of advising at CSUDH, deployable at an early juncture in order to understand current levels of success, and capable of recurrent deployment in order to chart progress.

G. **Plan for participation in campus student success symposia** in ways that will demonstrate and encourage the adoption of effective advising practices.

H. **Report to the president** not later than December 15, 2013.

**Members**: Faculty Chair, Clare Weber, Sociology; Co-chair, Keith Boyum; Executive Sponsors Mitch Maki, Susan Borrego (Keith Boyum); Peter Kim, Academic Affairs; William Franklin & Brandy McLelland, EMSA; Chris Manriquez, CIO; Sheela Pawar, Acting Associate Dean, CAH; Christopher Monty, History; Keisha Paxton, Psychology; Daryl Evans, Advisor; professional advisor to be named.

Executive Sponsor: [http://www.change-management.com/sponsor-roles.htm](http://www.change-management.com/sponsor-roles.htm)
Appendix B

Description of Academic Advising Practices at CSUDH

University Advising Center

New Student Orientation
Online registration is open to incoming freshmen that have completed their Intent to Enroll and have EPT and ELM scores. Incoming freshmen, that are eligible to register for NSO, will receive e-mail with registration information. Students are charged a $55.00 fee and $15.00 for guests. Deferred payment is available provided students demonstrate an estimated family contribution of $4,000 or less. Orientation Leaders (OL) lead the NSOs.

The University Advisement Center participates in all NSOs. However, they only conduct advising session workshops for incoming students prior to fall registration. Advising sessions for the student’s respective academic colleges conduct transfer students prior to fall registration.

Advising
Students may receive advising by appointment or walk in. Students are able to schedule 30-minute appointments with a UAC Academic Advisor from 8:30am to 1:30pm daily (Monday through Friday). Students are able to walk-in to meet with an advisor from 2:00 pm to closing and will be seen on a first come basis. Walk-ins are in the afternoon of the day to ensure greater access to Academic Advisors. If students don’t have an appointment earlier in the day, they have the option for walk-in services daily. If students need special accommodations and must be seen at that point in time, exceptions are always made to ensure students are never turned away from the UAC. The front desk personnel have the authority to request an Academic Advisor see a student, pending their schedule availability.
To ensure greater accessibility to advisors, the UAC also employs email advising where students can send an email of their questions and receive a timely response to their inquiries. Students are also able to engage UAC advisors via a webcam, two times a week (Tuesdays from 10-12pm and Wednesdays for 3-5pm). Phone appointments are also available, in case students are not able to make the commute to campus.

The UAC employs a student-centered academic advising model. In chronicling the advising session for DH students and for assessment purposes, the academic advisor employs Checklist Management within CMS PeopleSoft. Before the student leaves the advising session, they are furnished a print out of all of the contents of Checklist Management. During the follow up process, the Academic Advisor will also email an electronic copy of the advising session to the student’s Toromail account. The sharing of information with the student does not conclude at the end of an advising session. Depending on the content of the advising session, the Academic Advisor may: 1. Submit updates to student’s Academic Requirements Page, 2. Communicate content to the student, information that was not available at the advising session, 3. Collaborate with major departments to ensure there is consistency and uniformity of the information conveyed to students, 4. Work with Admissions and Records to ensure accuracy of student data, 5. Connect students to other academic resources across the campus.

**College Advising**

College Student Service Centers advise students on courses in the major, roadmaps, academic progress and probation, course substitutions and transfer courses. They work closely with departments and, in some cases, may provide the bulk of the advising for a department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Academic Advising College Student Services Centers</th>
<th>Students per College Advisor (Fall 2012 data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAH</td>
<td>Monday to Friday, (hours not posted on web). There are 2 Professional Advisors, one assigned specifically to NCRP.</td>
<td>825 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAPP</td>
<td>Monday to Friday, from 8:45 to 4:15. There are three undergraduate advisors assigned to specific programs.</td>
<td>876 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHHSN</td>
<td>Monday to Friday, from 8:45 to 4:15 by appointment.</td>
<td>2700 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COEIE</td>
<td>Monday to Friday, from 8:00 to 5:00. Advising also includes credentialing information, student teaching interviews and services for teachers trained out of state.</td>
<td>603 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>By appointment only, advising hours not posted on the web. Dept. of Psychology has peer advisor program.</td>
<td>2979 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Department/Faculty Advising**

Faculty hold regularly scheduled advising office hours. Part time and full time faculty advise students on academic work. In addition, full time faculty advise students on courses in the major, roadmaps, academic progress and probation, course substitutions, transfer courses, career and professional advising. As of Fall 2012, there were 267 (38.1%) full time faculty compared to 434 (61.9%) part time faculty. This ratio varies by department.

**Student Services**

**Admissions**

In general, the appropriate college designee places and removes holds placed on students’ records. However, for undeclared students, the University Advisement Center (UAC) is the designee on placing and removing holds.

For Mandatory Freshman Advising (MFA) and Strategies Towards Educational Progress & Success (STEPS), the UAC will place and remove holds, irrespective of the student’s declared major.

Mandatory Freshman Advising holds are placed upon all freshman students before they can register for their second and third semesters. These holds will be removed after a mandatory advising session that ensures students receive the necessary information for successful transition from high school to college, as well as information on the following semester’s course registration.

For any student on Academic Probation, a STEPS probation hold will be placed on any student who qualifies for Academic Probation as defined in Executive Order 1038 during each semester that he or she is on Academic Probation. The University Advisement Center (UAC) will provide STEPS (Strategies Towards Educational Progress & Success) workshops. STEPS Holds will be removed by the UAC when the student completes the STEPS workshop and/or STEPS Follow-up workshop during subsequent semesters on Academic Probation.

**Athletics**

Student athletes receive athletics holds. An athletic advisor meets with a student athlete one month prior to registration date. Student athletes entering as freshman are required to go through UAC mandatory advising with an additional form that asks the student to list their proposed schedule, identify what type of class it is (GE/major) and have a UAC advisor (for freshman) or a faculty advisor (for transfer students) agree these are correct courses. Transfer students must also submit a major advising worksheet or some other document from the department of their major that outlines their major requirements. An advisor in Athletics reviews this and then holds are lifted. There is a mandatory study hall for all freshmen, incoming transfers, and any continuing student with a term GPA of 2.7 or below. Hours vary from 2-6 hours per week depending on the team they belong to or their particular academic background. Grade checks will be done once a semester via a new online system. Athletics also collaborates with the career center.
Career Center

The CSUDH Career Center provides services and programs that help CSUDH students and alumni make an informed career choice, inform them on the expectations of the workplace, and connect them with prospective employers. Career-related services include individual career counseling appointments, assessment interpretation, online resources to aid students in making informed choices regarding major and career, (What Can I do with this Major? Focus II) and career panels featuring successful professionals. For those considering graduate or professional school, there are graduate school preparation workshops, personal statement reviews and an annual Graduate School Fair.

Employment preparation activities include resume critiques, a series of workshops presented each semester on job search topics, and employer mentoring activities such as the Resume Clinic, Dining Etiquette Workshop and Dinner, and Speed Networking with Working Professionals. Employment services range from job and internship fairs to on-campus employer interviews and information sessions, the biannual Internship Week, and online employment postings via Torolobs and Internships. Other online services include workshops in webinar format, practice interview software, resume writing tools, career information, Skype appointments with counselors, and job search "how to" videos (Career Spots).

Student Support Services

Student Support Services TRIO is a federally funded academic support program designed to provide academic advising support, to 160 qualified participants, that supplements and supports the Advising Center and the specific departments where participants are aligned. SSS advising is strengths-based and success driven using Appreciative Advising and Intrusive Advising techniques to support participants successfully navigate the institution in their efforts to earn their bachelors degrees. The 160 participants are divided among three advising professionals and each student is required to meet with their assigned staff member 3x per semester to ensure that students understand their academic requirements set by the university and respective academic department, to set semester goals for achievement, and to develop a blueprint, or set of "STEPS" designed to help students meet their academic, psycho-social, financial, and career goals. Advising ratio is 65 students to one advisor.

