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ABSTRACT

Academic advising exists to help students make sound decisions. Regrettably, every semester a number of students neglect to consult their professional or faculty advisor, instead choosing to self-advice or take the advice of peers. Consequently, many of these students flounder and the resulting cost (in terms of academic progress, degree attainment, pride in accomplishment, employability, and contribution to society) to the students, their families, the institution, and society is devastating. For example, a study by American Institutes for Research (2011) estimated an economic impact of $4.5 billion in lost income and federal and state income taxes.

Institutions of higher learning routinely mandate that students visit with their academic advisor; nevertheless, when students are dissatisfied with the interaction, they often ignore their advisor’s recommendations, make their own choices, and register for courses they believe they need. On the other hand, when students are satisfied with the interaction, they not only visit with their advisor more frequently, but they listen, follow the advice, and consequently advance or accelerate their academic progress.

Since “[t]he faculty-advisor is the one professor who has interactions with students from admission to graduation” (Choate and Granello, 2006, p. 117), the purpose of this research is to identify factors involved in the student-faculty advisor interaction and determine the significance of each factor’s impact on student satisfaction.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Community college leaders periodically evaluate their institution's advising model to improve the quality and perception of service provided to their students. These evaluations typically consist of an annual survey of student opinions. While a survey produces useful data, three essential pieces of information are often missing: 1) a means to distinguish between the student opinions of their professional advisors and their faculty advisors; 2) identification of student perceptions as well as expectations of their faculty advisors, e.g., what they want, what they need, what they're getting; and 3) the perceptions faculty members hold regarding how effective they see themselves as academic advisors as well as how comfortable and confident they are when faced with counseling students' personal matters.

The present study focuses on students enrolled at a large, public, technical community college in the Southeastern United States ("LPTCC" from here forward). This college serves more than 40,000 students annually across seven campuses and offers more than 80 programs of study for certificates, diplomas, and associate degrees. LPTCC also offers noncredit courses in job training, professional development, career development, personal enrichment, and basic education, and supports success through innovative partnerships, training, and education.

Given its large and diverse enrollment, the college supports academic advising by maintaining Student Success Centers on four of its seven campuses. At these centers, students meet with Student Success Specialists (Professional Advisors) as well as Faculty Coaches (Faculty Advisors). Faculty advisors receive in-service training from the professional advisors to help them navigate their advising responsibilities. Several faculty advisors work side by side with the professional advisors during the peak registration time in the summer, where they
develop their advising skills even further. The college mandates that currently enrolled students meet with their advisor at least one time every other semester, and all currently enrolled students have access to a web interface called "WebAdvisor" that provides them with 24/7 access to their academic information, e.g., class schedules, registration, and degree progress. An additional online tool is the Student Success Plan (SSP), which allows students access to their academic map and contact information for their faculty advisor. Faculty advisors use SSP as a case management tool to monitor their advisees' progress. Students use SSP to review the degree map developed with their advisor; however, they cannot see advising comments.

Statement of the Problem

Academic advising exists to help students make sound decisions. Regrettably, every semester many students neglect to consult their professional or faculty advisor, instead choosing to self-advise or take the advice of peers. Often the result is many of these students enroll in the wrong course, do not finish the course, go deeper into debt, stop out or drop out. To say this is a problem is an understatement because it often results in a lifetime of working a job merely to make a living, rather than enjoying a rewarding career. The incidence is exacerbated at community colleges where half of the students are not aware advising is available to them, and one-third take, on average, 20 credits more than necessary to complete their two-year degree (Complete College America, 2014; Jones, 2015). The resulting cost to the students, their families, the institution, and society is devastating. Had the students simply taken the time to meet with an advisor, they would have enrolled in the appropriate courses and saved considerable time, money, and effort.
Purpose of the Study

The overarching purpose of this research was to determine the level of satisfaction of LPTCC students and faculty advisors with the current faculty advising model. The objective was to identify factors involved in the student-faculty advisor interaction and determine the impact of each factor's contribution to student satisfaction with an advising model where faculty members serve as academic advisors.

The study identified and examined the following individual factors: ethnicity; gender; age; program of study; student attitude and personal matters; the frequency of student-faculty advisor interactions and the quality of those interactions; and finally, the faculty advisor's knowledge of transfer requirements.

Conceptual Framework

The benefits of academic advising are well documented; however, attempts to create a single "theory of academic advising" have not been successful. Hemwall & Trachte (1999) contend that people do not learn or change in only one way; therefore, academic advising is dependent on several theoretical frameworks, e.g., student development theory, learning theory, Socratic dialogues, et al.

Given this circumstance, attempting to pinpoint a theoretical framework to use as the foundation for this research was abandoned. Further, since the goal of this research was to test a model of student interaction and satisfaction at LPTCC, it followed that the pragmatic approach would be to develop and implement a research instrument specifically designed to collect the perceptions and experiences of LPTCC students and faculty advisors. With that aim in mind, the researcher consulted the literature, visited with numerous highly experienced social science researchers at Iowa State University and visited routinely with stakeholders at LPTCC. The
result was the development of two novel survey instruments, one for the students and one for the faculty advisors at LPTCC.

**Research Questions**

The following questions were used to guide the researcher in the collection and analysis of data for this study of students and faculty advisors at LPTCC:

1. How satisfied are LPTCC students and faculty with the current faculty advising model?
2. When controlling for demographics and degree program, do intercorrelations among survey items predict student satisfaction with the faculty advisor interaction?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between student responses and faculty responses to matched items in the respective surveys?

**Significance of Study**

Compared with other countries, the United States currently ranks 16th with respect to college completion rates for students between 25 and 34 years of age. The completion rate for students at public 2-year institutions (after six years) is only 42.1% (Juszkiewicz, 2017). Simultaneously, the number of jobs for unskilled laborers in the United States is declining due to globalization, a networked economy, and automation. The significance is that for many the American Dream has stalled.

Student satisfaction with advising significantly correlates to student retention. In 2009, after completing a study involving 27,816 students at 65 institutions, Schreiner stated, “a conscious decision by institutions to provide better support for enrolled students is likely to result not only in higher student satisfaction, but also a higher likelihood of students returning for another year” (p. 4).
Definition of Terms

**Academic Advising:** a decision-making process in which students receive guidance with academic and career planning. It involves interactions with students where the primary focus is their academic record, educational options, career objectives, and life goals.

**Attrition:** student departure from an institution before degree completion (Tinto, 1993).

**Cybox:** Iowa State University's secure cloud-based file storage service.

**Drop out:** to withdraw permanently from enrollment at a college or university.

**Faculty Advisors:** faculty members who mentor students regarding course selection and career opportunities in a specific major or area of study.

**Institutional behavior:** for the purposes of this study, institutional behavior is defined as the institution's efforts to create an inviting and welcoming social environment. Specifically, institutional efforts to initiate early, frequent, and high-quality student-faculty interactions.

**Persistence:** 1) the act of continuing towards an educational goal (Tinto, 2016); 2) a student's desire to remain at the same institution where they originally enrolled.

**Professional Advisors:** individuals who focus on general student development and success issues in academic curriculum requirements as well as college advising policies and procedures.

**Retention:** institutional efforts to encourage students to continue their education at the same institution where they initially enrolled.

**Stop out:** to withdraw temporarily from enrollment at a college or university.
Summary and Outline of the Dissertation

This dissertation contains five chapters:

Chapter 1 provides an introduction and overview.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature regarding academic advising. This review describes the relationship between interaction and satisfaction and their impact on student success, academic achievement, persistence and retention, and assessment and evaluation. The review also provides a brief history of advising, a discussion of the various advising models and approaches, advising theory, and advising effectiveness.

Chapter 3 explains the methodology and research design of the study. Specifically, this chapter presents the research questions, hypotheses, research design, data source, data collection, population and samples, variables used in this study, the statistical techniques used to answer the research questions, and positionality and ethical considerations, as well as limitations of the study.

Chapter 4 provides the results of the analysis of the survey data collected.

Chapter 5 concludes with a summary of the study, an interpretation of the results, the implications for policy and practice, and recommendations for stakeholders and further research.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

"Good advising may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college experience" (Light, 2001, p. 81). This is a bold statement; nevertheless, it is generally accepted because a number of rigorous studies support it—studies conducted by notable authors in the field who have concluded that good academic advising is extremely valuable for college students because it enhances their academic, social, and emotional success (Gordon, Habley, Grites, and Associates, 2008; Kramer, 2003; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

Despite the number of studies and substantial amount of data that have established the value of advising, 50% of college students avoid visiting with an advisor during the first four weeks of their first semester, and after one year, approximately 25% have dropped out of college (Tinto, 1993, 2002, 2004).

The previous paragraph describes an ongoing problem at educational institutions across the country and consequently raises a series of questions, e.g.: Why do so many students avoid visiting with an advisor? Is there a basis for their behavior? If so, have the significant factors been identified? Does the responsibility for a student failing to visit with an advisor rest with the student, their advisor, the institution, or another factor; or is it a combination of factors?

This is a complex problem that quickly becomes more complicated when the advisor is unaware of the student’s needs. “Students may enter the advising process with a set of perceptions and expectations quite unrelated to those of the advisor. The importance of the interpersonal relationship for students should not be underestimated” (Wyckoff, 1999, p. 3). Research has shown repeatedly that students value academic advisors who are available, approachable, knowledgeable, and responsive (Winston, Miller, Ender, Grites, & Associates,
1984; Frost, 1991; Smith & Allen, 2006; Gordon, Habley, Grites & Associates, 2008). Advisors with these characteristics often develop a positive rapport with their students. This rapport, in turn, increases the likelihood that students will listen to, and follow, their advisor’s recommendations regarding course selection and degree programs. When these recommendations support students’ academic success and life plans, student satisfaction and, subsequently, persistence and retention are increased.

The intent of this review is to provide an examination of the literature regarding academic advising—specifically the student-faculty interaction. The review is organized into six sections: 1) the impact of student-faculty interactions and satisfaction on academic achievement, persistence and retention, assessment and evaluation; 2) a brief history of advising; 3) advising models; 4) advising models and approaches; 5) advising theory; and 6) advising effectiveness.

Interaction and Satisfaction

In 1977, after completing an extensive study involving 200,000 students at over 300 institutions, Astin stated, "The student-faculty interaction has a stronger relationship to student satisfaction with the college experience than any other variable [and] any student characteristic or institutional characteristic." This is a compelling statement, not only because it is based on a significant number of students attending multiple institutions, but more importantly, because it raises the prominence of the student-faculty interaction above all else in terms of satisfaction. The author concluded that, "Students who interact frequently with faculty are more satisfied with all aspects of their institutional experience, including student friendships, variety of courses, intellectual environment, and even administration of the institution" (pp. 223 & 233).

Faculty advisors who enjoy interacting with students characteristically develop a good rapport. This rapport benefits the interaction by establishing trust and communicating to the
student that they matter and that the faculty member genuinely cares about them. Being acknowledged and accepted as an individual is essential for what Schlossberg, Lynch, and Chickering (1989) referred to as “mattering,” i.e., the need of an individual to feel appreciated and noticed. This is exemplified when faculty advisors take additional time to help students make the critical decisions that, potentially, will affect the rest of the students' lives.

Emphasizing the institutional significance of the student-advisor relationship, McGillin (2003) stated:

> Academic advising is the single most important relationship offered to students by an institution of higher education. It is through this relationship that students will engage in a critical narrative process that will give shape and meaning to their curricular and life choices and through which they come to understand the interconnections of knowledge and the curricula (p. 88). Through genuine encounters with a faculty advisor, students and advisors engage in a "co-construction" of the students' unfolding life narrative (p. 103).

When these encounters occur, the quality of the student-faculty interaction is crucial for the outcome to be constructive. Further, the student encounters with faculty outside the classroom (where the majority of academic advising takes place) are particularly constructive when they focus on intellectual discussions, rather than merely being a social exchange (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). This effect is unrelated to other college experiences or student characteristics, e.g., high-achieving students who tend to visit with faculty more frequently.

Frost (1991) supported this position and offered three explanations as to why the student-faculty interaction is so essential to advising: 1) the majority of students experience advising; 2) advising provides an opportunity for student-faculty interaction outside the classroom; and 3) advising initiates discussions about academic and career matters of interest to the student.
Moreover, the positive results of outside-the-classroom student-faculty interaction have been reported for students regardless of gender, race, age, or background (first generation, transfer, economically disadvantaged).

**Impact**

The faculty drive the academic mission of every institution of higher education. This is especially true at the community college where, according to Cain (1999):

> The teaching faculty is the key to the community college's work. Other factors in the system, such as support staff, administrators, politicians, and students, might help draw up the route for the trip, but it is the faculty members who drive the bus. The faculty members represent the authority figure, the mentor, and the role model that may not appear anywhere else in the student's life. Because the faculty members are in such a position, their influence over students can be very significant. (p. 47)

An essential part of the academic mission is advising, and over the past 50 years, the literature has repeatedly confirmed that a good faculty advisor makes a tremendous impact on student success and satisfaction. Students experience higher levels of satisfaction with their college experience when there is greater student-faculty interaction (Winston, Miller, Ender, & Grites, 1984; Pace, 2001).

In 2003, Creamer, Creamer, and Brown asserted, "From an institutional perspective, academic advising programs and services are second only to the instructional mission in most colleges and universities in their pervasive reach to all students throughout their time at the institution" (p. 205). Their assertions were affirmed by a 2017 Noel-Levitz's National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report, where students in two-year community and technical colleges
ranked the importance of academic advising second only to instructional effectiveness. The report endorsed academic advising as a critical variable in student satisfaction.

**Academic Achievement**

Engagement with classmates, faculty, and peers, as well as a variety of college activities, is frequently correlated with student academic achievement. Additionally, Kuh (2002) observed that students who demonstrated the highest levels of engagement also reported the highest amount of satisfaction with the quality of their academic advising.

In 1993, Astin completed a 25-year longitudinal study that included a national sample of approximately 500,000 students and 1,300 institutions of all types. His study revealed that the student-faculty interaction significantly correlated with each of the following academic achievement outcomes: GPA, degree attainment, graduating with honors, and enrollment in graduate or professional school.