Encounter to Excellence

The ETE program has 5 academic advisors and 17 peer mentors available to students. An Intrusive/Developmental model of advising is used. ETE Advisors conduct one-on-one advising sessions, as well as numerous advising workshops each semester. The ETE advising model emphasizes the development of self-confidence and equipping students with the tools to make better decisions through on-going provision of college knowledge. Support includes helping students select courses, connecting students with academic resources, intervening when students are experiencing academic and/or personal challenges, helping students select a degree program, assisting students in making connections with professors, and coaching on how to maintain balance with school, work, and family obligations.

ETE also offers supplemental instruction in English, math and other academic subjects. Supplemental instructors for math and English sit in on classes, model appropriate classroom
behaviors and study skills, and provide students with individualized support and group workshops outside of class. ETE students meet with assigned advisors and peer mentors twice each semester, and more often as needed. ETE employs a cohort model where students start out together in the summer bridge program and continue as a cohort in ETE. The ETE Student Center provides students with space to form study groups amongst peers, and room to do solo studying and homework, as well as a "home base" on campus where students can meet between classes, or connect with program staff such as Advisors, peer mentors, and supplemental instructors. Advising ratio of 150 students to 1 advisor.

Equal Opportunity Program

Advising Ratio of 150 students to 1 advisor

The EOP has 4 academic advisors and 8 peer mentors available to students. An Intrusive/Developmental model of advising is used. EOP Advisors conduct one-on-one advising sessions, as well as numerous advising workshops each semester. The EOP advising model emphasizes the development of self-confidence and equipping students with the tools to make better decisions through on-going provision of college knowledge. Support includes helping students select courses, connecting students with academic resources, intervening when students are experiencing academic and/or personal challenges, helping students select a degree program, assisting students in making connections with professors, and coaching on how to maintain balance with school, work, and family obligations.

EOP also offers supplemental instruction in English, math and other academic subjects. Supplemental instructors for math and English sit in on classes, model appropriate classroom behaviors and study skills, and provide students with individualized support and group workshops outside of class. EOP students meet with assigned advisors and peer mentors twice each semester, and more often as needed. EOP employs a cohort model where students start out together in the summer bridge program and continue as a cohort in EOP. The EOP office provides space to form study groups amongst peers, and room to do solo studying and homework.

Summer Bridge Academy

Summer Bridge Academy is a six-week intensive summer program for students who have taken the EPT/ELM exams and are required to take developmental classes in English and Math during the summer to prepare for college-level coursework. Preference is given to students whose ELM/EPT test scores require them to take two math and two English courses in preparation for college-level courses in these areas. The Summer Bridge Academy aims to ease the transition from high school to college by providing students with critical college knowledge that will help them acclimate to college life. In addition to developmental courses in English and math, students receive academic support in both areas inside and outside of the classroom, as well as workshops in various areas such as study skills, time management, financial literacy, building a network for college & career, developing relationships with faculty, and the importance of help-seeking for college success. In addition, students are provided with regular opportunities to work one-on-one and in small groups with Advisors and peer mentors.
## Undergraduate Academic Advising Holds by Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Description</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>New Student Hold</th>
<th>Continuing Student Hold</th>
<th>90+ Unit Hold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afr St: General Africana St</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africana Stu: His&amp;Pol Dev</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africana Stu: Lan&amp;Lit Dev</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africana Stu: Socio-Psych Beh</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthro: Archaeology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthro: General Anthro</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthro: Undeclared Concentration</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Studies</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Studies</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art: Design</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art: Art History</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art: Studio Art</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Science</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology: Cellular and Molecular</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Ecology Environmental</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology: Microbiology</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Accounting</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad: Pre-Maj: Accounting</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad: Information Systems</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Pre-major: Ent</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Finance</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad: Pre-Maj: Finance</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Gen Business</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad: Pre-Maj: Gen Business</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Major: Global Log &amp; Supply</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Global Log &amp; Supply</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS Admin: Pre-Maj Info Sys</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: International</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad: Pre-Maj: Internatnl Bus</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Info Sys Securit</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Info Sys Sec Premaj</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad: Mgt. &amp; Human Resources</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin Pre MGT &amp; HR</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Marketing</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad: Pre-Maj: Marketing</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin: Sports, Ent &amp; Hosp mgmt</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre: Sports, Ent &amp; Hosp Mgt</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Pre-Maj</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Ad Pre-Maj: Undeclared</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry: General Chemistry</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry: Biochemistry</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry: General Chemistry</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicana/o Stu: Art, Aest &amp; Perf</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicana/o Stu: Cul, His, Pol Dev</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicana/o Stu: Ed, Soc &amp; Com Dev</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicana/o Studies: Lan &amp; Lit</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice Admin</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Sci: Cytotechnology</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Sci: Medical Tech</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Sci: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com: Advertising and P.R.</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com: Journalism</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com: Media Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Technology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Tech: Professional Tr</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA: Audio Recording Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA: Music Technology Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA: Television Arts Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English: Education</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English: Language &amp; Linguistics</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English: Literature</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology: Earth Science</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology: Physical Science</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci: Community Health</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci: Health Care Mgt</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hea Sci: Diagnostic Imagine</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci: Radiologic Tech</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services: MHR</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS: American Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS: Comparative Cultures</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisc St: Environmental St</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDS: Global Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisc St: PACE/General</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisc St: Undeclared Conc</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St: Pre-Major</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Stds: Natural Science</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Anthropology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Art</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Dance</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Stud:Eng Lang &amp; Ling</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Health</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:History</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Stud: Human Development</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies: Integrated</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Stud: Eng Lit Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Math</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Physical Education</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Sociology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Stud: Spanish Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Special Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Theater Arts</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal St:Undeclared</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math:Mathematics Education</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics:Mathematics Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music:Music Education</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music:General Music</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music:Performance</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music:Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation, Con Res and Peace</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Ed:Dance</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.:Athletic Train Education</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Ed:Fitness Director</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.:Pre-Physical Therapy</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Ed:Teaching</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Ed:Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI: Philosophy</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI:Religious Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy:Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics:General Physics</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics:Physical Science</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Sci:General</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Sci:Undeclared Conc</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Adm:Administrative Mgt</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Adm:Criminal Justice Ad</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Adm:Pub Financial Mgt</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Adm:Health Services Adm</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Adm:Pub Personnel Adm</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Adm:Undeclared Conc</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Admin:Non-Profit Mgt</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance BS</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Mea Sci</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Measurement</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>NOT ON LIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Declared</td>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish: Linguistics</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Major</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Major</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts: Dance Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts: Undeclared Option</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is the business process guide that outlines the general structure of each and every advising session with a UATC Academic Advisor:

**Prior to Meeting with DH Students**

**Appointments v Walk-Ins**

Students are able to schedule 30 minute appointments with a UAC Academic Advisor from 8:30am to 1:30pm daily.

Students may schedule appointment by:

1) Calling the UAC front desk 310-243-3538
2) Emailing uac@csudh.edu

Appointments are reflected on the UAC shared Google Calendar to ensure Academic Advisors are able to access their daily appointments via the web from anywhere.

Students are able to Walk-In and see an Academic Advisor from 2pm to Closing and will be seen on a first come basis. Walk Ins are in the afternoon of the day to ensure greater access to Academic Advisors. If students don’t have an appointment earlier in the day, then they have the option for Walk-In services daily.

If students need special accommodations and must be seen at that point in time, exceptions are made to ensure students are never turned away from the UAC. The front desk personnel have the authority to request an Academic Advisor to see a student, pending their schedule availability. Student-centered Academic Advising services, is the primary mission of the UAC.

**Preparing for the Advising Session**

Prior to the student meeting an Academic Advisor, preparation is taken to:

1) Anticipate potential questions and areas of concern
2) Establish a connection with the student to ensure a level of comfort for the student

The following screens within CMS PeopleSoft are essential to gather as much information regarding the student’s academic standing at DH and to anticipate questions and concerns from the student:

- Student Center Page
The collection of the available information regarding the student’s academic records informs the Academic Advisor and dictates the type of information that will be conveyed to the student at the advising session.

This advantage is not available during Walk-In sessions as the Academic Advisor has no prior information on the student’s academic records. As a result, the initial moments of Walk-In sessions are to collect as much information on the student prior to the formal sharing of information throughout the advising session.