**Persistence and Retention**

Forty years ago, Crockett (1978) referred to academic advising as the "cornerstone of student retention." In the years that followed, multiple researchers corroborated Crockett's statement by accumulating a substantial amount of evidence that established the student-faculty interaction as a key influencer of student persistence and retention (Astin 1993; Kuh, et al., 2007; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1976; Tinto, 1993). The evidence was so convincing that Wyckoff (1999, p. 3) implored higher education administrators to "become cognizant not only of the educational value of advising but [also] of the role advising plays in the retention of students". Cuseo (2003a, p. 3) echoed Wyckoff, asserting that: "Academic advising is one of the major academic and social domains of the college experience that affect student decisions about staying or leaving." The conclusion was inescapable—the outcome of effective student-faculty
interaction is student satisfaction, and a satisfied student is more likely to persist. Tinto (1987) highlighted this conclusion in his seminal work on attrition and retention in which he emphasized:

> It is the daily interaction of the person with other members of the college in both the formal and informal academic and social domains of the college and the person's perception or evaluation of the character of those interactions…that in large measure determine decisions as to staying or leaving (p. 136). Student retention is at least as much a function of institutional behavior as it is of student behavior (pp. 136, 177).

Tinto confirmed the students' perception of the quality of the student-faculty interaction, both inside and outside the classroom, strongly influences their satisfaction and ultimately their decision to stay or leave, leading him to conclude that the institution is “at least” half responsible for the quality of the interaction. While this meant that institutions must shoulder half (or more) of the blame if students leave, it also meant that institutions could claim a portion of the credit if students stayed. This conclusion was precisely what college and university administrators needed to hear because it verified that persistence and retention are heavily influenced by and potentially improved by institutional behavior.

**Assessment and Evaluation**

Higher education institutions routinely evaluate courses and instructors; however, assessing the quality of advising, especially the student-faculty advisor interaction, occurs infrequently (Bedker & Young, 1994).

The absence of regular assessment and evaluation of advising is regrettable because it communicates the message to faculty advisors and their students that their institution does not value quality advising. College and university administrators would do well to remedy this
situation because regular assessment puts faculty on notice that student advising is a vital part of their professional responsibility. Additionally, assessing and evaluating faculty advisors increases the likelihood that weaknesses will be identified and corrected. In the words of Linda Darling-Hammond, "If there's one thing social science research has found consistently and unambiguously, it's that people will do more of whatever they are evaluated on doing. What is measured will increase, and what is not measured will decrease. That's why assessment is such a powerful activity. It cannot only measure, but change reality" (Hutchings & Marchese, 1990, p, 28).

Continuous assessment and evaluation of advising results in improved student-faculty communications, as well as increased advisor accessibility, responsiveness, and competence—in short, it raises the bar for the student-faculty interaction and consequently promotes a higher degree of student satisfaction.

**Academic Advising: Brief History**

"Informal advising of students, was a role of faculty members in the earliest American colleges, both private and church related" (Habley, 2003, p.23). Faculty advising at this time existed to show students how to "follow the paths already paved for them—the same paths followed by the faculty who instructed the students" (Frost & Brown-Wheeler, 2003, p. 227). These early colleges were usually small and "designed to produce well-educated ministers, lawyers, and doctors for an emerging society" (Kuhn, 2008, p. 3). During the colonial period, the college president and the faculty acted *in loco parentis*, "in place of the parent," overseeing the social, moral, and intellectual activities of students (Cook, 2001). During this time the curriculum was standardized for all students; consequently, the need for academic advising was minimal and not well defined (Kuhn, 2008).
Higher education in the United States experienced several significant changes during the late nineteenth century. The Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 provided access to college for the children of the middle class, and some institutions began admitting females. The curriculum was focused on "useful arts, [such] as agriculture, mechanics, mining and military instruction" (Thelin, 2004, p. 76) as well as home economics and the liberal arts. Additionally, the introduction of the elective principle in the late 1870's required faculty members to begin advising students about the selection of their courses of study. According to Rudolph (1962, p. 305), the elective principle allowed students to choose from a variety of courses and "moved the individual to the center of the educational universe and boldly asserted that all educated men need not know the same things." As faculty responded to increased teaching loads, demands to produce research, and expectations to mentor graduate students, their availability to advise undergraduate students declined. Subsequently, professional advisors began to be hired to handle the academic advising needs of students. The president of Johns Hopkins University, Daniel Coit Gilman, described the academic advisors' charge:

The advisor's relation to the student is like that of a lawyer to his client or of the physician to one who seeks his counsel. The office is not that of an inspector, nor of a proctor, nor of a recipient of excuses, nor of a distant and unapproachable embodiment of the authority of the faculty. It is the advisor's business to listen to difficulties which the student assigned to him may bring to his notice; to act as his representative if any collective action is necessary on the part of the board of instruction; to see that every part of his course is necessary; to see that every part of his course of studies has received the proper attention (Rudolph, 1962, p. 565).
Unfortunately, Gilman's idealized view of the student-advisor relationship was not based in reality as the advisor system "degenerated into a perfunctory affair involving only brief, impersonal interviews" (Veysey, 1965, p. 297).

With the arrival of the 1900s, higher education began to experience myriad changes: a growing number of electives provided more choices for students, not only regarding programs of study, but also which courses to take and the order in which to take them (Rudolph, 1962); minority groups, including adult students, gained influence as they began attending universities in higher numbers (Thelin, 2004); and the creation of academic departments and research-oriented graduate schools shifted the focus of faculty away from advising and toward research (Fenske, 1989).

By the 1920's "most colleges and universities were busy perfecting various systems of freshman counseling, freshman week, faculty advisers, and before long the campus psychologist as well as the college chaplain would join these many agencies in giving organized expression to a purpose that had once been served most simply by dedicated faculty" (Rudolph, 1962, p. 460). In 1944, Congress enacted the GI Bill to help veterans further their education, and by 1950, more than 2 million eligible veterans "opted to enroll in postsecondary education" (Thelin, 2004, p. 263). Many of these veterans were married and had children, so the institutions of higher education and the services they provided (especially academic advising) had to adapt to a new type of student.

During the 1960’s and 1970’s, the arrival of 'baby boomers' on to college campuses increased the demand for student advising and counseling (Gordon, 1992). The 1970's was also the decade when the advising profession became introspective and advisors began to share their methods with their counterparts at other institutions. This progressive shift in philosophy
culminated with the establishment of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) in 1979 (Beatty, 1991).

Since that time, the American College Testing Services (ACT) has routinely conducted surveys to study advising practices. The surveys report academic advising policy, organization, program effectiveness, advisor training, and research universities. Unfortunately, despite the preponderance of evidence establishing academic advising as paramount to student success as well as confirmation that advising pays dividends to institutions in the form of student satisfaction and retention, recent surveys conducted by ACT reveal that academic advising receives limited financial support or recognition from many institutions. Furthermore, many institutions rarely evaluate their advising programs; consequently, students consistently report dissatisfaction with their advising services.

This is hugely disappointing as this brief review of the over 200-year history of American college student advising uncovered a variety of philosophies, values, theories, programs, and models, all of which point to the same outcome, i.e., effective advising contributes to the success of all students and is essential for the success of many students. This success is measured by student persistence and ultimately graduation. The success belongs to the student but shared by the faculty, the advisors, the institution and society at large.

**Advising Models**

Habley (1983) examined the organizational structure of advising and proposed seven models useful for describing the advising programs: 1) Faculty Only, 2) Supplementary, 3) Split, 4) Dual, 5) Total Intake, 6) Satellite, and 7) Self-Contained. Of these seven models, the self-contained, split, and faculty-only models account for 75% of the advising paradigms used by public community colleges. The self-contained model grew out of the public school system,
where all advising takes place in a centralized unit and is administered by a director who is responsible for all advising on campus (King, 2002). As enrollments in the nation's community colleges rose and the size of those campuses grew, there was increasing use of the self-contained model (Habley, 1997). The split model (as its name suggests) splits students between faculty and centralized staff; the centralized staff counsel undecided and underprepared students, but once established conditions are met, e.g., degree program chosen, students are assigned to a faculty advisor. The faculty-only model exists where there is no centralized unit.

**Advising Approaches**

A variety of academic advising approaches exists; the approach employed by an advisor is dependent on the needs of the student. The four conventional advising models are the prescriptive approach, the developmental approach, the intrusive approach (also known as proactive advising) and appreciative advising (also known as strengths-based advising).

**Prescriptive Advising**

Crookston (1994) defined the prescriptive or traditional advising approach as an impersonal, authority-based association, analogous with the doctor/patient relationship. In this approach, the student does what the academic advisor tells the student to do. Prescriptive advising is from the advisor to the student, as the advisor is expected to have all of the answers. As a result, the majority of the decision-making responsibility is placed on the advisor, not on the student Crookston (1972). Further, the prescriptive advisor’s role is limited to answering specific questions rather than addressing comprehensive academic concerns.
Developmental Advising

The developmental approach to advising asserts that a person's life plan should be determined first, and then education is undertaken to achieve that plan. The primary task of the academic advisor is that of helping students choose a vocation around which to center their lives (Crookston, 1972).

Through developmental advising, the academic advisor and student collaborate. Students do not take a passive role; instead, they share responsibility with their academic advisor for the decisions that are made. Crookston emphasized that when a student takes ownership of a decision, and a choice turns out badly, the student bears a portion of the accountability and does not merely place blame on their advisor.

Developmental advising also focuses on increasing the student's reasoning ability and problem-solving skills; when this occurs, advising becomes synonymous with teaching (Crookston, 1994).

Table 2.1 provides a side-by-side comparison of prescriptive and developmental advising approaches in terms of ten characteristics of student conduct.

Intrusive Advising

Intrusive advising is based on the developmental approach to advising with a key feature being that contact is initiated by the advisor using intentional and consistent interactions between the advisor and student (Jeschke, Johnson, & Williams, 2001). With intrusive advising, the advisor contacts the student and works to "develop plans for academic, social and organizational improvement" (Smith, 2007, p. 814).
### Table 2.1 Contrasting dimensions of prescriptive and developmental approaches to advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In terms of</th>
<th>Prescriptive</th>
<th>Developmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td>Focus on limitations</td>
<td>Focus on potentialities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Students are lazy, need prodding(^a)</td>
<td>Students are active, striving(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>Grades, credit, income</td>
<td>Achievement, master, acceptance, status, recognition, fulfillment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity of self-direction(^a)</td>
<td>Immature, irresponsible; must be closely supervised and carefully checked(^a)</td>
<td>Growing, maturing, responsible, capable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Advisor takes the initiative on fulfilling requirements; the rest is up to student initiative</td>
<td>Either or both may take the initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>By advisor</td>
<td>Negotiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>By advisor to advise</td>
<td>Negotiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By student to act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning output</td>
<td>Primarily in student</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>By advisor to the student</td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Based on status, strategies, games, low trust</td>
<td>Nature of task, competencies, situation, high trust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) McGregor's (1960) \(x\) and \(y\) theories.

Adapted from “A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching,” by B. Crookston, *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13, 1972, pp. 12-17

### Appreciative Advising

Appreciative advising optimizes advisor interaction by focusing on student strengths rather than student weaknesses by the advisor’s use of "the intentional collaborative practice of asking positive, open-ended questions that help students optimize their educational experiences and achieve their dreams, goals, and potentials" (Amundsen, Bloom, & Hutson, 2006, p. 30).

The questions asked center on possibilities rather than problems, consequently encouraging students to contemplate how their strengths can be applied to their academic goals.

### Summary of Advising Approaches

While the approaches described above each have their strengths, they are not mutually exclusive, nor is one approach "the best." For example, some students want or need their advisor to tell them what to do or which course to take and when; those students are satisfied when their
advisor uses prescriptive advising because it meets their expectations (Hale et al., 2009). Other students seek their advisor's input for academic and career as well as personal matters; in those situations, students prefer the developmental approach (Bland, 2003). Moreover, student expectations typically evolve throughout their college career, e.g., students in their first year often want or need prescriptive advising, but as they mature they begin to appreciate the developmental approach (Broadbridge, 1996).

**Advising Theory**

O'Banion (1972) suggested that academic advising could be categorized into a five-stage process: “1) exploration of life goals, 2) exploration of vocational goals, 3) program choice, 4) course choice, and 5) scheduling choice.” The author cautioned that advising programs that routinely jumped to stage three in this process consequently reduced the opportunity for students to seriously consider a variety of potential life goals and vocational possibilities. He also echoed Crookston when he asserted that an advisor serves only to provide sound information and that the responsibility for making decisions lies with the student.

O'Banion advocated that skilled counselors—individuals specially trained to approach their advisees with an open mind, respectful of individual differences, and holding to the belief that everyone has potential—conduct academic advising in the first two stages of the process. The author emphasized that advisors in subsequent stages become fully knowledgeable about their college’s programs, including all requirements, fees, and transfer policies, as well as how previous students performed in the program. Only when advisors possess complete and accurate information should they help their advisees choose specific courses that the advisor has verified will meet graduation and transfer requirements.
O'Banion stated that while faculty members are experts in their discipline, they also have the unique opportunity to become well acquainted with their students, and college administrators may elect to utilize faculty as advisors in an effort to keep costs down. If a faculty member finds the student-faculty interaction rewarding and they have a small advising load, both teaching and advising benefit; however, when instructors are forced into an advising role, both advising and teaching may suffer. O’Banion speculated that when faculty members do not receive appropriate training, a sensible load, recognition, release time, or increased pay, the instructor advising system would likely become “grossly ineffective.”

O'Banion went on to say that the team approach to advising is promising as it distributes the student load across a variety of professional advisors, counselors, and faculty advisors. When these professionals collaborate and make referrals to the individual best suited to advise a student at a given time, the outcome is frequently positive. O'Banion recognized that nothing is ideal, and that overlap will occur; but he maintained that when the team approach is carefully designed and orchestrated, it will yield the most significant opportunities possible for students to realize their potential.