**Meeting with DH Students**

*Dialog and Exchange of Information*

The objective of every advising session is to furnish to students timely, accurate, consistent, and reliable information regarding a student’s matriculation towards degree.

The Academic Advisor engages in active listening to determine the overall needs of the student. Thereafter, relevant academic policies, campus procedures, and general recommendations are conveyed to ensure students have all of the necessary information to make informed decisions regarding their academic path to graduation.

A template of an advising session is the following:

1) Greetings/Introductions
2) Information sharing and gathering
3) Signing into student’s MyCSUDH account
4) Dialog on strategies to resolve questions and issues
5) Documentation of the advising session
6) Salutations
7) Follow Up

In chronicling the advising session for DH students and for assessment purposes in the future, the Academic Advisor will employ Checklist Management within CMS PeopleSoft. Before the student leaves the advising session, they will be furnished a print out of all of the contents of Checklist Management. During the follow up process, the Academic Advisor will also email an electronic copy of the advising session to the student’s Toromail account.

The following screens within CMS PeopleSoft as well as other resources are essential to chronicling the contents of every advising session:

- Checklist Management Page
- Academic Requirements Page
- PeopleSoft Template Spreadsheet (excel)

Because not all information for the student is accessible for the student within CMS PeopleSoft, outside academic resources, including the PeopleSoft Templates are essential to ensuring that students are receiving timely, accurate, consistent, and reliable information regarding their academic careers at CSUDH.

After Meeting with DH Students

Follow Up

The sharing of information with the student does not conclude at the end of an advising session. Rather, as Academic Advisors are advocates for their student’s success, the follow up process is necessary to ensure that students are in the best position for success.

Depending on the content of the advising session, the Academic Advisor may be:

1) Submitting updates to student’s Academic Requirements Page
2) Communicating content to the student, information that was not available at the advising session
3) Collaborating with major departments to ensure there is consistency and uniformity of the information conveyed to students
4) Working with Admissions and Records to ensure accuracy of student data
5) Connecting students to other academic resources across the campus

The overall ability of the Academic Advisor to communicate information to students and advocate on their behalf, in partnering with students in navigating through the structures of the DH campus, will aid students achieve their primary objective of degree completion.
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Graphical Display of Academic Advising Practices at CSUDH

- Follows Overleaf.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF STUDENT</th>
<th>Summer Prior to Enrollment</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Pre-Transfer</th>
<th>Third Year/First Transfer Year</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST TIME FROM [1550]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Developmental (309)</td>
<td>New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td>- Mandatory Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Non-Summer Bridge (1248)</td>
<td>New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td>- Mandatory Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-EOO/Handicapped (1246)</td>
<td>Summer Bridge Experience (Bridge Advising)</td>
<td>Ongoing Bridge Advising</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athletes [9]</strong></td>
<td>Athletic Advising</td>
<td>New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td>- Mandatory Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
<td>Athletic Advising</td>
<td>- Ongoing Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans (45)</strong></td>
<td>Veterans Office Benefits Counseling - Informal advisement</td>
<td>New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td>- Mandatory Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Veterans Office Benefits Counseling - Informal advisement Advising due to Probation hold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International</strong></td>
<td>International Advising</td>
<td>- Mandatory Freshmen Advising Session (hold)</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>International Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support 161</strong></td>
<td>Possible Summer Bridge Experience</td>
<td>New Student Orientation (advising hold)</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Departmental advising and holds Advising due to Probation hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOWER DIVISION NON-FRESH TRANSFERS (30)</strong></td>
<td>Athletic Advising</td>
<td>New Student Orientation</td>
<td>Athletic Advising</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor</td>
<td>Vendor Contact Name</td>
<td>Vendor Contact Email</td>
<td>Vendor Contact Phone</td>
<td>Vendor Contact Address</td>
<td>Vendor Contact Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 1</td>
<td>John Doe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.doe@example.com">john.doe@example.com</a></td>
<td>123-456-7890</td>
<td>123 Main St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 2</td>
<td>Jane Smith</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.smith@example.com">jane.smith@example.com</a></td>
<td>987-654-3210</td>
<td>456 Main St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor 3</td>
<td>Bob Johnson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bob.johnson@example.com">bob.johnson@example.com</a></td>
<td>678-901-2345</td>
<td>789 Main St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Note 1: Additional vendor details.
- Note 2: Special vendor requirements.
- Note 3: Custom vendor integration details.
1. Definition of Academic Advising

- The participants defined academic advising as “receiving advice from someone knowledgeable about the requirements needed for graduation in addition to guidance with the classes a student should take every semester.”

2. Selecting a Major

- The majority of the participants reported that they selected their major without being influenced by a CSUDH advisor. The major influences reported are: (1) students selected their major on their own, (2) with the help of friends or family members, and (3) with the guidance from a high school or Jr. college faculty.

3. Academic Advising Expectations

- The participants described that they expected someone with knowledge about academic guidance. Someone who would be able to advise them with their academics providing not only guidance but also other resources for academic support.

**Working Set of Recommendations:**
- Ongoing training should be conducted to help advisors gain the skills needed to successfully provide individualized academic advising and offer other resources for academic support.
- A connection should be established among the departments for advisors to be able to know what type of resources are available for students.
| 4. Type of Help Needed During Academic Advising Time | ➢ There were three major needs reported by the participants: (1) guidance with courses; (2) questions about academic requirements; and (3) help accessing resources such as internships, student support services, transfer issues, and advice about graduate school |
| 5. Decision to Take Classes | ➢ The road map in combination with guidance on how to follow the map was used by the participants to take classes each semester.  

**Working Set of Recommendations:**  
- A campus-wide assessment should be conducted to be able to determine how road maps are used by advisors  
- There should be a system that requires all advisors to provide guidance when handing out a road map to students |
| 6. Academic Advising Experiences | ➢ Student advising experiences, either positive or negative, influence the desire to finish studies at CSUDH and affected students’ academic success.  

**Working Set of Recommendations:**  
- Academic advising experiences can affect student retention and also graduation rates. Therefore, these links should be taken into consideration when implementing new strategies for improvement across campus. |
| 7. Challenges While Seeking Academic Advising | ➢ The participants reported challenges with availability. Academic advising appointments are needed for different times of the day including the evening and summer.  

**Working Set of Recommendations:**  
- The use of new technologies such as Skype should be considered to accomplish academic advising outside traditional business hours. |
| 8. Issues with Cultural Values and Gender Differences | ➢ Not many students reported having issues with their cultural values or experiencing gender differences when seeking academic advising.  
- When students did report having issues with their cultural values or experienced gender differences, the students felt judged and/or misunderstood  

**Working Set of Recommendations:**  
- When giving academic advising, the advisors take into consideration the students’ cultural values and gender differences by asking how they feel about advice that was given during the advising session. This opens a dialog with what students want and need with their advisor. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Positive Academic Advising Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Some advisors were clear when communicating with students about the academic requirements for graduation. In addition, many advisors strategized with students to facilitate choosing classes every semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Some participants reported that their advisor gave them guidance with academics and also information about accessing resources for student support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ There were more overall positive experiences reported than negative. The participants felt that the road map helps them select the classes they need every semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working Set of Recommendations:**

- Ongoing training should be conducted for advisors to continue to provide quality academic advising. Advisors should also be given support to achieve effectiveness advising students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Negative Academic Advising Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ The first negative academic advising experience relates to availability and struggles scheduling time to speak with an advisor. The second negative experience relates to students feeling like their time with the advisor was rushed making them feel like a number and not welcome. The third negative experience links to some advisors lacking knowledge about the road map. In those instances, the advisor handed out the road map to the student and did not guide the student how to follow the map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working Set of Recommendations:**

- Academic advisors should be available after hours. During the summer academic advising is critical for new incoming students.
- Students should not wait more than 15 minutes to see an advisor.
- Academic advisors should adopt a welcoming attitude when interacting with advisees/students.
11. Special Academic Advising

- The participants did not report significant need for special academic advising. However, they did expressed the need to have academic advisors give them information about how to access resources such as information about graduate school, how to handle transfer issues, and internships.