Contrary to O'Banion's linear process of advising, Burton and Wellington (1998) advanced a nonlinear process known as the Integrative Advising Model. The authors stated that the nonlinear model of advising is necessary because the student population of today (which includes a significant number of females, people of color, working adults, individuals supporting a family, commuters, et al.) differs from the student population of the 1970's (which was mostly late-teen males attending full time and living on a residential campus). Burton and Wellington proposed that the integrative model anticipates the continuous adaptations that may arise in today's students' lives (e.g., changes in vocation, finances, family, et al.), any of which may
influence a student to change his or her path and/or program of study several times before graduating. The integrative model encourages professional advisors, faculty advisors, and others to urge their students to examine their personal and vocational objectives continuously. This collaboration allows the advisors to help their student focus and reflect on their goals, which affords the student control over the extent of self-analysis and ultimately the choices made.

After evaluating five theories of academic advising—prescriptive, engagement, academically centered, developmental, and student-centered—Church (2005) also advocated for the Integrated Advising Theory, stating that it embodied the responsibilities exhibited in the National Academic Advising Association (2006) NACADA Statement of Core Values (respect, professionalism, inclusivity, integrity, empowerment, commitment, and caring) as well as the five ethical traits advanced by Kitchener (2000) (for autonomy, avoiding harm (non-maleficence), benefiting others (beneficence), being just (justice), and being faithful (fidelity)). Church also praised the Integrative Theory for its common-sense approach to advising that allowed it the flexibility to borrow from the other theories and focus on what is best for the student and the institution.

**Advising Effectiveness**

Academic advisors provide guidance regarding general education requirements, suggest programs of study, maintain academic records, organize orientation programs, and train advisors campus-wide (De Sousa, 2005). However, an effective advisor requires more than mere knowledge of the institution and its resources. An effective faculty advisor adds the human element by taking into consideration both the personal and intellectual attributes of each student. Cuseo (2003b) defined this relationship as one "that helps students become more self-aware of their distinctive interests, talents, values and priorities" (p. 15). Effective faculty advisors are
well aware that the first half of a student's first semester is the critical period where positive student-faculty interactions assure students that they are valued, appreciated, and welcomed on campus.

College students face a variety of challenges. First- and second-year students can quickly become overwhelmed by the college experience—especially first-generation and non-traditional students. Many of these students have trouble coping, but effective faculty and professional advisors are prepared for this and work proactively to make sure students are well aware of what to expect when they matriculate (De Sousa, 2005). Nevertheless, even good academic preparation does not always equip students to succeed academically. Many students arrive at college needing to learn how to make sound academic decisions on their own; therefore, a positive attitude and self-motivation are critical.

**Advising as Teaching**

The phrase "advising as teaching" was first coined by Crookston (1972). In the years since, it has become generally accepted that advising is more meaningful when approached as a teaching process, because the teaching process encourages students to become active participants in the decision-making process.

The NACADA (2006) Pedagogy of Academic Advising stated:

Academic advising, as a teaching and learning process requires a pedagogy that incorporates the preparation, facilitation, documentation, and assessment of advising interactions. Although the specific methods, strategies, and techniques may vary, the relationship between advisors and students is fundamental and characterized by mutual respect, trust, and ethical behavior.
When faculty are both teachers and advisors, they can guide students as they develop the knowledge and skills required to take ownership of their curriculum, schedule their classes and begin career planning. Faculty advisors help students build their confidence and increase their independence. The aim is to motivate students to establish career objectives, and then develop an educational plan that will help them reach their goals. (Hemwall & Trachte, 2005).

Many undeclared students are as confused about what they want to study as they are about potential career opportunities. It is essential for these students to learn about their options, focus their interests, increase their confidence, establish their autonomy, and ultimately find their purpose. Once they find their purpose, the value of committing time and energy to their coursework is recognized. Unfortunately, helping undeclared students develop their purpose is one of the most challenging tasks that advisors encounter (Chickering, 1969, 1994; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Cleveland-Innes & Emes, 2005; Crockett, 1985; Drake, 2011; Melander, 2005).

Encouraging their advisees to attend First-Year Seminars and Learning Communities are two highly successful strategies that advisors employ to help students discover their purpose. First-year seminars provide incoming first-year, first-generation students the opportunity to meet with faculty members who are active researchers and accomplished teachers. During these seminars, students may be given an introduction to the intellectual life on campus and observe how faculty approach problems, collect data, evaluate evidence, and draw conclusions. Learning Communities create opportunities for first-year students to interact with faculty in an informal, outside-the-classroom environment where they can establish personal connections and begin building a rapport.

Ryan (1992) compared teaching and advising and the shared characteristics are identified in Table 2.2.
### Table 2.2 A comparison of effective teachers and advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Teachers</th>
<th>Effective Advisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master their subject matter</td>
<td>Possess accurate information about the policies, procedures, resources, and programs of their departments and institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, organize and prepare materials for classroom presentation</td>
<td>Are well prepared for advising sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage students actively in the learning process</td>
<td>Enable advisees to actively participate in the advising process by challenging them with new, more demanding learning tasks involving alternative ideas or choices and encouraging them to ask questions to clarify these ideas and explore these choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide regular feedback, reinforcement, and encouragement to students</td>
<td>Provide timely feedback, reinforce learning that has taken place, and applaud student successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create an environment conducive to learning</td>
<td>Create a good learning climate within advising sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate student interest in their subject by teaching it enthusiastically</td>
<td>Project enthusiasm for their area of academic expertise and their advisory duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students learn independently</td>
<td>Encourage advisees to become self-directed learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach students how to evaluate information</td>
<td>Help advisees evaluate and re-evaluate their progress toward personal, educational, and career goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act as co-learners during the learning process</td>
<td>Set performance goals for themselves and their advisees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a resource to students</td>
<td>Provide materials to advisees and refer them to others when referral is an appropriate response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate course content to students' experiences</td>
<td>Assist students in the consideration of their life goals by helping them relate their experiences, interests, skills, and values to career paths and the nature and purpose of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide problem-solving tasks to students</td>
<td>Provide tasks to be completed before the next advising meeting that will require the advisee to use information-gathering, decision-making, and problem-solving skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalize the learning process</td>
<td>Help students gain self-understanding and self-acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit good questioning skills</td>
<td>Serve as catalysts by asking questions and initiating discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit good listening skills</td>
<td>Listen carefully and constructively to advisees' messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit positive regard, concern, and respect for students</td>
<td>Provide a caring and personal relationship by exhibiting a positive attitude toward students, their goals, and their ability to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are approachable outside the classroom</td>
<td>Provide accessible and responsive advising services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Teachers</th>
<th>Effective Advisers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present themselves to students in an open and genuine manner</td>
<td>Provide a climate of trust in which advisees feel free to ask questions, express concerns, revise ideas, make decisions, and share personal experiences and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as role models who can help students understand the mission, values, and expectations of the institution</td>
<td>Model the tenets of the university, and demonstrate enthusiasm and knowledge about the goals and purposes of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Promote effective learning climates that are supportive of diversity” (Puente, 1993, p. 82)</td>
<td>Respect diverse points of view by demonstrating sensitivity to differences in culture and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use outcomes assessment to “make data-based suggestions for improving teaching and learning” (Halpern, 1993, p. 44)</td>
<td>Make changes or add to advising knowledge and skills by assessing the advising process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stimulate learning at higher cognitive levels” (Mathie, et al., 1993, p. 185)</td>
<td>Help students move beyond rote memorization or recall (Grites, 1994), help advisees test the validity of their ideas (Hagen, 1994), and “challenge students to confront their attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions” (Laff, 1994, p. 47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students “choose careers that best suit their aptitudes and interests” (Brewer, 1993, p. 171)</td>
<td>Help students explore career goals and choose programs, courses, and co-curricular activities that support these goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize interactive computer software that promotes active learning (Mathie, et al., 1993)</td>
<td>Utilize institutional technology (e.g., degree audit reports) to augment advising, recommend interactive software (e.g., SIGI PLUS) that can help advisees clarify goals and identify career options (Rooney, 1994), and communicate with advisees via e-mail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All the information in the table has been summarized from Ryan (1992).

Summary

An effective student-faculty advisor interaction leads to increased student satisfaction, persistence, retention, and graduation (Smith & Allen, 2006; Swecker, et al., 2013).

While the literature overwhelmingly supports the significance of a positive student-faculty advisor interaction, it is absent of empirical data that attempt to identify and isolate the discrete factors that contribute to this interaction and the effect these factors have on student satisfaction. This is the gap in the literature that this research seeks to address.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Overview

The overarching purpose of this research was to determine the level of satisfaction of LPTCC students and faculty with the current faculty advising model. The objective was to identify the factors involved in the student-faculty advisor interaction and determine the impact of each factor’s contribution to student satisfaction with an advising model where faculty members serve as academic advisors.

Additionally, the study had two aims: 1) to explore student perceptions of the relationship with their faculty advisors and the effectiveness of the LPTCC advising model, and 2) explore the faculty advisors’ perceptions of the relationship with their advisees and the effectiveness of the LPTCC advising model.

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the study’s methodology, including research questions, hypotheses, research design, survey instruments, populations and samples, variables, statistical techniques, limitations, and ethical considerations.

Research Questions

The following three questions were used to guide the researcher in the collection and analysis of data for this study of students and faculty advisors at LPTCC:

1. How satisfied are LPTCC students and faculty with the current faculty advising model?
2. When controlling for demographics and degree program, do intercorrelations among survey items predict student satisfaction with the faculty advisor interaction?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between student responses and faculty responses to matched items in the respective surveys?
Hypotheses

Creswell (2014) states that quantitative hypotheses are predictions a researcher makes about the expected outcomes of the relationships among variables. The null hypothesis makes the prediction that there is no relationship or association between or among groups on a dependent variable. That being the case, the hypotheses for this study were written in the null form, with the exception of research question number one, which was limited to descriptive analysis.

H₀₁: When controlling for demographics and degree program, there are no factors that predict student satisfaction with their faculty advisor.

H₀₂: There are no statistically significant differences between student responses and faculty responses to matched items in respective surveys.

Research Design

Survey Instruments

Two survey instruments were developed for this study: one survey for students and another survey for faculty advisors. Two survey instruments were used because an assessment of academic advising should not be limited to students’ perceptions alone; the faculty advisors' experience and perceptions are crucial needs to be explored as well (Cuseo, 2003b). There are several external ready-made instruments available to assess the quality and impact of academic advising; however, it is important to recognize that every college, indeed each campus, is unique (Nutt & Doody, 2015).

For this reason, the decision was made to develop and implement survey instruments tailored to suit the specific needs of LPTCC. Both surveys were carefully designed to capture the perceptions of students and faculty advisors regarding the advising function. Several of the items
included in each survey were adapted from the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI; Winston & Sandor, 2002).

Each survey measured the perceptions of the participants with 21 7-point Likert-type items, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). Twelve of the items (in each survey instrument) were “mirror images” of one another, i.e., the items were intentionally matched so the responses from each survey could be compared during subsequent analysis.

The student survey also included three demographic questions (ethnicity, gender, age); ten multiple-answer questions; and, since it is generally good practice to include qualitative responses in an assessment (Demetriou, 2005), an open-ended opportunity for students to share their thoughts about interacting with faculty advisors.

The faculty advisor survey also included one single-answer question; one multiple-answer question; three open-ended questions; and two open-ended opportunities to comment on 1) the time spent advising students and 2) the faculty advising model overall.

**Pilot Studies**

A pilot study for the student survey instrument was conducted in April 2017, prior to the distribution of the survey in December 2017. The pilot survey was distributed to ten students at a large, public community college in the Midwestern United States in order to review content, intent, language, and survey flow. Based on feedback from the participants, the wording of some items was modified, and ten items were eliminated to promote future survey completion.

A pilot study for the faculty survey instrument was conducted in September 2017. The pilot survey was provided to two faculty members at Iowa State University (ISU) and four faculty and staff members at LPTCC. Based on feedback from the participants, the wording of some items was modified to promote future survey completion.
IRB

The researcher submitted the final surveys and a proposal for review to the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at Iowa State University and LPTCC. The ISU Office of Institutional Research declared the study “exempt” on October 12, 2017, and their letter of approval was forwarded to the LPTCC IRB. The IRB at LPTCC conducted a full review before approving the proposal on November 30, 2017 (Appendix A).

Populations and Samples

The two survey instruments used in this study were developed specifically for students and faculty advisors at LPTCC.

Student Survey

Only students assigned to faculty advisors were included in the student survey, and participation was limited to students above the age of 18 and enrolled in credit-bearing courses during fall semester 2017. To ensure each participant met these criteria, the institutional research officer at LPTCC sorted the list of students and removed those who did not qualify. A survey invitation (Appendix B) with an individualized link was emailed to 8713 students enrolled at LPTCC; 1103 students completed the survey, and 828 were usable surveys. This resulted in an overall response rate of 9.5%. Admittedly this is a modest response rate; however, this is in keeping with surveys of a similar nature.
**Faculty Survey**

A survey invitation (Appendix C) with an individualized link was emailed to 271 faculty advisors at LPTCC, and 119 faculty advisors completed the survey, resulting in an overall response rate of 43.9%.

**Data Collection**

Data for the studies were collected in the following manner.

**Student Survey**

The researcher uploaded the student survey and the student email addresses (provided by LPTCC) into the web-based survey tool Qualtrics. A day before the survey was distributed, an official at LPTCC sent an email to the LPTCC students that qualified, describing the upcoming survey and assuring them of its legitimacy. On the day of distribution, Qualtrics automatically sent each qualified student an invitation to participate in the survey, and each invitation included a unique link to the survey instrument. If a student decided to participate, initially they would see a message from the LPTCC Associate Vice President of Student Services describing the importance of the survey and thanking them for participating; this was followed by the ISU Research Consent Form, and finally the survey itself (Appendix D).

After completing the survey, participants were given the opportunity to enter a drawing for one of five $20 gift cards from WALMART. This opportunity was highlighted on the invitation in an effort to increase the response rate.