**Working Set of Recommendations:**
- There should be an assessment to analyze if fragmented systems campus-wide are preventing connection with academic advising.
- Advisors should be informed about the resources are available to students regarding internships, career options with their degree, and graduate school information.

12. Major Obstacle to Graduate

- The first obstacle that the participants reported is finding help with their academics such as meeting the requirements to graduate, selecting the correct classes, and how to successfully complete the classes. The second obstacle reported was time management. It is difficult to balance work, family, and school. The third obstacle reported is the fear of graduating on time.

13. Student Suggestions

- Academic Advisors should be proactive to gain new knowledge about ways to advice in a way that is it friendly for everyone. For instance, make good use of Google drive, and cloud. Advisors should be available after hours. Students should also be proactive with their academic advising.
- The system that Student Support Services on-campus has is a good example of what advising should be.

**Working Set of Recommendations:**
- It could be beneficial to analyze the system that Student Support Services has in place to see if it is possible to adopt some strategies that could improve academic advising at CSUDH campus-wide.
- Telecommuting should be considered to have academic advising available after hours.

---
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CSUDH Student Advising Experiences

**Gender**

- Men: 43%
- Women: 57%

**Age**

- 18-25: 34
- 26-35: 7
- 36-45: 3
- 46-55: 2
- 56-65: 1
Do you know the requirements needed for graduation?

- Yes: 68%
- No: 11%
- I don't Know: 17%
- I prefer not to answer: 4%
Have you taken the GRE?

- Yes: 64%
- No: 19%
- I don't know: 13%
- I prefer not to answer: 4%

How many times have you seen an academic advisor?

- 1 to 5: 75%
- 6 to 10: 15%
- 11 to 15: 4%
- 16 to 20: 6%
How many times have you met with an academic advisor within your college?

- 1 to 5: 32
- 6 to 10: 3
- 11 to 15: 1
- 16 to 20: 0

How many times have you met with an academic advisor within your major?

- 1 to 5: 35
- 6 to 10: 3
- 11 to 15: 3
- 16 to 20: 1
How many times have you met with an academic advisor at the university center?
Appendix E
What We Heard as a Task Force – Further Themes and Details

- In Chapter Five we offer an overview of what we heard from multiple sources and on multiple occasions. In this appendix, we offer finer-grained analyses of what we heard.

Part One. Nine Themes (within four ‘grand categories”) Heard in Particular at the Open Forum

Summary. This is a more limited recounting of themes than was provided in Part One above. In this listing, “what we heard” takes as its specific focus the open hearing in March 2014.

As will be seen, we identify a constellation of issues pertaining to students; another constellation of issues pertaining to faculty and faculty engagement with advising; communications, training, support and coordination for professional advisers; and policy issues.

In response to the Task Force invitation to an open hearing on Monday, March 10, 2014, some 66 people turned out to our location in Loker Student Union, on the CSUDH campus. When asked for their job title or status, about 2/3 of the group indicated that they were advisers at the University, and had usefully been encouraged to attend the hearing through employee union e-mail communications.

Across about 90 minutes, we received a total of 33 comments, which we enumerated and grouped\(^{48}\) in Appendix H. Please see that appendix for substantial detail in the comments made at the open hearing.

\(^{48}\) Appendix H also uses bullets to show what we regard as extensions of main topics / comments. The enumeration could have been more fine-grained, of course, and the total number of comments could have been reported as considerably higher.
It will be seen that in Appendix H we used nine categories for grouping the enumerated 33 comments. We note that, as may be typical for an open hearing, all of comments heard sought to identify problems and to propose helpful solutions. (An open hearing is a place for airing problems, and much less a place for identifying satisfying strong practices. Elsewhere in this report we note and describe strong advising practices at this University.)

Categories for the 33 comments from Appendix H are re-grouped below into nine themes, and four “grand categories,” for convenience of exposition.

**Grand Category A. Students; Student Issues.**

- **THEME ONE. Reaching Students With Information About Advising:** Nine comments focused on reaching students with information about advising, often connected to registration holds (a separate category for our purposes). Some focused on incentivizing students to seek advisement early – and perhaps, often.

- **THEME TWO. Registration Holds:** Four additional comments focused on registration holds: three of these focused on using this means for spurring students to seek advising. (One had a departmental / college administrative focus.) Two further comments (Group I in Appendix H) focused on special student populations.

**Grand Category B. Faculty and Faculty Engagement with Advising**

- **THEME THREE. Support and Encourage Faculty Advising:** Five comments focused on topics that included support for faculty advisers, seeking faculty recognition for advising in retention / tenure / promotion evaluations, and in general encouraging faculty energy and attention to advising. These are found in Category E in Appendix H.

- **THEME FOUR. Advising in the Major; Advising for Particular Majors:** Four additional comments spoke to issues that may be major-specific, which is of course an important faculty concern. These comprise Categories C and D in Appendix H.

- **THEME FIVE. Training for Faculty; Using Advising Tools:** Two additional comments took this focus. Issues considered included use of Peoplesoft, something heard in other ways by the Task Force. These were comments numbered 24 and 25, included in Category F in Appendix H, focused generally upon training.
Grand Category C. Professional Advisers: Communications, Training, Support, and Coordination

THEME SIX. Communications, Training Support: Two extensive comments and related discussion were heard at the open meeting, and are memorialized as items 20 and 21 in Appendix H. The Task Force was made aware that these were an important concern among professional advisers at this University. (Other needs for communications and training, to include for students and for faculty, were a part of Category F, focused on communications and training generally, in Appendix H.)

THEME SEVEN. Coordination Among Advisers: Two further comments (items 26 and 27 in Appendix H) took this focus; again, although only two items were enumerated, the actual discussion at the hearing was extensive. Coordination was sought importantly for purposes of achieving consistency (and accuracy) in advice given to students.

Grand Category D. Policy Issues.

THEME EIGHT. Course Substitutions for Fulfilling Major Requirements: Two enumerated comments in Appendix H memorialize what was heard at the open hearing. Issues included ensuring that an available substitution for one student should be made similarly available to others who are similarly situated; and “mass substitutions” were criticized as a poor practice – program changes are called for when all persons experience substituted courses to meet requirements.

THEME NINE. Timing for Requirements, and Routing of Adviser Sign-Offs: One Each of these completed the policy issues category among comments at the open hearing. Note items 28 and 29 in Appendix H.

Part Two. Themes Heard Specifically Via the Survey of Full-Time Faculty

Respondents to our survey of full-time faculty provided their input in a context of specific questions asked, although space was provided for “other” comments. Inasmuch as we asked mostly about faculty perceptions and faculty roles and relationships, the comments that follow pursue those topics.

• Faculty members are doing advising, but half of them report no formal training to advise.

• Consider various modes of advising and how impacts advising. Address modes in faculty training.
• Faculty reported most knowledge of requirements of their major and then decreasing knowledge of GE courses in their program and GE courses in general, respectively.

• Two-thirds use PeopleSoft, but half report minimal and moderate comfort with it.

• Faculty have generally positive attitudes towards advising, but feel that students do not recognize their roles and responsibilities in planning their academic courses and plans for graduation.

• Faculty feel that advising is not rewarded or considered during reviews and there is not enough to handle the number of students in need of advising.

• Although many faculty could benefit from training in advising CSUDH students, only a small subset are likely to attend such a training.

**Implications** include the following. **CSUDH should consider:**

- Devising creative modes and incentives for training in academic advising tailored to faculty. Potential options include online methods of training and including training in department meetings. Including training in the context of the department will allow faculty to see the importance of advising as it relates to their discipline and creates a discourse among colleagues to regarding advising in their department. This may also send the message that advising is a valued part of the jobs of faculty members.

- Developing ways to value and reward effective advising.

- Encouraging use of various modes of advising and provide training on how to use them (e.g., advising via email and Skype). This may also have the impact of addressing the large numbers of students in need of advising.

- Addressing workload issues related to time for advising.

- Developing ways to make PeopleSoft “people friendly.” Easy-to-use and accessible materials on using PeopleSoft during advising would be welcome.