The survey remained active for eight weeks. During that period, Qualtrics automatically sent reminder emails (only to those students who had not participated) at 2-, 4-, and 6-week intervals in an effort to increase the response rate. The reminders contained the same language
and graphics as the original invitation. Once the survey closed, the participants’ responses to the survey were downloaded to Cybox separate from any identifying information.

**Faculty Survey**

The researcher uploaded the faculty survey and the faculty email addresses (provided by LPTCC) into Qualtrics. A day before the survey was distributed, an official at LPTCC sent an email to the faculty advisors, describing the upcoming survey and assuring them of its legitimacy. On the day of distribution, Qualtrics automatically sent each faculty advisor an invitation to participate in the survey, and each invitation included a unique link to the survey instrument. If a faculty advisor decided to participate, initially they would see a message from the LPTCC Director of Institutional Research describing the importance of the survey and thanking them for participating; this was followed by the ISU Research Consent Form, and finally the survey itself (Appendix E).

The survey remained active for eight weeks. During that period, Qualtrics automatically sent reminder emails (only to those faculty members who had not participated) at 2-, 4-, and 6-week intervals in an effort to increase the response rate. The reminders contained the same language and graphics as the original invitation. Once the survey closed, the participants’ responses to the survey were downloaded to Cybox separate from any identifying information.

**Variables**

The variables used in this study were drawn from previous research (AAI; Winston & Sandor, 2002), suggested by highly experienced social science researchers, requested by stakeholders at LPTCC, or constructs revealed by an exploratory factor analysis (EFA).
Dependent Variable

Satisfaction. The predominant question in this research study was, “How satisfied are LPTCC students and faculty with the current faculty advising model?” The student survey contained one item that explicitly addressed this question: Q20: I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my current faculty coach.

Independent Variables

The independent variables in this study were classified as nominal, dichotomous, interval, and scale.

Demographics. The nominal variables included ethnicity and gender. Initially, ethnicity consisted of seven groups designated by LPTCC: Prefer not to answer = 0, American Indian or Alaskan Native = 1, Asian = 2, Black or African American = 3, Hispanic or Latinx = 4, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander = 5, White = 6, Other, please specify = 7. However, after evaluating the responses to Q18 What is your Ethnicity?, the data were recoded to retain only those groups that responded in sufficient quantities to make a significant contribution to the analysis. Consequently, ethnicity was collapsed into three groups: Asian, Black, and Hispanic.

Similarly, the responses to Q17: What is your gender? initially consisted of six groups designated by LPTCC: Prefer not to identify = 0, Male = 1, Female = 2, Transgender = 3, Genderqueer = 4, and Please specify = 5. Once again, the data were recoded to retain only those groups that responded in sufficient quantities to make a significant contribution to the analysis. Consequently, only two groups remained: Female = 0 and Male = 1, producing the dichotomous variable Gender.
The responses to Q19: *What is your age?* were collected as an interval variable using groupings designated by LPTCC: 18-20 = 1, 21-22 = 2, 23-24 = 3, 25-30 = 4, 31-35 = 5, 36-40 = 6, 41-50 = 7, 50+ = 8.

*Degree Program.* To determine whether a particular degree program influenced student satisfaction, the survey included item Q16: *What is your Degree Program? (Check all that apply).* This item allowed the participant to select from 66 programs. Using the size of responses to each program as a guide, the degree programs were initially collapsed into seven categories, and then these categories were combined into three programs: Vocational, Health, and STEM.

*Factor Structure.* An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the first twenty items in the student data set (Table 3.1) revealed three latent constructs: Interaction, Regular meetings, and Negative attitude.

*Personal Matters.* During preliminary discussions, LPTCC stakeholders expressed concerns about faculty advisors counseling students with difficult personal matters. To address this concern, the student survey included item Q6_2: *I would feel comfortable discussing difficult personal matters with my faculty coach.*

*Transfer Knowledge.* LPTCC stakeholders also expressed an interest in whether an advisor’s knowledge of transfer requirements influenced student satisfaction. To address this curiosity, the student survey included Q6_10: *My faculty coach knows what LPTCC courses will transfer to the institution of my choice.*
Table 3.1 The first twenty items in the student survey that were used for an EFA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item ##</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5_1</td>
<td>I visit with my faculty coach to identify realistic academic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_2</td>
<td>My faculty coach has suggested appropriate Degree Programs that I might pursue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_3</td>
<td>My faculty coach uses my academic record (including test scores and grades) to help him/her suggest courses that are the most appropriate for me to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_4</td>
<td>I seek the assistance of my faculty coach when confronted with cancelled courses or other scheduling problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_5</td>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on studying more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_6</td>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on managing my time more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_7</td>
<td>When I am faced with difficult academic decisions, my faculty coach explains my alternatives and we work together to decide which one is the best choice for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_8</td>
<td>My faculty coach keeps me informed of my academic progress by discussing my academic record (including test scores and grades) with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_9</td>
<td>My faculty coach is knowledgeable about LPTCC requirements to complete my Degree Program and graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_1</td>
<td>My faculty coach is approachable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_2</td>
<td>I would feel comfortable discussing difficult personal matters with my faculty coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_3</td>
<td>My faculty coach helps connect me to campus resources when I have problems in and out of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_4</td>
<td>My faculty coach talks with me about my interests and plans outside of academics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_5</td>
<td>My faculty coach is available when I need advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_6</td>
<td>Having meetings with my faculty coach helps me be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_7</td>
<td>Meeting with a faculty coach each semester should be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_8</td>
<td>I prefer to rely on advice from my peers rather than my faculty coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_9</td>
<td>I know what courses I need; I do not require guidance from a faculty coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_10</td>
<td>My faculty coach knows what LPTCC courses will transfer to the institution of my choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_11</td>
<td>I know what LPTCC courses will transfer to the institution of my choice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quantitative Data Analysis

The data collected from each survey were imported into the IBM Statistical Program for the Social Sciences® (SPSS) where it was examined for non-responders, questions that may have been skipped, or participants who did not finish the survey. When this “cleaning” process was complete, the data sets were ready for analysis.
Descriptive Analysis

Satisfaction. A descriptive analysis was performed on the following item in the student survey: Q20: I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my current faculty coach. The resulting mean and standard deviation are presented in Table 4.3.

Demographics. A descriptive analysis was also performed on Q17: What is your gender?, Q18: What is your Ethnicity?, and Q19: What is your age?. As explained previously, due to small cell sizes, ethnicity was recoded to include only groups that responded in significant numbers: Asian, Black, and Hispanic. Similarly, gender was recoded to represent only Male and Female.

Degree Program. As described in the previous section, after the results of the descriptive analysis revealed the cell sizes, all of the degree programs offered at LPTCC were collapsed into three categories: Vocational, Health, and STEM.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The items in the student survey were written to capture participant perspectives of various aspects of the advising function. An EFA is a data reduction technique used to reduce a large number of variables to a smaller composite number of variables. The presumption is that items are intercorrelated and cluster together to measure some common, but hidden, factors or constructs (Mertler & Vannatta, 2013). To identify these latent traits, SPSS was used to perform a principal component analysis with Varimax rotation on the responses to the first twenty Likert-type items in the student survey. During the analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were applied; they verified that the survey items were suitable for an EFA. The EFA revealed three constructs that the researcher termed 1) Interaction, 2) Regular meetings, and 3) Negative attitude (Table 4.2).
Reliability Analysis

SPSS was also used to conduct a reliability analysis on the groups of items that made up each of the constructs revealed by the EFA; the resulting (Cronbach’s Alpha) values for each of the constructs are indicated in table 4.2.

Regression Analysis

Using the variables determined by the demographics, degree program, and EFA, the researcher confronted the second research question: “When controlling for demographics and degree program, do intercorrelations among survey items predict student satisfaction with the faculty advisor interaction?” To answer this question a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted using the thirteen independent variables: student demographics (Ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic), Gender, Age); degree program (Vocational, Health, STEM); and the three factors revealed in an EFA (Interaction, Regular meetings, Negative attitude) and two single-item variables (Personal matters and Transfer knowledge).

Independent Samples T-test

The third research question asked: “Are there statistically significant differences between student responses and faculty responses to matched items in the respective surveys?” To answer this question, an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the means of the responses to each of the twelve matched items in the respective surveys. The results include the effect size and were reported as Hedges’ g, rather than the traditional Cohen’s d, because the Hedges’ g calculation corrected for the difference in sample size (Table 4.7).

Qualitative Data Analysis

Each of the open-ended questions in the student and faculty surveys was given a thorough textual analysis. The participants’ responses were categorized by definitions, and each definition
was coded with a descriptor. The descriptors were then grouped into themes, and actual examples of the participants’ responses were tabulated, ranked, assigned a score, and then graphed.

**Limitations**

This study had six limitations: 1) the survey was disseminated to one large, public, technical community college in the Southeastern United States; therefore, the ability to generalize findings to other colleges across the country is speculative; 2) the two survey instruments developed specifically for this study adapted items from the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI; Winston & Sandor, 2002); these items were modified per the expert advice of several scholars who were highly experienced at survey design; nevertheless, neither survey instrument was formally validated; 3) both surveys relied on self-reporting by the participants; 4) due to small cell sizes, some demographics were recoded to provide valid statistical analysis; 5) the study could not tie student responses to a specific faculty advisor; and finally 6) the qualitative analysis of the open-ended questions was evaluated using textual analysis by the researcher alone, i.e., there was no member checking, reconciling with another coder, or any of the traditional qualitative methods used to validate results. That being the case, the following positionality statement is offered to describe the researcher’s point of view.

**Positionality Statement**

The analysis of the responses to the open-ended items in the student and faculty surveys was through the lens of a middle-aged white male who was raised, attended college, and lived his entire life in a predominantly rural, conservative, agricultural area of the Midwestern United States. The researcher believes he is uniquely qualified to do this analysis for five reasons: 1) He graduated from a community college and a vocational school, so he has experienced many of the
challenges that confront students who attend similar institutions; 2) As a student he rarely asked for input from a faculty advisor, and as a result, he suffered the consequences put forth at the beginning of this paper; 3) Throughout his college career he worked two and sometimes three jobs to support himself, his wife and their two children, so he can empathize with many students’ struggle to persist; 4) For over 30 years, he has been employed at a large Research I university where he has had the opportunity to interact with a diverse group of students and faculty from across the United States and around the world; consequently, he is keenly aware of viewpoints very different from his own; and 5) For the past ten years he has been an adjunct instructor of an evening class at a large, public, community college in the Midwestern United States where he interacts (as a faculty member and advisor) with students who match the demographics described in this study.

**Ethical Considerations**

Since this research involved human participants, an application describing the research proposal was submitted for review to the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) at Iowa State University and LPTCC. The ISU Office of Institutional Research declared the study “exempt” on October 12, 2017, and that letter of approval was forwarded to the LPTCC IRB. The IRB at LPTCC conducted a full review before approving the proposal on November 30, 2017. Copies of the Iowa State University and LPTCC IRB letters of approval are provided in Appendix A. Note: the identifying information on the LPTCC document has been redacted.

One ethical obligation that the researcher took very seriously was ensuring the confidentiality of the participants. Both survey instruments were administered at ISU using the online survey tool Qualtrics; this required LPTCC to forward a list of participants’ email addresses to the researcher. The IRBs at both institutions confirmed that this did not violate
FERPA as the email addresses were not accompanied by personal identifiers, and the survey responses were separated from the email addresses when the surveys closed.

**Summary**

The purpose of this research was to test a model of interaction and satisfaction. The objective was to identify the factors involved in the student-faculty advisor interaction and determine the impact of each factor’s contribution to satisfaction with an advising model where faculty members serve as academic advisors.

This chapter described the methodology used to examine this topic including research questions, hypotheses, research design, survey instruments, populations and samples, variables in the study, statistical techniques, limitations, and ethical considerations.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

Overview

The purpose of this research was to determine the level of satisfaction of LPTCC students and faculty advisors with the current faculty advising model. The objective was to identify factors involved in the student-faculty advisor interaction and determine the impact of each factor’s contribution to satisfaction with an advising model where faculty members serve as academic advisors.

This chapter presents the results of the completed study. The majority of the results was determined by performing the following statistical analyses with SPSS: Descriptive Analysis, Exploratory Factor Analysis, Regression Analysis, and an Independent Samples t-test. As a follow-up to the statistical analyses of the survey’s quantitative data, a textual analysis of the responses to several qualitative items was performed by the researcher. The results of each of these analyses are presented through narratives, tables, and graphs.

Descriptive Analysis

Satisfaction. The first research question asked, “How satisfied are LPTCC students and faculty with the current faculty advising model?” The student and faculty surveys each contained one item that explicitly addressed this question. In the student survey, item Q20 stated “I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my current faculty coach.,” and in the faculty survey, item Q8_5 stated “Advising students brings me satisfaction.” Participants responded on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The results indicate that 881 students scored satisfaction (M=5.24, SD=1.81) and 110 faculty advisors scored satisfaction (M=4.84, SD=1.82).
Demographics. The descriptive analysis of the student data set focused on three demographic characteristics (ethnicity, gender, and age); due to small cell sizes, ethnicity was recoded to include only groups that responded in significant numbers: Asian, Black, and Hispanic. Similarly, gender was recoded to include only Male and Female. Age was collected as an interval variable using the groupings shown (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Descriptive analysis for all students in the study—frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latinx</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (non-response)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to identify</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional gender category/identify, please specify</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (non-response)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (non-response)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degree Program. To determine whether a particular degree program influenced student satisfaction, the survey included item Q16: *What is your Degree Program?*. This item allowed the participant to select from 66 programs. Using the size of responses to each program as a guide, the degree programs were initially collapsed into seven categories, and then these categories were combined into three programs: Vocational, Health, and STEM.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis**

An EFA was performed on the responses to the student survey, and the extraction produced three components with Eigenvalues greater than 1; therefore, adhering to Kaiser’s rule, these were the only components retained. Together, these components accounted for more than 69% of the variance. SPSS presented these three components in a pattern matrix, and subsequent interpretation of the loadings on each component was performed using the following criteria: loadings over 0.71 are considered excellent, over 0.63 very good, 0.55 good, 0.45 fair, and 0.32 poor (Comrey & Lee, 1992, p. 243). The outcome revealed three constructs that the researcher termed 1) Interaction, 2) Regular meetings, and 3) Negative attitude (Table 4.2).

Based on discussions with stakeholders, two additional single-item factors—Personal matters and Transfer knowledge—were identified as relevant; therefore, they were retained, as well.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction (α=.965)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am faced with difficult academic decisions, my faculty coach</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explains my alternatives and we work together to decide which one is the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best choice for me.</td>
<td>.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on studying</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more effectively.</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on managing my</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time more effectively.</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach keeps me informed of my academic progress by</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussing my academic record (including test scores and grades) with me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach uses my academic record (including test scores and</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grades) to help him/her suggest courses that are the most appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for me to take.</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach has suggested appropriate Degree Programs that I might</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursue.</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach helps connect me to campus resources when I have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems in and out of the classroom.</td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach is knowledgeable about LPTCC requirements to complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my Degree Program and graduate.</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach is available when I need advice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I visit with my faculty coach to identify realistic academic goals.</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek the assistance of my faculty coach when confronted with cancelled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses or other scheduling problems.</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach talks with me about my interests and plans outside of</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach is approachable.</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular meetings (α=.728)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with a faculty coach each semester should be required.</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having mandatory meetings with my faculty coach helps me be successful.</td>
<td>.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative attitude (α=.618)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what courses I need; I do not require guidance from a faculty</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coach.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to rely on advice from my peers rather than my faculty coach.</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO = .957 and Bartlett’s test of sphericity (p = .000).
**Regression Analysis**

The second research question asked, “When controlling for demographics and degree program, do intercorrelations among survey items predict student satisfaction with the faculty advisor interaction?” To answer this question, the correlations amongst the predictor variables (Asian, Black, Hispanic, Gender, Age, Vocational, Health, STEM, Interaction, Negative attitude, Regular meetings, Personal matters, and Transfer knowledge) included in the study were examined, and these data are presented in Table 4.3.

The correlations were very weak to strong, ranging between $r = -.070$, $p < .05$ and $r = .721$, $p < .001$. This indicates that multicollinearity is unlikely to be a problem (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). Nine of the thirteen predictor variables were statistically correlated with the dependent variable (satisfaction), indicating that these data can be reliably examined through multiple linear regression. The correlations between these predictor variables and satisfaction were very weak to strong, ranging from $r = -.069$, $p < .05$ to $r = .706$, $p < .001$ (Table 4.3).

Next, a hierarchical multiple regression was performed to investigate a variety of factors that predict levels of student satisfaction with their faculty advisor.

In Step 1 of hierarchical multiple regression, five predictors were entered: Asian, Black, Hispanic, Gender, and Age. This model was statistically significant ($F(5, 822) = 4.083; p < .01$; Table 4.4), but only explained 1.8% of the variance in student satisfaction. Further, only two of the demographic predictors (Black and Age) made a significant unique contribution to the model.
Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics, reliability, and correlations for all continuous variables (N=828)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>BK</th>
<th>HA</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>STEM</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (SAT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (AS)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (BK)</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (HA)</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (G)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (A)</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.13***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational (V)</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health (H)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM (STEM)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12***</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (IN)</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitude (N)</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>-.16***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Meetings (RM)</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal (P)</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13***</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>-.14***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer (T)</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.65***</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Range</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Statistical significance: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
After the entry of the three degree programs (Vocational, Health, and STEM) in Step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 2.4% ($F_{(8, 819)} = 3.952; p < .001$; Table 4.4). These variables explained an additional 1.0% of variance in student satisfaction after controlling for Asian, Black, Hispanic, Gender, and Age ($\Delta R^2 = .010; (F_{(3, 819)} = 2.731; p < .05)$).

After the entry of the final five predictor variables (Interaction, Negative attitude, Regular meetings, Personal matters, and Transfer knowledge) in Step 3, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 51.7% ($F_{(13, 814)} = 107.660; p < .001$; Table 4.4). The introduction of these variables explained an additional 49.0% of variance in student satisfaction after controlling for the previously entered predictors ($\Delta R^2 = .490; (F_{(5, 814)} = 167.879; p < .001$; Table 4.5)).

**Table 4.4 ANOVA of student satisfaction with faculty advising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>64.675</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.935</td>
<td>4.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2604.401</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>3.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2669.076</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>3.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>90.469</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.309</td>
<td>3.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2578.607</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>3.148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2669.076</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>3.148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1399.574</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>107.660</td>
<td>69.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1269.502</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2669.076</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction  
b. Predictors: Gender, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Age  
c. Predictors: Gender, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Age, STEM, Health, Vocational  
d. Predictors: Gender, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Age, STEM, Health, Vocational, Interaction, Negative attitude, Regular meetings, Personal Matters, Transfer knowledge
Table 4.5 Hierarchical multiple regression model of student satisfaction with faculty advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>2.223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-1.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.082**</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>3.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.309*</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-2.61</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-1.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.074**</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>2.794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>2.376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>- .813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-1.453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>.255*</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.689***</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>14.443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative attitude</td>
<td>-0.067*</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-2.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal matters</td>
<td>.094**</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>2.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer knwldg.</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Statistical significance: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
In the final adjusted model, only five out of thirteen predictor variables were statistically significant, with Interaction recording a much higher Beta value ($\beta = .599$, $p < .001$) than Personal matters ($\beta = .103$, $p < .01$), Age ($\beta = .080$, $p < .01$), Negative attitude ($\beta = -.060$, $p = < .05$), or STEM ($\beta = .055$, $p < .05$). This model was statistically significant ($F(13, 814) = 69.031; p < .001$) and explained 51.7% of the variance in student satisfaction.

**Independent Samples T-test**

The third and final research question asked: “Are there statistically significant differences between student responses and faculty responses to matched items in the respective surveys?” To answer this question, an independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the means of the responses to each of the twelve matched survey items. The matched survey items were paired, tabulated, and assigned a theme (Table 4.6).

**Table 4.6 Matched student & faculty survey items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Matched survey items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic goals</td>
<td>Q5_1</td>
<td>I visit with my faculty coach to identify realistic academic goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_1</td>
<td>I collaborate with my advisees to identify realistic academic goals based on what they share about themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree program</td>
<td>Q5_2</td>
<td>My faculty coach has suggested appropriate Degree Programs that I might pursue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_2</td>
<td>I suggest appropriate Degree Programs that my advisees might pursue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate courses</td>
<td>Q5_3</td>
<td>My faculty coach uses my academic record (including test scores and grades) to help him/her suggest courses that are the most appropriate for me to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_4</td>
<td>I use my advisee’s academic record (including test scores and grades) to help me determine what courses are the most appropriate for him/her to take.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheduling problems</td>
<td>Q5_4</td>
<td>I seek the assistance of my faculty coach when confronted with cancelled courses or other scheduling problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_5</td>
<td>I assist my advisees when they’re confronted with cancelled courses or other scheduling problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Matched survey items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>study tips</td>
<td>Q5_5</td>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on studying more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_6</td>
<td>I give my advisees helpful tips (when they need them) on studying more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time management</td>
<td>Q5_6</td>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on managing my time more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_7</td>
<td>I give my advisees helpful tips (when they need them) on managing their time more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult academic decisions</td>
<td>Q5_7</td>
<td>When I am faced with difficult academic decisions, my faculty coach explains my alternatives and we work together to decide which one is the best choice for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_8</td>
<td>When my advisee is faced with difficult academic decisions, I explain the alternatives and help them decide which one is the best choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic progress</td>
<td>Q5_8</td>
<td>My faculty coach keeps me informed of my academic progress by discussing my academic record (including test scores and grades) with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_9</td>
<td>I keep my advisees informed of their academic progress by discussing their academic record (including test scores and grades) with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduation requirements</td>
<td>Q5_9</td>
<td>My faculty coach is knowledgeable about LPTCC requirements to complete my Degree Program and graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9_10</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the LPTCC requirements my advisees need to complete their Degree Program and graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficult personal matters</td>
<td>Q6_2</td>
<td>I would feel comfortable discussing difficult personal matters with my faculty coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10_1</td>
<td>I feel comfortable discussing my advisees’ difficult personal matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>campus resources</td>
<td>Q6_3</td>
<td>My faculty coach helps connect me to campus resources when I have problems in and out of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10_2</td>
<td>I help connect my advisees to campus resources when they have problems in and out of the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests outside academics</td>
<td>Q6_4</td>
<td>My faculty coach talks with me about my interests and plans outside of academics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10_3</td>
<td>My advisees and I discuss their interests and plans outside of academics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the t-test showed statistically significant differences between the means of the responses to ten out of the twelve matched pairs; only the matched pairs “academic progress” and “interests outside academics” were not statistically significant (Table 4.7).
The results of the Hedges’ g effect size were tabulated in the last column of Table 4.7, and the values were used to rank the matched pairs of items in decreasing order.

Table 4.7 Independent samples t-test comparison of student & faculty responses to matched items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Student mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>Faculty mean</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Hedges’ g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5_1</td>
<td>Q9_1</td>
<td>academic goals</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>-6.324***</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_7</td>
<td>Q9_8</td>
<td>difficult academic decisions</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>-6.434***</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_3</td>
<td>Q9_4</td>
<td>appropriate courses</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.918</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>-5.856***</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_2</td>
<td>Q9_2</td>
<td>degree program</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>-4.631***</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_3</td>
<td>Q10_2</td>
<td>campus resources</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.824</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>-3.886***</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_6</td>
<td>Q9_7</td>
<td>time management</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.927</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.550</td>
<td>-2.530*</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_2</td>
<td>Q10_1</td>
<td>difficult personal matters</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>2.185*</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_9</td>
<td>Q9_10</td>
<td>graduation requirements</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.805</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>-2.219*</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_5</td>
<td>Q9_6</td>
<td>study tips</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.994</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>-2.203*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_4</td>
<td>Q9_5</td>
<td>scheduling problems</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>-2.071*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5_8</td>
<td>Q9_9</td>
<td>academic progress</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>-1.591</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6_4</td>
<td>Q10_3</td>
<td>interests outside academics</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>-1.280</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Statistical significance: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Qualitative Data Analysis

In this study, the qualitative method for data collection was limited to the open-ended items in the student and faculty surveys; the responses to each item were thoroughly examined using a methodical textual analysis process. The evaluation of the responses in sum provided the researcher with enhanced insight into the student and faculty advisor impressions of the student-faculty interaction; these impressions added value and utility to the evidence revealed through quantitative methods.

Student Responses

Item Q21 in the student survey stated: If there is anything else you would like to share, please elaborate in the text box below. Of the 1103 participants in the student survey, 182 chose to respond to this item; of those, 174 were deemed by the researcher to be useful. Those 174
students shared personal, detailed descriptions of their advising experience at LPTCC. Using these responses, a thematic analysis was conducted to categorize the viewpoints of the students.

After a thorough review of the student responses, various categories emerged. These categories were coded: Knowledgeable, Organized, Resourceful, Approachable, Trustworthy, Collaborative, Timely & Available, Flexible, and Initiative & Persistence. Definitions of each codename were assigned and allowed for further refinement. Ultimately, the codenames were combined into three overarching themes: 1) the codenames Knowledgeable, Organized, and Resourceful were combined to create the overarching theme Competence; 2) the codenames Approachable, Trustworthy, and Collaborative were combined to form the theme Fosters Relationships & Student Satisfaction; and finally 3) the codenames Timely & Available, Flexible, and Initiative & Persistence were combined to create the theme Communication & Responsiveness. These three themes were assigned a color for the convenience of the researcher (Table 4.8).

Using these three overarching themes and their respective definitions as a guide, actual (unedited) student responses were evaluated by the researcher and assigned an individual score for each response in each of the three themes.

To accomplish this, the researcher developed an intensity/frequency scale ranging from a negative five (-5) to a positive five (+5). A -5 represented the most intense and/or frequent negative student responses, and a +5 represented the most intense and/or frequent positive student responses. Using this scale, the scores for each theme were assigned and tabulated (Tables 4.9, 4.10, and 4.11).

Note: the responses in the (yellow) center row of every table are identical. This row illustrates the 18 students who responded that they “didn’t know” or had “never heard of” a
faculty advisor. These students’ responses were scored zero as they were neither positive nor negative with respect to the performance of a faculty advisor. This finding is important to stakeholders because it reveals that 10% of the student respondents to item Q21 claim they were unaware they had a faculty advisor at LPTCC.