- Clarifying to students their personal responsibilities in course selection and graduation preparation.
Part Three. Nine Themes Heard in the Comments of Chairs, Deans, and Professional Advisers

The well-placed professionals who have firsthand knowledge and much experience in delivering academic advice to undergraduates offered a variety of concerns that, in context of our reports above in Parts I, II, and III, will sound familiar. Concerns included the accuracy and consistency, the content, of the advice provided; the same issue about knowledge but extended to consider those who may or may be experts in giving academic advice, but who yet deliver it; communication themes; policy, policy-making, and procedures; work roles; and Peoplesoft tools. An item not called out in earlier parts of this chapter focuses on the financial aid status of students as conditioning students’ abilities to follow best advice.

In separate meetings, Task Force Co-Chair Clare Weber met with each college dean and the department chairs within the respective colleges. Dr. Weber also met with professional advisers, from both the University Advising Center and from college advising operations, in a large group meeting.

A Task Force subcommittee, assessing and categorizing raw notes, sought to align and seek consistencies between and among the comments received in these meetings. The subcommittee identified nine themes. It is fair to say that comments heard for each theme were, in the main, criticisms or complaints.

Let us recount each of the nine themes in turn.

**THEME ONE. Content of the advice that is Given.** Interlocutors expressed concerns that advice given to undergraduates was too-frequently inaccurate, and inconsistent, in the sense that some undergraduates were provided with, for example, relief from a requirement via a course substitution where others were not provided with similar relief.

**THEME TWO. Content knowledge on the part of those who provide advice to undergraduates.** Those interviewed by Dr. Weber worried that there is widespread lack of, or at least incomplete, knowledge about policies and procedures that either directly address advising, or have apparent substantial impact on advising interactions between undergraduate students and either professional advisers or faculty.

**THEME THREE. Communication themes among administrators and advice-givers.** From deans, chairs and professional advisers, Dr. Weber heard that students too-frequently access outdated (and thus inaccurate) information online, and that advice-givers do not always receive clear, timely and accurate updates about advising policy and practices.

**THEME FOUR. The influence of financial aid status on advising.** Those interviewed by Dr. Weber expressed concern that advice about when to register (and for what courses) was complicated by the timing of disbursement of financial aid (thus allowing timely payment of tuition / fees due upon registration).

**THEME FIVE. Information systems issues focused on the Peoplesoft / CMS system.** People were clear with Dr. Weber in their unhappiness about the (lack of) user friendliness in the information system on campus, and about the lack of certain kinds of data in the current information system.
THEME SIX. Policies. In her interviews as described, Dr. Weber heard concerns that policies governing student academic advising are not consistently enforce, and not frequently-enough reviewed with a critical eye.

THEME SEVEN. Policy-Making. Interlocutors told Dr. Weber that advising policies and practices – along with policies and practices in many other areas – are hard to access, opaque as to currency, and in general constitute a source of confusion as professional advisers and faculty alike seek to know and to inform students about who must do what according to what policy and authority.

THEME EIGHT. Procedures. Chairs, deans and professional advisers felt that current procedures to implement policies too frequently seem un-timely, and/or inefficient.

THEME NINE. Work roles. Adviser job responsibilities, actions, and workloads need clarification and modification, in the accounts provided in the meetings convened by Dr. Weber.

Themes Heard in the Student Focus Groups

- Please see separate Appendix D
Appendix F
Key Results From the Faculty Advising Survey

Methods

• Full-time faculty and lecturers who engage in academic advising of CSUDH undergraduates at were asked to participate in a brief survey via Survey Gizmo.
• 91 individuals completed the online survey
• Questionnaire covered a number of domains including:
  — frequency, types, and modes of advising
  — attitudes and perceptions regarding advising
Sample Demographics

College

- CAH: 24.8%
- CBAPF: 19%
- COE: 5%
- CHH&N: 13.2%
- CNBS: 9.1%
- Ext. Ed.: 28.9%
Gender & Rank

Gender

- Male: 59.2%
- Female: 40.8%

Academic Rank

- Full Professor: 30%
- Asst. Professor: 25%
- Asso. Professor: 15%
- Other: 5%

Summary of Data
Advising and Training

Do you provide academic advising to CSUDH students?

- Yes: 60.3%
- No: 30.6%
- Not Sure: 9.1%

Have you received training in academic advising at CSUDH?

- Yes: 29.4%
- No: 70.6%

Types of Advising & Frequency

- Course Specific
  - Rarely
  - A few times
  - Frequently
  - Not at all
- Major
- Personal Development
Modes of Advising

How do you rate your knowledge of advising in...
PeopleSoft

Do you use PeopleSoft for when advising undergraduates?

- Yes: 63.3%
- No: 36.4%

Rate your comfort level with PeopleSoft?

- Very High: 32.3%
- High: 27.3%
- Moderate: 25.2%
- Minimal: 17.2%

Faculty Attitudes toward Advising

- Opportunity to talk 1 on 1 w/ students: 68.8%
- Pleasant & Rewarding: 67.7%
- Important part of job: 55.2%
- I can see the connection between advising and classroom: 45.8%
How likely would you be to attend a training on academic advising?

Conclusions & Recommendations
Conclusions (DRAFT)

- Faculty members are doing advising, but half of them report no formal training to advise. (Slide 7)
- Consider various modes of advising and how impacts advising. Address modes in faculty training. (Slide 9)
- Faculty reported most knowledge of requirements of their major and then decreasing knowledge of GE courses in their program and GE courses in general, respectively. (Slide 10)
- Two-thirds use PeopleSoft, but half report minimal and moderate comfort with it. (Slide 11)
- Faculty have generally positive attitudes towards advising, but feel that students do not recognize their roles and responsibilities in planning their academic courses and plans for graduation. (Slides 12 and 13)
- Faculty feel that advising is not rewarded or considered during reviews and there is not enough to handle the number of students in need of advising. (Slide 14)
- Although many faculty could benefit from training in advising CSUDH students, only a small subset are likely to attend such a training. (Slide 15)

Recommendations (DRAFT)

- Devise creative modes and incentives for training in academic advising tailored to faculty. Potential options include online methods of training and including training in department meetings. Including training in the context of the department will allow faculty to see the importance of advising as it relates to their discipline and creates a discourse among colleagues regarding advising in their department. This may also send the message that advising is a valued part of the jobs of faculty members.
- Develop ways to value and reward effective advising.
- Encourage use of various modes of advising and provide training on how to use them (e.g., advising via email and Skype). This may also have the impact of addressing the large numbers of students in need of advising.
- Address workload issues related to time for advising.
- Develop ways to make PeopleSoft “people friendly.” Develop easy-to-use and accessible materials on using PeopleSoft during advising.
- Clarify to students, their personal responsibilities in course selection and graduation preparations.
Appendix G

Advising Practices at
California State University, Sacramento

Materials Prepared for September 6, 2013 Consulting Visit
to CSUDH

Lori E. Varlotta
Senior Vice President for Planning, Enrollment
Management and Student Affairs
1. New Student Orientation (NSO)

**Advising:** New student orientation is required for all incoming students including transfer students. Fees are $72 for first-year students, $51 for transfer students, and $46 for parents and guests. First-year students have the option of an overnight stay in campus housing which allows them to engage in a variety of activities to build a sense of community and sample the campus life; the fee for overnight stay is $62.

At orientation students register for classes, take placement exams, are advised on General Education requirements, are advised in their major by faculty in their major department, tour campus, learn about campus organizations, and attend workshops on housing, career counseling, financial management, campus technology, and many other topics.

**Student Demographics:** Because orientation is required of all students, the demographics correspond with the university student body: 40% White; 21% Asian/Pacific Islander; 19% Latino; 11% self-reported “Other;” 6% African American; 2% Foreign; 1% American Indian.

**Mode of Delivery:** Transfer students participate in an eight-hour, one-day orientation while first-year students participate in a 1½ day orientation. Orientation includes the following activities:

- Registering for classes
- Taking Placement exams
- Advising for General Education requirements (see Advising Folder Appendices)
- Advising in their major by faculty in their major department
- Touring campus
- Learning about campus organizations
- Attending workshops

**Service Delivery:** The Orientation Team consists of two professional advisors, one full-time support staff, three student orientation coordinators, and 35 orientation leaders. Students are trained in a three-unit semester-long training and leadership course that they are required to take during the spring semester prior to summer orientation. The professional advisors hold master’s degrees in Counseling or Education Leadership.