Table 4.8 Themes, codes, and definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Provides an accurate and precise comprehension of the college’s or university’s requirements, e.g., entrance exam scores, classes essential for graduation, and/or transfer to another institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>Guide: Ensures that all course, program, and/or graduation requirements are met for advisee. Assists students with course scheduling structure to maximize time and effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resourceful</td>
<td>Pro-active, creative problem solver, adaptable, flexible, open-minded. Finds answers if they don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Relationships</td>
<td>Approachable</td>
<td>Positive, welcoming (happy to see you), likable, accessible, encouraging, communicative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>Honest, reliable, and follows through with commitments (in student’s corner).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>Coach, mutual goal &amp; benefit, united (two-way street), cooperative, follow-through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Responsiveness</td>
<td>Timely &amp; Available</td>
<td>Responds to student inquiries and sets appointments within an expected and reasonable timeframe. Is available for on-campus appointments at the student’s location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Flexible in the use of communication methods and appointment types, e.g., Email, Skype, cell phone, FaceTime, office hours, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative &amp;</td>
<td>Is the first to establish communication and keeps trying if unsuccessful. Checks in on and follows through with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• “They are extremely knowledgeable about the subjects they teach and the resources.”&lt;br&gt;• “All of the people... at... have been exceptional.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• “They are very approachable and knowledgeable or find out what they don’t know.”&lt;br&gt;• “Very knowledgeable.”&lt;br&gt;• “Thanks and keep up the great work.”&lt;br&gt;• “My faculty coach is very thorough and knew which classes I was able to take at which time. I was very pleased with my faculty coach. She is very knowledgeable about the course she teaches.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• “She is very informative...”&lt;br&gt;• “…if she is not sure of something she will check while I am with her and find out all she can.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• “Having an academic advisor has been helpful in making sure the classes taken are the most beneficial, also it takes the stress out of making sure you have all the classes needed.”&lt;br&gt;• “My advisor was very helpful in helping me stay on track and making a schedule that will help me do just that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• “…they helped me get my classes set up and paid for.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>• “I didn’t know we had faculty coaches.”&lt;br&gt;• “… I have never even heard of a &quot;faculty coach&quot;. I have no idea who he/she is.”&lt;br&gt;• “I am a transfer student here and was not informed of a faculty coach, have never met with them for help, or could even tell you what their name is.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>• “I felt like I was told things I already knew, and my questions were not answered.”&lt;br&gt;• “The one I currently have is nice, but I don’t feel like he can offer me any information that I don’t already know.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>• “We need better faculty coaching to guide us better in the right career path.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>• “Suggests classes that I have already taken.”&lt;br&gt;• “I think it might be best to either train the coaches in class and course requirements and what it takes to graduate. There were several instances where I figured out what classes I needed to take before he did.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>• “I have spoken with my &quot;coach&quot; one time and he spoke as if he was lost and did not know how to handle my concerns.”&lt;br&gt;• “I was completely misadvised because she didn’t know or bother to look to see about all correct order I had to take classes.”&lt;br&gt;• “I had met with my advisor, and we had outlined where I needed to go to graduate, but when I tried to register, he had given me incomplete and/or incorrect information.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>• “ Outsider faculty coaches do not know ANYTHING about what courses will transfer, which courses to take, or anything else about that major.”&lt;br&gt;• “Advising here at... is completely horrible and unprofessional. My two years being here I had no idea which classes I need to take, there was nothing remotely close to advising here.”&lt;br&gt;• “I’ve had to get through school by advising myself. It is a complete joke.”&lt;br&gt;• “…the advising situation... is severely flawed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fosters Relationships &amp; Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Student Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5                                          | • “Awesome faculty! Great environment…”  
• “I think she deserves a raise for all the rolls she plays for the students she has to advise. Some may not even be hers, but she does what is needed for everyone that comes into her office.”  
• “Wonderful listener!”  
• “…the environment is very warm, inviting and accepting to all who want to advance in life.”                                                                 |
| 4                                          | • “…she helped me get the help I needed, so grateful and thankful for her.”  
• “…the relationship we have is great.”  
• “…my temporary coach was very helpful and nurturing.”                                                                                                                                 |
| 3                                          | • “They are very approachable.”  
• “…felt very comfortable with my coach advising me to give her a call if I needed anything from her.”                                                                                                                                 |
| 2                                          | • “She helped me through many issues and advised me on which classes I should take.”  
• “My advisor was very helpful in helping me stay on track and making a schedule that will help me do just that.”                                                                                                                                 |
| 1                                          | • “I am so glad this is available to students.”                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 0                                          | • “I didn’t know we had faculty coaches.”  
• “…I have never even heard of a "faculty coach". I have no idea who he/she is.”  
• “I am a transfer student here and was not informed of a faculty coach, have never met with them for help, or could even tell you what their name is.”            |
| -1                                         | • “I feel like my coach would be pretty busy most of the time, and I would rather not bother them.”                                                                                                                                 |
| -2                                         | • “To have the faculty coach not rush me and not just advise me on classes through email only.”                                                                                                                                 |
| -3                                         | • “Wish I had an advisor that actually cared about me individually…”  
• “My coach just gave me a strong sense of apathy when meeting with them.”                                                                                                                                 |
| -4                                         | • “They were very rude, and even went as far to ask if I was lying.”  
• “Then he blamed me for being "confused" on the issue. I was not confused.”                                                                                                                                 |
| -5                                         | • “I decided not to go anyone because the people who are supposed to “help” you, are so rude and do not care about answering my questions or seeing me graduate… I feel so uncomfortable and dreading talking to staff about how to graduate.”  
• “It’s unfortunate that my faculty coach has eroded my desire to finish this program.”                                                                                                                                 |
Table 4.11 Communication & responsiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication &amp; Responsiveness</th>
<th>Student Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5                             | “...always available to meet with me when necessary.”  
|                               | “I can email my advisor at any time and I know he is going to answer at any time and any day including weekends.”  
|                               | “She is very patient and always willing to work with my schedule when I need to go over things with her.”  |
| 4                             | “I appreciate her open-door policy and approachability.”  |
| 3                             | “I did not meet my coach face-to-face but talked with her via email and she was very fast answering my questions, I felt that she was always very attentive.”  |
| 2                             | “I appreciate that I can email my coach and know that I will receive the same response as if I had visited her in person.”  |
| 1                             | “I...have never met my advisor or faculty coach in person. I have only spoken with my advisor through emails.”  |
| 0                             | “I didn’t know we had faculty coaches.”  
|                               | “…I have never even heard of a "faculty coach". I have no idea who he/she is.”  
|                               | “I am a transfer student here and was not informed of a faculty coach, have never met with them for help, or could even tell you what their name is.”  |
| -1                            | “It would be nice if the advising coach called sometimes just too check in and see if there is anything I need help with.”  
|                               | “I feel like my coach would be pretty busy most of the time, and I would rather not bother them.”  |
| -2                            | “Have tried meeting with my advisor twice and he never can meet in person.”  
|                               | “…he told me just to send the forms I needed signed off on, rather than interact with me in person.”  |
| -3                            | “Coach will say that they will get back with me and then I never hear from them.”  
|                               | “I don’t think it’s wise to assign advisors to students on different campuses. It’s unnecessarily difficult to get in contact with her and frustrating to say the least. I feel that our relationship would be much stronger if I was able to walk and see her in the advising office on my campus.”  |
| -4                            | “My purpose for even taking this survey is that it will change the course of the otherwise lazy approach to advising at ....”  
|                               | “…my current adviser has yet to respond to multiple emails I’ve sent him requesting a face-to-face, advice on courses, and for his convenience a teleconference.”  |
| -5                            | “I’ve been assigned advisers who were not in my major, who were no longer employed by..., and who are generally inaccessible.”  
|                               | “I have never met my coach. they were totally unavailable during the semester. I had emailed them several times to try and make sure that I was going to get enrolled in the right classes and they were no help at all!”  |
The scores for each theme were graphed and the responses to theme 1, Competence (Figure 4.1), and theme 2, Fosters Relationships & Student Satisfaction (Figure 4.2), were evenly balanced. However, the responses to the theme 3, Communication & Responsiveness,
(Figure 4.3), were skewed negatively. The fact that humans often have a stronger emotional reaction to negative events (Baumeister, et al., 2001) may explain a portion of the imbalance, but it is the researcher’s assessment that the graph depicts an accurate representation of the participants’ experiences in this theme.

![Communication & Responsiveness](image)

**Figure 4.3 Communication and responsiveness**

**Faculty Responses**

The faculty survey included five open-ended items. Due to the nature of these items, the responses could not be ranked or scored equitably. For example, in item Q7: “Optional Comments Regarding Time for Advising Appointments,” faculty respondents reported significant differences in the amount of time devoted to face-to-face meetings, meeting prep, email correspondence, phone calls, and accessing the database. In addition, communication with college advising resources and following up with advisees after an appointment reportedly took a substantial amount of time. The number of advisees assigned to a faculty advisor contributed to the high rate of variability in time spent with each student as well.
Many respondents reported that the time spent with advisees “depended on the situation,” and some stated that item Q7 was unclear. Approximately 30% of the respondents attempted to quantify time spent on advising appointments—offering a range from 10 to 60 minutes, with 20 minutes being cited most frequently. Furthermore, 37% of the respondents claimed that most of their advisees did not seek their assistance, other than “to have a hold removed.”

For the reasons described above, the responses to the open-ended items in the faculty survey were grouped together, and the number of responses in kind graphed (Figures 4.4, 4.5, 4.6).

![Graph of responses to Q11](image)

**What Aspect of the LPTCC Advising Model Do You Like Best?**

- NOTHING AT ALL, NONE; I DON’T LIKE ANY ASPECT OF THIS ADVISING MODEL; NOT MUCH: 11
- WORKING WITH AND HELPING STUDENTS FIGURE OUT CAREER PATHS, COURSE SELECTION, AND DISCUSS ACADEMIC GOALS: 18
- ADVISING STUDENTS IN MY PROGRAM; DEPARTMENT; AREA OF EXPERTISE: 20
- ESTABLISHING AND BUILDING RELATIONSHIPS WITH ADVISEES; CONNECTING WITH STUDENTS ONE-ON-ONE; PERSONAL INTERACTION WITH STUDENTS: 6
- SSP IS A GREAT TOOL; SSP MAPPING HAS STREAMLINED A LOT OF WORK; MOODLE RESOURCE PAGE; ONLINE CATALOG: 17
- STUDENTS ARE PUT ON HOLD FROM REGISTERING UNTIL THEY MEET W/ FACULTY COACH TO MAKE SURE THEY STAY ON TRACK; STUDENTS NEED TO REACH OUT TO ME: 3
- OTHER: 3

*Figure 4.4 Faculty response to Q11: “What aspect of the LPTCC advising model do you like best?”*
Figure 4.5 Faculty response to Q12: “What aspect of the LPTCC advising model do you like least?”
Figure 4.6 Faculty response Q13: “What single aspect of the LPTCC advising model would you like to change and why?”
Summary

This chapter summarized the results of this study. First, descriptive results revealed the demographic characteristics of students who participated in the study. Second, the LPTCC degree programs were collapsed into three groups. Third, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted and revealed three latent constructs that potentially contributed to student satisfaction. Fourth, stakeholder input identified two additional factors of interest. Fifth, using all of the variables previously described, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted that (in step 3) revealed five significant factors that predict student satisfaction with their faculty advisors. Sixth, an independent samples t-test was performed on 12 matched items in the student and faculty surveys. Lastly, a textual analysis was performed on the open-ended questions in the student and faculty surveys and, where possible, the responses were ranked, scored, and graphed.

The next chapter will provide interpretations of the findings, discuss the implications for policy and practice, and offer conclusions as well as recommendations for stakeholders and future research.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview

This chapter provides a summary of the study, a discussion of the results presented in Chapter 4, implications for policy and practice, and recommendations for stakeholders and future research. The interpretation of the results is organized by the types of analyses used and provides answers to all of the research questions.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the factors involved in the student-faculty advisor interaction at a large, public, technical community college (LPTCC) in the Southeastern United States and determine the impact of each factor’s contribution to student satisfaction with the advising model where faculty members serve as academic advisors.

Discussion of the Results

Research Questions

1. How satisfied are LPTCC students and faculty with the current faculty advising model?

The first research question was aimed directly at the heart of this study—student and faculty satisfaction with the LPTCC advising model. The student and faculty surveys each contained one item that explicitly addressed this question. In the student survey, item Q20 stated “I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my current faculty coach,” and in the faculty survey, item Q8_5 stated “Advising students brings me satisfaction.” Participants responded on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). The results indicate that 881 students scored satisfaction (M=5.24, SD=1.81) and 110 faculty advisors scored satisfaction (M=4.84, SD=1.82). These results indicate that at the time the surveys were taken,
the average student was “somewhat satisfied,” while the average faculty advisor was slightly less than “somewhat satisfied” with the LPTCC faculty advising model.

Other than revealing that LPTCC student and faculty respondents were neither entirely satisfied nor dissatisfied with the current advising model, these results do not convey a rationale for the respondents’ attitudes. To obtain deeper insight into the experiences and perceptions of the LPTCC students and faculty toward the current advising model, the results of the responses to the qualitative items in both survey instruments were interpreted.

The responses to the student survey’s open-ended item Q21: “If there is anything else you would like to share, please elaborate in the text box below” revealed a wide range of attitudes held by LPTCC students toward the current advising model. Three themes emerged, and the student responses were tabulated, ranked, scored, and graphed (see chapter 4). Analysis of these results revealed the students’ attitudes were evenly split on themes one and two; however, in theme three, the majority of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the Communication & Responsiveness they received from LPTCC faculty advisors.

LPTCC faculty advisors interpreted the five open-ended items in their survey in a variety of manners that was not anticipated by the researcher; this limited the comparison of results across items. Nevertheless, one common theme emerged, i.e., faculty advisors expressed dissatisfaction with their advisees’ lack of initiative, accountability, and responsibility for maintaining communication with their advisor.

These results indicate that neither the students nor the faculty advisors fully appreciate that the central theme of advising is one of shared responsibility. The students lack initiative because they do not realize how crucial an advisor is to their success. Similarly, faculty advisors
do not appear to recognize how vital their initiative and persistence are to their students’ academic success.

2. *When controlling for demographics and degree program, do intercorrelations among survey items predict student satisfaction with the faculty advisor interaction?*

   The second research question sought to determine if there were survey items that intercorrelated to reveal latent constructs; if so, did any of those constructs predict student satisfaction? A null hypothesis was proposed: “*When controlling for demographics and degree program, there are no factors that predict student satisfaction with their faculty advisor.*” The findings suggested that the null hypothesis should be rejected as two latent constructs (Interaction and Negative attitude), identified by the exploratory factor analysis, and one single-item (Personal Matters) explained a statistically significant amount of variance in satisfaction, as shown in Step 3 of the hierarchical multiple regression (Table 4.5). Inspection of these results overwhelmingly indicated that a preponderance of the variance was explained by the construct Interaction, i.e., the quality of the student-faculty advisor interaction was substantially greater than other predictors of student satisfaction.