**Assessment and Retention Data:** Mandatory New Student Orientation began in 2006 for first-year students and 2010 for transfer students. The Orientation and Academic Advising staff has been conducting preliminary analysis of differences in student success indicators for students who participated in Orientation, the first step in the First Year Advising Program, vs. student groups who matriculated prior to the program’s implementation. Preliminary data indicate that students who participated in Orientation display higher one-year retention rates and are more likely to end their first year in good academic standing than students from prior years. Now that more than six years have passed since the inception of the First Year program, staff plans to conduct a comprehensive study on student success and graduation rates.

**NSO Contact & Website**
- Mary Shepherd – shepherd@csus.edu

Website: [http://www.csus.edu/orientation/](http://www.csus.edu/orientation/)
2. Academic Advising & Career Center

Sacramento State has a combined advising and career center, although the integration of advising and career services is still being improved upon. The Academic Advising & Career Center has a drop-in policy and it is open from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The Center also has 11 professional advisors, all of whom provide some drop-in advising. Several of the advisors also coordinate other advising programs such as First-Year Advising, Second-Year Advising, or peer mentor training associated with Learning Communities.

2.1 First-Year Advising (FYA)

**Advising:** Every first-year student at Sacramento State receives proactive advising; those not advised by EOP, Veterans Services, CAMP, Athletics, Guardian Scholars or other student-specific programs are advised in the FYA program. In Fall 2012, 97% of first-year students participated in First-Year Advising and 93% participated in Spring 2013.

**Student Demographics:** Because FYA is required of all first-year students, the demographics correspond with the university student body: 40% White; 21% Asian/Pacific Islander; 19% Latino; 11% self-reported “Other;” 6% African American; 2% Foreign; 1% American Indian.

**Mode of Delivery:** Students schedule 30-minute appointments each semester that cover General Education and Graduation requirements including: assistance planning a two-semester schedule, goal setting exercises, review of study tips, career exploration, and information on accessing the “Student Center” at “My Sac State” as well as understanding its resources including: how to locate and review unofficial transcripts, how to access additional campus resources, etc.

**Service Delivery:** A total of 21 advisors participated in FYA during AY 2012-13. In addition to the professional advisors in the Academic Advising & Career Center, six faculty advisors receive three units of buyout per semester; the AVP for SES, five graduate students, two cross-trained career counseling interns, and four FYA advisors are available from 9:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. daily for FYA advising.

**Training:** All FYA advisors, including faculty and professional advisors, undergo 12 hours of training specific to first-year students.

**Assessment and Retention Data:** The First Year Advising Program was piloted for Fall 2006 and was fully implemented for Fall 2007. As previously mentioned, preliminary data indicate that students who participate in Orientation show higher one year retention rates and are more likely to be in good academic standing after their first year.

One year retention rates for students who participated in the First Year Advising Program in 2007-08 increased by 7% compared to first year students from Fall 2003. Assessment of student retention and other success indicators is conducted for this program each year. The increases for one year retention rates have ranged from 6% (comparing fall 2008 to Fall 2004 cohorts) to 12% (comparing Fall 2010 to Fall 2006 cohorts). Academic Advising staff acknowledges that there are many variables involved with student retention and success. Thus, no direct cause and effect outcomes are implied in this assessment.
Advising staff and University leadership do agree that the FYA program does appear to be contributing to increases in student success. More comprehensive study on student success from FYA programs is planned for the coming years.

### 2.2 Second-Year Advising (SYA)

**Advising:** Every second-year student who is on current academic probation or at-risk of probation is required to participate in Second-Year Advising (“good standing but at-risk” refers to students who have an overall GPA greater than 2.0 but a semester GPA less than 2.0).

**Student Demographics:** The Center collects but does not report demographic data for students participating in SYA. In Spring 2013, 352 students met the criteria to participate in SYA. These students were categorized into one of the following groups: 1) Enrolled Probationary Students, 2) Enrolled Good Standing Students (students who were in good standing at the end of the Fall 2012 semester but whose term GPA dropped below 2.0), 3) Non-enrolled Students (students who enroll in classes for the subsequent semester).

**Mode of Delivery:** Students schedule a one-hour appointment with an advisor during the early part of the fall semester, and students then follow-up with a 30-minute appointment toward the end of the semester. SYA provides intrusive advising that covers the following:

- Discussing time management, study skills, and balancing of school, work, and personal life
- Setting S.M.A.R.T goals and helping to create an action plan to reach such goals
- Making recommendations necessary for success, including:
  - Managing study hours
  - Decreasing outside work hours (no more than 20 hours per week)
  - Utilizing faculty advising hours
  - Utilizing/avoiding course repeats
- Reiterating the importance of utilizing “My Sac State’s” “Student Center”
- Informing students on class standing and class level limits to avoid disqualification
- Informing students of relevant academic policies such as repeat policies and withdrawal policies
- Making students aware of important dates and deadlines and their implications including the university withdrawal deadline and early registration deadline
- Requiring attendance at one of the “Surviving College” workshops
- Referring students to appropriate campus resources (e.g., Math Lab, Writing Center, Tutoring Center(s), etc.)

**Service Delivery:** The SYA program includes five full-time professional advisors, all of whom also do drop-in advising.

**Training:** All SYA advisors are professional advisors holding a master’s degree in Career Counseling. New SYA advisors undergo training in all aspects of the Academic Advising & Career Center.
Assessment and Retention Data: Staff in Academic Advising compared students who participated in the second year advising program with similar cohorts of students from previous years (prior to the implementation of SYA). As reported in the Center’s 2011-12 Assessment Report, students who participated in this program showed improvement on four important success indicators. Results are reproduced below.

Table 1: Student Success Indicators as of the end of the third term (end of third semester at Sacramento State) prior to the implementation of SYA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (N=)</th>
<th>Good Standing</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Disqualified/Dismissed</th>
<th>Withdrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 (n=433)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 (n=511)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 (n=501)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Student Success Indicators as of the end of the third term (end of third semester at Sacramento State) after the implementation of SYA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (N=)</th>
<th>Good Standing</th>
<th>Probation</th>
<th>Disqualified/Dismissed</th>
<th>Withdrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 (n=321)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional data on SYA student use of academic success services is also available in the 2011-12 Academic Advising Assessment Report. Next year (2014-15), students who participated in the SYA program will have been able to be enrolled for six or more years. As such, a comprehensive study of student success for these students, including graduation rate comparisons, is planned.

2.3 Drop-in Advising

Advising: The Center provides General Education academic advising for all students (except those in "boutique" programs), all academic advising for undeclared students including most students who have an “Expressed Interest” in an impacted major, intrusive advising by appointment for all students who have been disqualified or dismissed from the university, and proactive advising for all students on academic probation.

Student Demographics: Because drop-in advising serves all students on campus, the demographics correspond with the university student body: 40% white; 21% Asian/Pacific Islander; 19% Latino; 11% self-reported “Other;” 6% African American; 2% Foreign; 1% American Indian.

Mode of Delivery: Drop-in advising is available to students from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. daily. The Center advises over 10,000 drop-in students each year. During peak demand, the wait time for drop-in advising can reach over 90 minutes.
In addition to face-to-face drop-in advising, the Center provides interactive online chat advising. In AY 2012-13, chat advising was available two hours per day. In AY 2013-14, the Center will expand its chat advising availability from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. daily. Online chat advisors can advise four to five students in the time it takes to advise one student in person.

Beginning AY 2013-14, the Center will incorporate a “triage advisor.” As students enter the Center, the triage advisor answers cursory advising questions. The triage advisor is typically able to help over 30% of the students who come to the Center, eliminating the need for them to sign in and wait for a full drop-in advising meeting.

The Center maintains a database in which all advisors make notes about every advising session so that students do not need to meet with the same advisor on each visit.

Each semester the Center conducts 15 workshops on five different topics: Time Management, Goal Setting, Grades and GPA; From Probation to Graduation; Major Exploration; Stress Management; and Study Tips. Workshops are open to the entire student body and some workshops are required for students on probation or at-risk of probation.