3. *Are there statistically significant differences between student responses and faculty responses to matched items in the respective surveys?*

   The third research question sought to determine if there was a difference between the means of the responses to the matched items in the student and faculty surveys. A null hypothesis was proposed: “*There are no statistically significant differences between the means of student responses and faculty responses to matched items in respective surveys.*” The outcome of an independent samples t-test suggested that the null hypothesis should be rejected as the results revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the means of the responses to ten out of the twelve matched pairs in the respective surveys.
Each matched pair of items is identified by its assigned theme, and the pair’s significance and effect size are discussed separately below. Note: The magnitude of the effect size was interpreted by Cohen’s (1988) rule-of-thumb scale of Small Effect = 0.2, Medium Effect = 0.5, and Large Effect = 0.8.

**Academic goals.** The mean response from students regarding whether they visited with their faculty advisor to identify realistic academic goals was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.78), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was less than “Agree” (5.66). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.47 emphasizes that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

**Difficult academic decisions.** The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor explained alternatives and helped them decide which one is the best choice was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.76), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was less than “Agree” (5.59). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.43 emphasizes that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

**Appropriate courses.** The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor used their academic record to suggest courses that are the most appropriate for them to take was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.66), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was greater than “Somewhat agree” (5.45). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of
the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.42 emphasizes that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

*Degree program.* The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor *suggested an appropriate degree program* was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.69), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was greater than “Somewhat agree” (5.39). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.37 emphasizes that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

*Campus resources.* The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor *connects them with campus resources when they have problems in and out of the classroom* was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.81), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was greater than “Somewhat agree” (5.34). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.30 emphasizes that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

*Time management.* The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor *gives them time management tips (when they need them) on managing their time more effectively* was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.52), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was also less than “Somewhat agree” (4.93). Nevertheless, this difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near
medium effect size of 0.22 indicates that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

*Difficult personal matters.* The mean response from students regarding whether *they feel comfortable discussing difficult personal matters with their faculty coach* was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.70), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was greater than “Neither agree nor disagree” (4.27). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly greater than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.22 indicates that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

This was the only theme where the students ranked the matched item higher than their faculty advisors, i.e., the students felt more satisfied with the interaction they received during the discussion of personal matters than the faculty felt they provided. A potential explanation for the students’ heightened response is founded in research advanced by Schlossberg, Lynch, and Chickering (1989) in which they described the importance of "mattering," i.e., where students felt like they mattered simply because their faculty advisor took the time to listen.

*Graduation requirements.* The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor *was knowledgeable about requirements to complete a Degree Program and graduate* was greater than “Somewhat agree” (5.39), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was less than “Agree” (5.72). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.19, while small, indicates that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.
Study tips. The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor gives them helpful study tips (when they need them) on studying more effectively was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.60), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was also less than “Somewhat agree” (4.96). Nevertheless, this difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.18, while small, indicates that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

Scheduling problems. The mean response from students regarding whether students seek their faculty advisor’s advice when confronted with cancelled courses or other scheduling problems was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.83), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was greater than “Somewhat agree” (5.16). Nevertheless, this difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. Combining this difference with the near medium effect size of 0.18, while small, indicates that the difference between the means is real and not due to chance.

Academic progress. The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor keeps students informed about their academic progress by discussing their academic record (including test scores and grades) was greater than “Neither agree nor disagree” (4.45), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.71). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was not significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. The extremely small effect size of 0.13 supports the interpretation that the difference between the means is not significant.
Interests outside academics. The mean response from students regarding whether their faculty advisor discussed the student’s interests and plans outside academics was greater than “Neither agree nor disagree” (4.45), while the mean response from faculty advisors for the matched item was less than “Somewhat agree” (4.70). This difference indicates that the students’ perception of the frequency of this theme occurring was not significantly less than that of the faculty advisors’. The extremely small effect size of 0.13 supports the interpretation that the difference between the means is not significant.

When viewed overall, the themes described the student-faculty advisor interaction. Each theme indicated a difference between what the students perceived and what the faculty perceived. In all but one theme, the faculty held a more positive view of the advising process than the students, i.e., the faculty saw themselves performing their advising responsibilities better than the students did. This result was not surprising because, when given the opportunity to rate themselves, respondents typically rate themselves higher than others.

Four of the twelve themes (Academic goals, Appropriate courses, Difficult academic decisions, and Degree program) encompassed interaction of an academic nature. The significance and effect size (Table 4.7) determined for each of these themes emphasized that the outcome of a quality student-faculty interaction is satisfaction.

Implications for Policy and Practice

The results of this study demonstrated that the student interaction with a faculty advisor was by far the dominant factor predicting student satisfaction with their college experience. This outcome provides a secure foundation from which to draw four implications regarding policy and practice. These implications are summarized below.
First, advising students is challenging; in fact, it is likely that many faculty advisors who are doing a terrible job think they are doing a fine job, simply because they do not know what they are supposed to do. To improve student-faculty interaction, colleges must provide professional development for faculty advisors, e.g., regular meetings to ensure that faculty advisors remain cognizant of program of study requirements, mentors that demonstrate practices that build a good rapport with students, and programs that expound the enormous impact the student-faculty interaction has on satisfaction.

Second, some faculty members have no desire to be an advisor, while others feel the distribution of the student load is unfair. Some of these issues can be alleviated if the college implements procedures to even or lessen the load, provides course release time, or offers stipends to communicate that the college values advising and faculty advisors’ time.

Third, while developing a completely fair, equitable, and justifiable distribution of advisees is unlikely to occur, administrators must ensure that the advisor-to-student ratio meets the needs of the enrollment, because overloading advisors with too many advisees will cause frustration for the advisors and their students, resulting in decreased satisfaction for both groups.

Fourth, recognize and reward faculty advisors, and professional advisors, who contribute to the success of a college advising program.

**Conclusions**

**Recommendations for Stakeholders**

This study produced overwhelming empirical evidence supporting the student-faculty interaction as paramount when examining factors that influence satisfaction with the advising function at LPTCC.
To reiterate the results presented in chapter 4, the hierarchical model that included Interaction as a variable explained an astounding 51.7% of the variance in student satisfaction! Based on this result, the primary recommendation to LPTCC stakeholders is to champion the development of high-quality student-faculty interactions and expand on the themes developed during the qualitative analysis.

Table 5.1 provides a concise inventory of these recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Competence              | Assign students to faculty advisors in the same or similar discipline.  
                          | Ensure faculty advisors are up-to-date regarding program requirements.  
                          | Provide appropriate resources and accurate information regarding transfer requirements with the institutions that have articulation agreements.  
                          | Never assume that:  
                          | • faculty fully understand how essential advising is to student persistence, and what the term interaction really means, or that  
                          | • faculty know what, when, why, and how to advise, and/or when to intervene.  
| Foster Relationships     | Encourage faculty advisors to develop relationships beyond signing forms.  
                          | Provide opportunities for faculty advisors to learn:  
                          | • how vital their role as advisor is, and  
                          | • strategies that help them develop a good rapport with students.  
                          | Increase opportunities for student-faculty interaction outside the classroom, where faculty can guide discussions to those of an academic nature and of concern to the students.  
                          | Provide faculty advisors with examples of what high-quality interactions look like, e.g., the summer training currently offered to LPTCC faculty advisors who are inclined to learn more about how to be a good advisor.  
| Communication & Responsiveness | Connect students with their faculty advisors early in the first semester.  
                          | Insist that all faculty post and maintain office hours.  
                          | Establish a timeframe for responses to student inquiries.  
                          | Do not overload faculty with more students than they can advise effectively.  

To uncover campus-specific recommendations, LPTCC administrators are encouraged to consider conducting focus groups with students and faculty to learn how campus experiences affect their satisfaction.

LPTCC faculty advisors must be willing to accept that many students, especially first-generation students, are often shy and easily intimidated by a college faculty member. That being the case, the onus is on the faculty advisor to reach out to these students, to assure them that they matter, to assure them that they can succeed, and to demonstrate a sincere interest in helping them achieve success.

Finally, the scope of the advising role should be explicitly addressed in the employment contract so faculty recognize advising as a significant portion of their job responsibility. The employment contract must outline the consequences should faculty fail to fulfill the advising role. And, LPTCC administrators must continuously evaluate the quality of faculty advisors’ interactions with students and include the evaluation as part of the annual employment review.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study explored the level of satisfaction of LPTCC students and faculty advisors with the current faculty advising model. The objective was to identify factors involved in the student-faculty advisor interaction and determine the impact of each factor's contribution to student satisfaction with an advising model where faculty members serve as academic advisors.

The study identified and examined the following individual factors: ethnicity; gender; age; program of study; student attitude and personal matters; the frequency of student-faculty interactions and the quality of those interactions; and finally, the faculty advisor's knowledge of transfer requirements.
The quantitative portion of this study uncovered empirical evidence that demonstrated the paramount importance of the quality of the student-faculty interaction. This finding, combined with the evidence gathered in the qualitative portion of the study, contributed to the existing body of research literature and suggests the following three recommendations for future research.

First, the results and conclusions of this study were intended to provide information for LPTCC leaders who may seek to use the data to make decisions within individual departments or to assist their entire institution. LPTCC has permission to conduct any further analyses with the data and the survey instruments should they desire to explore additional research questions.

Second, both survey instruments could be disseminated beyond LPTCC in an effort to promote a statewide, regional, or national study of the factors that contribute to satisfaction at community colleges. A larger population may diminish two of this study’s limitations: 1) small cell sizes for reporting demographic information, and 2) the limited ability to generalize findings to community colleges across the nation.

A broader study may also increase awareness of the importance of a quality student-faculty interaction among community college leaders, and a larger data set may allow for additional statistical analysis.

Third, this study provided qualitative as well as quantitative results regarding the student-faculty interaction. A qualitative study with a larger population, using formalized qualitative methods, may uncover additional evidence and allow for deeper analysis of the results presented by this study. The subsequent analysis may provide a more compelling incentive for higher education leaders to develop advising policies and practices that could be beneficial to a greater number of students.
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The project referenced above has been declared exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b) because it meets the following federal requirements for exemption:
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Non-exempt research is subject to many regulatory requirements that must be addressed prior to implementation of the study. Conducting non-exempt research without IRB review and approval may constitute non-compliance with federal regulations and/or academic misconduct according to ISU policy.

Detailed information about requirements for submission of modifications can be found on the Exempt Study Modification Form. A Personnel Change Form may be submitted when the only modification involves changes in study staff. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an Application for Approval of Research Involving Humans Form will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review. Only the IRB or designees may make the determination of exemption, even if you conduct a study in the future that is exactly like this study.

Please be aware that approval from other entities may also be needed. For example, access to data from private records (e.g., student, medical, or employment records, etc.) that are protected by FERPA, HIPAA, or other confidentiality policies requires permission from the holders of those records. Similarly, for research conducted in institutions other than ISU (e.g., schools, other colleges or universities, medical facilities, companies, etc.), investigators must obtain permission from the institution(s) as required by their policies. An IRB determination of exemption in no way implies or guarantees that permission from these other entities will be granted.
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IRB File NUM:  

Title: Community College Faculty Advising: Testing a model of student interaction and satisfaction

Principal Investigator: William B. Robertson

Institution/Department: Iowa State University

Insurance Coverage: In Place  Not necessary

Action Taken: Exempt from Full Review
              Expedited Review
              Full IRB Review

Disposition of Application: Approved
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Approval Date*: 30-Nov-2017
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Hello Student,

Guilford Technical Community College has partnered with Iowa State University to conduct a survey about faculty advising.

Your participation in this survey is very important and completely confidential.

Please click the following to begin: Take the Survey

Or, copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

https://iastate.qualtrics.com/jfe/preview/SV_09DMncANUWOPTIV?Q_CHL=preview

When you complete the survey, you will have the opportunity to enter a drawing to win one of five $20 gift cards from WALMART – just in time for the holidays! (Winners will be notified by email.)

If you have any questions, please contact one of the people below.
Thank you in advance for your participation!

Kind regards,

**William B. Robertson**
Doctoral Candidate  
School of Education  
Iowa State University  
[wroberts@iastate.edu](mailto:wroberts@iastate.edu)  
(515) 294-7868

---

**Courtney Lambeth**
Research Assistant  
Institutional Research  
[community college website]  
[cmlambeth@LPTCC.edu](mailto:cmlambeth@LPTCC.edu)  
(336) 334-4822 ext. 50276

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
[Click here to unsubscribe](mailto:)
APPENDIX C. INVITATION EMAIL SENT TO FACULTY

From: William Robertson <noreply@qemailserver.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 7:37 AM
To: Robertson, William B [B M S] <wroberts@iastate.edu>
Subject: LPTCC Faculty Coaches Survey

Guilford Technical Community College has partnered with Iowa State University to conduct a survey about faculty advising at LPTCC.

We value your opinion and your participation in this survey is very important—and completely confidential.

Please click the following to begin: Take the Survey

Or, copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

https://iastate.qualtrics.com/jfe/preview/SV_09DMncANUWOPTIV?Q_CHL=preview

If you have any questions, please contact one of the people below.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Kind regards,

William B. Robertson
Doctoral Candidate
School of Education
Iowa State University
wroberts@iastate.edu
(515) 294-7868

Courtney Lambeth
Research Assistant
Institutional Research

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
Click here to unsubscribe
APPENDIX D. STUDENT SURVEY

Q1

Q2 You have been chosen to complete an academic advising survey; please consider taking a few minutes out of your day to complete this survey. As an educational institution, LPTCC wants to promote educational opportunities for all students. To accomplish this, LPTCC is working with a Doctoral student from Iowa State University to determine how we can improve faculty advising at our college. Please take a few minutes to complete the following survey; all results are completely confidential but collectively they will give us a sense of whether or not we are meeting students’ needs.

Thank you in advance for your time!

Dr. Alison Wiers
Associate Vice President,
Student Support Services

Q3

Q4 Research Consent Form

Title of Study: Community College Faculty Advising: Testing a model of student interaction and satisfaction.

Investigators: William B. Robertson, Dr. Linda Serra Hagedorn

Introduction This is a research study. The study proposed will provide insight into Community College student/faculty interactions related to advising and the advisory relationship. The results may assist to provide improved advising services and improved communication with the ultimate goal of increasing persistence to graduation. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are a student. Note: Research studies include only those people who volunteer to participate. If you are under 18 years of age, we ask that you not participate in this study.