**Service Delivery:** The Center has three professional advisors dedicated to drop-in advising. In addition, all Second-Year advisors provide drop-in advising, as do some First-Year advisors, all advising coordinators, and some career counselors. At all times there are at least three professional staff handling drop-in student advising as well as one advisor handling triage and one advisor handling online chat.

**Training:** All drop-in advisors are professional advisors who hold a master’s degree or are currently enrolled in an appropriate graduate degree program. All advisors also participate in multiple-day training when they begin working at the Center. Training updates are provided for all staff when warranted by changes in policy or curricula.

### 2.4 Peer Mentors: First-Year Experience (FYE)

**Advising:** The Center partners with Academic Affairs to train and support peer mentors in First-Year Learning Communities and First-Year Seminars. Peer mentors provide some academic advising and serve as a resource for over 1000 first-year students.

**Student Demographics:** Because the First-Year Experience serves all students on campus, the demographics correspond with the university student body: 40% White; 21% Asian/Pacific Islander; 19% Latino; 11% self-reported “Other;” 6% African American; 2% Foreign; 1% American Indian.

**Mode of Delivery:** The Peer Mentor Program is associated with on-campus Learning Communities and provides instructional support to the faculty, provides academic advising on General Education requirements, and works with the students on life skills, study skills, and other activities. Peer mentors also serve as liaisons between the students and instructors. In each learning community peer mentors work with 20-25 students. Peer mentors do not provide advising outside of their assigned learning communities.
Service Delivery: The Peer Mentor Program is coordinated by a professional advisor with a master’s degree in Higher Education Leadership. A graduate student assistant provides additional leadership and support to approximately 35 peer mentors.

Training: Peer mentors are trained by professional advisors in the Center. They receive over 50 hours of training prior to the beginning of the semester: one hour bi-weekly training and eight hours of specialized training.

Assessment and Retention Data: The Peer Mentor Program has been in place since 2003. Retention and graduation data show that students who participate in a Learning Community with a peer mentor are 19% more likely to graduate from Sacramento State than those who do not participate.

2.5 Disqualified and Dismissed Students

Advising: Disqualified and dismissed students are required to meet with an advisor and receive intrusive advising as a condition of their university reinstatement.

Student Demographics: We do not report demographic data on students who are dismissed, disqualified, or reinstated.

Mode of Delivery: Students schedule a one-hour appointment with an academic advisor who specializes in readmitted and reinstated students.

Service Delivery: The Center has a single advisor dedicated to dismissed and disqualified students. A committee of advisors reviews files and readmits disqualified students. A faculty committee makes all final decisions to reinstate dismissed students.

Training: A professional advisor holding a master’s degree oversees all readmissions and reinstatements.

2.6 Guardian Scholars Program (GSP)

Advising: Oversight and leadership of the Guardian Scholars Program recently transitioned from Academic Affairs to the division of Planning, Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (PEMSA). Students participating in the Guardian Scholars Program are emancipated former foster youth. As part of the GSP, professional advisors provide GSP students with frequent and intrusive academic advising as well as life skills counseling and tutoring.

Student Demographics: Approximately 80 students participate in the Guardian Scholars Program and 75% are students of color.

Mode of Delivery: The GSP is an open drop-in program. There is a strong camaraderie among many of the GSP peer mentors. GSP advisors provide nominal General Education advising and they also serve as advocates and liaisons to major departments for major advising.
Service Delivery: The Guardian Scholars Program has two professional advisors, both of whom also provide general drop-in advising. The advisors devote about 40% of their time with outreach to other community programs that provide support services for foster youth and former foster youth. This outreach is necessary because most Guardian Scholars hear about the program through other outside support programs.

Training: Advisors in the GSP are professional advisors who hold, or are working on, a master’s degree in Social Work, Counseling, or Education Leadership.

3. College Advising

Two colleges, the College of Business and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, have college sponsored advising centers.

College of Business Advising Center
- The College of Business Advising Center provides major advising for students admitted to the major.
- The Center tracks and advises undeclared students who have an “Expressed Interest” in majoring in business.
- The Center is typically open seven hours a day, four days per week.
- The Center is staffed by professional advisors.

College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) Advising Center
- The NSM Advising Center is used almost exclusively by the Department of Biological Science and the Department of Chemistry.
- The Center primarily provides major advising but frequently includes some General Education advising as well.
- The Center is typically open four to six hours a day.
- The Center is staffed primarily by retired faculty.

4. Department Advising

- The majority of major advising is provided by faculty in the major department.
- The advising workload is determined by department policy; some departments attempt to share the advising load equally among faculty while other departments designate a few faculty members to do the bulk of the department advising in conjunction with a reduced teaching load.
- Impacted majors allow students to declare an “Expressed Interest” in the major, but those students remain undeclared. Most “Expressed Interest” students are advised in the Academic Advising & Career Center. The College of Business and the Department of Design advise their own “Expressed Interest” students.
- Major advising is not required by all departments. Among the departments that “require” major advising each semester, not all enforce the requirement with registration holds.
Advising Contacts & Website

Academic Advising & Career Center
- David Evans – dave_evans@csus.edu
- Heidi van Beek – heidi.vanbeek@csus.edu

College Advising
- Biological Sciences: Melanie Loo – mwloo@saclink.csus.edu
- College of Business: Maria Lindstrom – mariar@csus.edu

Notable Department Advising
- Criminal Justice: Debra Mullin – mullind@csus.edu
- History: Aaron Cohen – cohenaj@csus.edu

Website: [http://www.csus.edu/acad/](http://www.csus.edu/acad/)  
[http://www.csus.edu/careercenter/](http://www.csus.edu/careercenter/)

5. Student-Athlete Resource Center (SARC)

**Advising:** The Student-Athlete Resource Center (SARC) provides Division I student-athletes with the support for development as independent and successful young adults as well as the skills needed to achieve academic goals, persist toward graduation, and meet all NCAA eligibility requirements. SARC offers admissions counseling, academic advising, tutoring and mentoring, NCAA rules compliance and eligibility education, financial services support, and life skills programming to all of Sacramento State’s Division I student-athletes (see SARC Student-Athlete Profile Appendix). SARC’s services and programming are provided in a variety of ways including: individual advising, orientations, group and team meetings, coaches’ compliance and rules education workshops, freshmen seminar classes, and various student development and academic workshops (see Student-Athlete Academic Agreement Appendix).

**Student Demographics:** Sacramento State offers an NCAA Division I Athletic Program with 21 sports (12 women sports and nine men sports) and a headcount of approximately 450-475 student-athletes. Of these student-athletes, 57% are female and 43% are male; 45% of student-athletes are from one of several underrepresented/minority groups.

**Mode of Delivery:** Student-Athletes meet with SARC advisors once per semester for a mandatory advising session (see SARC Advising Checklist Appendix). Additional drop-in advising is available during the beginning and end of each semester to address various issues related to final course approval, registration issues, and eligibility/GPA concerns. Once declared, student-athletes are also required to meet with a department major advisor at least once per year and provide proof of such advising to the SARC.

The SARC also provides tutoring and mentoring to approximately 125 student-athletes each year. These services typically occur on a weekly basis and can include two to three sessions per week. The SARC also offers several other services and support for student-athletes including but not limited to: athlete life skills and academic orientations, priority registration, progress reports to faculty, study lab, computer laptop rental, health, career and social media guest speakers, athlete-dedicated first-year-experience/seminar classes, 5th-year and summer scholarships, and advisor-supported connections to campus departments like Financial Aid, Residence Halls, and the Hornet Bookstore.
**Service Delivery:** The SARC has seven full-time employees that provide services in four primary support areas: 1) Athletic Admissions and Initial Eligibility, 2) Athletic Academic Services, 3) Life Skills and Student-Athlete Development, and 4) Athletic Compliance and Financial Services. Of the seven SARC employees, five are involved in academic advising and support while two are dedicated to NCAA rules compliance and athletic-related financial services support. The SARC also employs 15-20 part-time tutors and mentors each semester.