Description of Procedures
If you agree to participate, please click the red arrows button at the bottom of this screen. The survey questions ask about your experience with your current faculty coach. You can skip any question that you do not wish to answer or that makes you feel uncomfortable; however, for the
information to be useful to us, please complete as many questions as possible. The survey will take approximately 5-7 minutes to complete.

**Risks or Discomforts**
There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project; however, you are free to skip any question or terminate the survey in the event the survey becomes emotionally uncomfortable. There is no risk to your academic career.

**Benefits**
If you decide to participate in this study there will be no direct benefit to you; however, it is hoped that the information gained in this study will provide a better understanding of the [redacted] student/faculty interactions related to advising and the advisory relationship.

**Costs and Compensation**
You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

**Participant Rights**
You may choose not to take part in the study or to stop participating at any time, for any reason, without penalty or negative consequences. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. Your choice of whether or not to participate will have no impact on you as a [redacted] student in any way. If you wish to retain a copy of this informed consent form for your information and record, please print this page. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this project, you may contact [redacted], Research Assistant, Institutional Research, [redacted] Community College, at [redacted].

**Confidentiality**
Records identifying participants will be kept strictly confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy study records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information. To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: All electronic files will be stored in a Cybox file with password protection. Only the principal investigators William Robertson and Dr. Linda Hagedorn have the password access to the data in the Cybox file. All of your responses will be kept confidential. The researchers will not share your individual responses with anyone other than the research major advisor/supervisor. In the event you choose to withdraw from the study all information you provide (including email contact information) will be destroyed and removed from the final paper.

**Questions or Problems**
You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study, please contact William Robertson at [redacted], wroberts@iastate.edu.

**Consent and Authorization Provisions**
Clicking on the red arrows button below will take you to the survey and indicates that you have read the information contained in this form and that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.
Q5 Please rate the following statements based on your experience with your current faculty coach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I visit with my faculty coach to identify realistic academic goals. (1)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach has suggested appropriate Degree Programs that I might pursue. (2)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach uses my academic record (including test scores and grades) to help him/her suggest courses that are the most appropriate for me to take. (3)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seek the assistance of my faculty coach when confronted with cancelled courses or other scheduling problems. (4)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on studying more effectively. (5)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree (3)</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</td>
<td>Somewhat agree (5)</td>
<td>Agree (6)</td>
<td>Strongly agree (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach gives me helpful tips (when I need them) on managing my time more effectively. (6)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I am faced with difficult academic decisions, my faculty coach explains my alternatives and we work together to decide which one is the best choice for me. (7)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach keeps me informed of my academic progress by discussing my academic record (including test scores and grades) with me. (8)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach is knowledgeable about requirements to complete my Degree Program and graduate. (9)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 Please rate the following statements based on your experience with your current faculty coach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach is approachable. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel comfortable discussing difficult personal matters with my faculty coach. (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach helps connect me to campus resources when I have problems in and out of the classroom. (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach talks with me about my interests and plans outside of academics. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach is available when I need advice. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having mandatory meetings with my faculty coach helps me be successful. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with a faculty coach each semester should be required. (7)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to rely on advice from my peers rather than my faculty coach. (8)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what courses I need; I do not require guidance from a faculty coach. (9)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty coach knows what courses will transfer to the institution of my choice. (10)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what courses will transfer to the institution of my choice. (11)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7 How many of the courses you took at LPTCC will transfer to the institution you selected?

- All (1)
- Most (2)
- A few (3)
- None (4)
- I don't know (5)
Q8 How often do you visit with your faculty coach?

- I've never met with my faculty coach. (0)
- Less than once a year (1)
- Once a year (2)
- Once a semester (3)
- At least twice a semester (4)
- More than twice a semester (5)
- Other (6) ________________________________________________

Q9 My faculty coach’s office is on the campus where I take most of my classes.

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q10 While attending [ ], did you ever change your faculty coach?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q11 How many faculty coaches have you had?

- 2 (1)
- 3 (2)
- 4 or more (3)
Q12 Why did you change faculty coaches? (Check all that apply)

- I changed my Degree Program. (1)
- My previous faculty coach was rarely available to meet with me. (2)
- My previous faculty coach did not possess the academic knowledge necessary to help me. (3)
- My previous faculty coach did not possess the transfer knowledge necessary to help me. (4)
- Other (5) ________________________________________________

Q13 Do you plan to transfer to another institution?

- Yes, after completing an Associate Degree. (1)
- Yes, without completing an Associate Degree. (2)
- No (0)

Q14 If you plan to transfer, which college or university to you plan to attend?

- Ashford University (1)
- East Carolina University (2)
- North Carolina A&T State (3)
- North Carolina State (4)
- Strayer University (5)
- University of North Carolina (Charlotte) (6)
- University of North Carolina (Greensboro) (7)
- University of North Carolina (Wilmington) (8)
- University of Phoenix (9)
- Winston Salem University (10)
- Other (11) ________________________________________________
Q15 What Degree are you pursuing? (Check all that apply)

- None (0)
- I don't know (7)
- AA (1)
- AS (2)
- AAS (3)
- AE (4)
- AFA (5)
- Certificate (6)

Q16 What is your Degree Program? (Check all that apply)

- I don't have a Degree Program (101)
- I don't know (0)
- Other (not listed): (102) __________________________________________________________
- Accounting (1)
- Advertising and Graphic Design (2)
- Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Technology (3)
- Architectural Technology (4)
- Associate in Fine Arts (AFA) (5)
- Associate in Engineering (AE) (6)
- Associate in Science (AS) (7)
- Associate in Arts (AA) (8)
- Automotive Systems Technology (9)
- Aviation Electronics (Avionics) Technology (10)
- Aviation Management and Career Pilot Technology (11)
- Aviation Systems Technology (12)
- Basic Law Enforcement Training (BLET) (13)
Biotechnology (14)
Business Administration (15)
Carpentry (16)
CCPI Technical Pathway (17)
CCPI Transfer Pathways (CTP) (18)
Civil Engineering Technology (19)
College Transfer Programs (20)
Collision Repair & Refinishing Technology (21)
Computer Information Technology (22)
Computer-Integrated Machining (23)
Construction Management Technology (24)
Cosmetology (25)
Criminal Justice Systems (26)
Culinary Arts (27)
Cyber Crime Technology (28)
Dental Assisting (29)
Dental Hygiene (30)
Diesel & Heavy Equipment Transport Technology (31)
Early Childhood Education (32)
Electrical Systems Technology (33)
Electronics Engineering Technology (34)
Emergency Management (35)
Emergency Medical Science (36)
Entertainment Technology (37)
Fire Protection Technology (38)
Geomatics Technology (39)
Global Logistics Technology (40)
Heavy Equipment and Transport Technology (41)
Hospitality Management (42)
Human Services Technology (43)
Information Technology (44)
Machining (45)
Mechanical Engineering Technology (46)
Mechatronics Engineering Technology (47)
Medical Assisting Technology (48)
Medical Office Administration (49)
Networking Technology (50)
Nursing (51)
Nursing – Practical Nursing (52)
Nursing - NCP RIBN (53)
Office Administration (54)
Paralegal Technology (55)
Pharmacy Technology (56)
Physical Therapist Assistant (57)
Plumbing (58)
Radiography (59)
Simulation and Game Development (60)
Surgical Technology (61)
Turfgrass Management Technology (62)
Welding Technology (63)
Q17 What is your gender?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)
- Transgender (3)
- Genderqueer (4)
- Additional gender category/identify, please specify (5) ______________________
- Prefer not to identify (0)

Q18 What is your Ethnicity?

- American Indian or Alaskan Native (1)
- Asian (2)
- Black or African American (3)
- Hispanic or Latinx (4)
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (5)
- White (6)
- Other, please specify (7) ______________________________
- Prefer not to answer (0)

Q19 What is your age?

- 18-20 (1)
- 21-22 (2)
- 23-24 (3)
- 25-30 (4)
- 31-35 (5)
- 36-40 (6)
- 41-50 (7)
- 50+ (8)
Q20 I am satisfied with the relationship I have with my current faculty coach.

- Strongly agree (7)
- Agree (6)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Disagree (2)
- Strongly disagree (1)

Q21 If there is anything else you would like to share, please elaborate in the textbox below.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Q22 For your participation, do you want to be included in a drawing for a $20.00 Walmart gift certificate?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*Note: Records identifying participants will be kept strictly confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available.*
APPENDIX E. FACULTY ADVISOR SURVEY

Q1

Q2 Thank you in advance for your participation in this important Survey. Community College has been working with Achieving the Dream for a number of years. Community College is also involved with Completion by Design and now the Frontier Set. Community College’s involvement with these organizations is with the goal to increase student progression and completion through a number of actions focused on institutional processes such as academic advising. During Spring 2017, Community College participated in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and with the New Student Survey of Engagement to gain insight on our academic advising process. Community College believes the following survey will provide additional insight into our student/faculty interactions related to advising and the advisory relationship. The results may assist Community College to provide improved advising services, to improve communication, and persistence to graduation. Your participation in this confidential survey is vital to Community College’s ongoing efforts to improve student progression and completions. Again, thank you for completing this survey.

Rodney S. Foth, Ed.D
Director Institutional Research

Q3

Q4 Research Consent Form

Title of Study: Community College Faculty Advising: Testing a model of student interaction and satisfaction.

Investigators: William B. Robertson, Dr. Linda Serra Hagedorn. This is a research study. Please take your time to decide whether or not you would like to participate. Research studies include only people who choose to take part—your participation is completely voluntary. If you wish to retain a copy of this informed consent form for your information and record, please print this page.

Introduction
The proposed research will provide insight into student/faculty interactions related to advising and the advisory relationship. The
results may assist [redacted] to provide improved advising services to improve communication and persistence to graduation.

Description of Procedures
If you agree to participate you will need to click the red arrows button at the bottom of this screen. You will be asked questions regarding your experience. You can skip any question that you do not wish to answer or that makes you feel uncomfortable; however, for the information to be useful to us, please complete as many items as you can. The survey will take approximately 5-7 minutes to complete.

Risks or Discomforts
There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project and you are free to skip any question or terminate the survey in the event the survey becomes emotionally uncomfortable.

Benefits
If you decide to participate in this study there will be no direct benefit to you; however, it is hoped that the information gained in this study will provide a better understanding of the [redacted] student/faculty interactions related to advising and the advisory relationship.

Costs and Compensation
You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

Participant Rights
Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part in the study or to stop participating at any time, for any reason, without penalty or negative consequences. You can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this project, you may contact [redacted], Research Assistant, Institutional Research, Guilford Technical Community College, at (336) 334.4822 ext. 50276, or cmlambeth@LPTCC.edu.

Confidentiality
Records identifying participants will be kept strictly confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy study records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information. To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: All electronic files will be stored in Cybox file with password protection. Only the principal investigators William Robertson and Dr. Linda Hagedorn have the password access to the data in Cybox file. All of your responses will be kept confidential. The researchers will not share your individual responses with anyone other than the research major advisor/supervisor. In the event you choose to withdraw from the study all information you provide (email contact information) will be destroyed and removed from the final paper.

Questions or Problems
You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study. For further information about the study, please contact William Robertson at [redacted], wroberts@iastate.edu.

Consent and Authorization Provisions
Clicking on the red arrows button below will take you to the survey and indicates that you have read the information contained in this form and that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.
Q5 How many advisees do you have? (type in estimate if unsure)

________________________________________________________________

Q6 On average, how much time do you spend with each advisee?

- < 5 minutes (1)
- 5-10 minutes (2)
- 11-20 minutes (3)
- 21-30 minutes (4)
- 31 minutes or more (5)

Q7 Optional comments regarding time for advising appointments.

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
Q8 Please rate the following statements based on your experience with your advisees overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The method of assigning faculty coaches to students at LPTCC is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equitable.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given my teaching assignment, my advising load is reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have sufficient time in my schedule to meet with my advisees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and faculty coaches should be required to meet each semester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising students brings me satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I collaborate with other faculty coaches regarding best practices when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visiting with advisees.</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8 - continued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While I have been a faculty coach at LPTCC, I have received professional development training to help me develop the skills necessary to effectively counsel my advisees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q9 Please rate the following statements based on your experience with your advisees overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I collaborate with my advisees to identify realistic academic goals based on what they share about themselves. (1)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I suggest appropriate Degree Programs that my advisees might pursue. (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I possess sufficient knowledge of my advisee’s Degree Program to help him/her select specific courses. (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use my advisee’s academic record (including test scores and grades) to help me determine what courses are the most appropriate for him/her to take. (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I assist my advisees when they’re confronted with cancelled courses or other scheduling problems. (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9 - continued</td>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree (3)</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</td>
<td>Somewhat agree (5)</td>
<td>Agree (6)</td>
<td>Strongly agree (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give my advisees helpful tips (when they need them) on studying more effectively. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give my advisees helpful tips (when they need them) on managing their time more effectively. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my advisee is faced with difficult academic decisions, I explain the alternatives and help them decide which one is the best choice. (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my advisees informed of their academic progress by discussing their academic record (including test scores and grades) with them. (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about the requirements my advisees need to complete their Degree Program and graduate. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 Please rate the following statements based on your experience with your advisees overall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable discussing my advisees’ difficult personal matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help connect my advisees to campus resources when they have problems in and out of the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My advisees and I discuss their interests and plans outside of academics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received enough training to use the Student Success Plan (SSP) software proficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to create a map in SSP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q10 - continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (3)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (4)</th>
<th>Somewhat agree (5)</th>
<th>Agree (6)</th>
<th>Strongly agree (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable using SSP to monitor the progress of my advisees. (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I follow up when I am notified that one of my advisees received an Early Alert. (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q11 What aspect of the LPTCC Advising model do you like best?**
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

**Q12 What aspect of the LPTCC Advising model do you like least?**
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

**Q13 What single aspect of the LPTCC Advising model would you like to change and why?**
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

**Q14 Please use the space below to share additional comments on the current LPTCC faculty advising model.**
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________