**Training:** Tutors and mentors are provided training and review throughout the semester and also during pre- and post-semester meetings with the full-time SARC advisors. The SARC staff occasionally invites faculty and other campus employees to present special programming on topics like writing and conduct/plagiarism.

**Additional Retention Data:** As of Fall 2013, the first-year freshman retention rate for student-athletes over five cohorts averages approximately 88%. The current overall GPA for student-athletes is 2.86 compared to the undergraduate student body’s 2.84 average GPA. For Spring 2013, 45.9% of student-athletes earned a 3.00 GPA and 95.2% were in “Good Academic Standing.” Also, 14 of Sacramento State’s 21 teams had a 2.83 or higher team GPA. All 21 teams are above a 925 NCAA Academic Performance Rate (APR) and no teams are included in the APR penalty structure. The latest federal graduation rate data (four-class average) has student-athletes 16% higher than all undergraduates (57% vs. 41%) and the NCAA’s Graduation Success Rate for Sacramento State student-athletes is 72%. (For additional retention data see SARC Athlete Spring 2013 GPA Report Appendix).

**SARC Contact & Website**
- Paul Edwards – edwardsp@csus.edu
- Website: [http://www.csus.edu/sarc/](http://www.csus.edu/sarc/)

---

**6. College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)**

**Advising:** The mission of the CAMP Retention Department is to offer intensive first-year personal, academic, and financial support to promote continued enrollment and, ultimately, graduation from Sacramento State. The goals of the department are to 1) ensure that all academic, financial, health, and personal student concerns are addressed, 2) intercept and resolve student issues that could potentially lead to disenrollment, and 3) work to promote a sense of family and community through extensive services (see CAMP Brochure Appendix).

**Student Demographics:** 100% of first-year CAMP students are first-generation, 100% have a migrant and seasonal farmworker background, 98% are Latino, 70% are female and 30% male, 100% are low-income, 85% are English Language Learners (ELL), and 98% are in need of remediation upon arrival to Sacramento State. CAMP participants have a significantly lower mean SAT score (814) than Non-CAMP First-Generation full-time freshman (FTF) Hispanic students (880).

**Mode of Delivery:** CAMP students meet with an advisor (one-on-one) once a month to review Professor Contact Forms (see CAMP Professor Contact Form Appendix), discuss progress, and create an academic G.E. plan (see CAMP General Education Worksheet Appendix). In addition, students are required to complete five hours of study time per week in the CAMP tutoring lab. Based on the 2012 Annual
Performance Report, first-year students met with a CAMP advisor an average of two times per week and continuing students once per semester.

**Service Delivery:** The Retention team is comprised of one full-time counselor, three graduate student advisors, and four English/math tutors. CAMP serves 80 incoming freshmen and 300 continuing students.

**Training:** Advisors and tutors are provided with a three-day comprehensive training in the summer and winter as well as bi-monthly trainings/presentations from various departments or student service related campus programs.

**Additional Retention Data:** Based on the CAMP Program Assessment Report conducted by the Office of Institutional Research in Spring & Fall 2011, the first-year retention rate for CAMP participants was significantly higher than that of Non-CAMP students (100% vs. 95.7% and 92.6% vs. 82.3%, respectively). (For additional retention data see CAMP Program Assessment Summary Report Appendix).

**CAMP Contact & Website**
- Viridiana Diaz – viridiaz@csus.edu
- Website: [http://www.csus.edu/camp/](http://www.csus.edu/camp/)

### 7. Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)

**Advising:** The mission of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) is to provide a vehicle for the CSU to increase the access, academic success, and retention of educationally and economically disadvantaged students. EOP strives to provide the necessary economic and educational resources to help students realize their potential. EOP at Sacramento State offers an intensive six-week Summer Bridge Program (a nationally recognized Learning Communities Program), a Spring Career Transitions Component, and a comprehensive retention advising services component through the ARISE Program. To promote advising engagement throughout the program, EOP provides advising based on each year of the student’s enrollment from the freshmen through senior years (see EOP Student Advising Requirements by Year Appendix).

**Student Demographics:** EOP serves first generation, historically low-income, and/or educationally disadvantaged students. Based on current demographic data for EOP, 67% are female and 33% are male. A review of EOP students by ethnic category reveals that the largest population in the program is Chicano/Latino, which stands at a rate of 36%. A detailed breakdown of the demographic characteristics of the students in the program can be found in the EOP Ethnicity Data Appendix. In total, EOP serves 276 incoming freshmen, 150 incoming transfer students, and approximately 1,400 continuing students.

**Mode of Delivery:** Services available to EOP students in the form of advising include individual advising conducted by SSP-III and SSP-AR III level counselors. Students also receive support from our Graduate Intern Component, which provides basic General Education and career advising. Specialized advising and retention services are coordinated by an SSP-IV level counselor/coordinator, who arranges a variety of
workshops for students and regularly updates EOP’s online advising resources (see EOP Advising Online Resources Links Appendix).

**Service Delivery:** The EOP Retention Team is comprised of nine full-time counselors, one Faculty Mentor Coordinator, two graduate student intern advisors, four program assistants, and 16 instructional student assistants. In addition, the administrative arm is staffed by three personnel.

**Training:** Advisors and tutors are provided weeklong summer training. During the regular semester, in-service meetings are held on a weekly basis. The counseling team also holds a bi-weekly case consult meeting, led by an on-staff licensed MFT (SSP-AR), to facilitate conversation around individualized counseling cases and related professional development topics.

**Additional Retention Data:** Based on the EOP Program Assessment Report conducted by the Office of Institutional Research, in Spring 2011 the retention rate for EOP participants was slightly higher than that of non-EOP students (97.2% vs. 95.1%). Furthermore, the retention rate for EOP participants in Fall 2011 was also slightly higher than that of non-EOP students in the same term (84.0% vs. 81.5%). A recent data report summary also revealed that the majority of EOP students (94%) were in good academic standing as of Spring 2013 (see EOP Performance by College Appendix).

**Best Practices:** EOP uses an automated registry system to track appointments and record electronic notes. The tool was built in-house and allows for effective follow-up and assessment of advising services (see EOP Registry Appendix for a screen shot of the registry system used).

**EOP Contact & Website**
- Marcellene Watson-Derbigny – [watsonml@csus.edu](mailto:watsonml@csus.edu)
Website: [http://www.csus.edu/eop/](http://www.csus.edu/eop/)

---

### 8. Veterans Success Center (VSC)

**Advising:** The Veterans Success Center (VSC) offers individual and group advising to over 1,400 Active Duty, Reservists, National Guard, veterans, and military dependents. Advising includes admissions counseling and help applying for federal and state educational benefits through the Department of Veterans Affairs. Additionally, the VSC offers workshops and resource panels on filing disability paperwork, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), and wellness and professional networking. Holds are not placed on accounts of student veterans and dependents that do not visit the VSC for advising; however, failing to visit the VSC may lead to a delay in receiving tuition and housing payments from the Federal and State Department of Veterans Affairs.

**Student Demographics:** 100% of VSC students are veterans, dependents of veterans, ROTC members, or Active-Duty military. VSC students represent all branches of the United States military with highest participation from both the Army and Air Force (27.2% and 24% respectively). As of Spring 2013 the VSC served 1,239 students.
Mode of Delivery: Student Veterans meet with a Veterans Admissions Counselor (SSP-III level) upon applying to Sacramento State. On a per semester basis, students are encouraged to meet with a Veterans Benefit Adviser (SSP-III level) on issues pertaining to the GI Bill. Students on probation or at-risk of disqualification or dismissal are encouraged to meet with the VSC Director (SSP-IV level) for advising. Additionally, the VSC Director advises students interested in leadership activities including participation in the Student Veterans Organization.

Service Delivery: The VSC is comprised of one Director (SSP-IV level), one Veterans Benefit Advisor (SSP III-level), and a part-time Veterans Admission Counselor (SSP-III level). The VSC employs six to eight students per semester that act as mentors and student ambassadors.

Training: Student advisors participate in a comprehensive training period upon employment. All VSC staff and students participate in monthly training sessions provided by key personnel from on campus and within the community.

Veterans Success Center Contact & Website
- Jeff Weston – jweston@saclink.csus.edu
Website: http://www.csus.edu/vets/index.html