

Chapter 13

Assessment

Tables

In this chapter, the responses to three survey questions are examined to better understand the use of assessment in academic advising.

Respondents indicated whether a formal mission statement exists for academic advising, the efforts in place to assess academic advising, and the type of data used to assess the effectiveness of advising.

For the question about a formal mission statement for academic advising, respondents marked either *yes* or *no*. They selected from six options to indicate the efforts in place (or planned): survey of student satisfaction of academic advising, formally identified academic advising student learning outcomes, established academic advising student learning outcomes, formally identified job performance criteria of individual academic advisors, none of these efforts are in place but at least one is being developed, and none of these efforts are in place and none are being developed. They could use an open response option to name an effort not listed as an answer option on the survey. The answers provided to the open response option were categorized as follows: Some efforts are in place and more are being developed, feedback of faculty needs, survey of student expectations, advisor satisfaction survey, external formal assessment of advising program, administration satisfaction survey, and other. Respondents could mark more than one response to this question.

To determine the data used to assess the effectiveness of advising respondents selected from seven answer options: student satisfaction of

academic advising, student achievement of academic advising student learning outcomes, student retention and persistence to graduation, academic advising unit's/program's achievement of program goals/outcomes, individual academic advisor's job performance, none of this data has been used to assess academic advising but assessment plans are being developed, and none of this data has been used to assess academic advising and no assessment plans are being developed. An open response option allowed them to enter a response not listed as an answer option on the survey. The answers provided to the open response option were categorized as feedback of faculty needs, survey of student expectations, advisor satisfaction survey, external formal assessment of advising program, and administration satisfaction survey. Respondents could mark more than one response to this question.

Sample sizes with fewer than 50 respondents are marked with an * (e.g., $n = 30^*$) for tables that present the number and percentage of respondents who endorsed a particular answer. A change in the answer of one respondent in this sample would change the degree of difference by more than 2%. Therefore, inferences involving these groups should be made cautiously.

Table 13.1

ACADEMIC ADVISING MISSION STATEMENT (N = 770)

Mission Statement	<i>f</i>	%
Yes	464	60.3
No	265	34.4
Don't know	39	5.1
Choose not to reply	2	0.3

Table 13.2

ACADEMIC ADVISING MISSION STATEMENT BY SIZE OF INSTITUTION

Mission Statement	Small		Medium		Large	
	<i>n</i> = 425		<i>n</i> = 258		<i>n</i> = 84	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Yes	247	58.1	157	60.9	57	67.9
No	156	36.7	87	33.7	22	26.2
Don't know	21	4.9	13	5.0	5	6.0

Note. Small = 5,999 or fewer; medium = 6,000-23,999; large = 24,000 or more undergraduate enrollments.

Table 13.3

ACADEMIC ADVISING MISSION STATEMENT BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

	2-year		Public bachelor		Private bachelor		Public master		Private master		Public doctorate		Private doctorate		Proprietary	
	<i>n</i> = 239		<i>n</i> = 30*		<i>n</i> = 74		<i>n</i> = 89		<i>n</i> = 117		<i>n</i> = 127		<i>n</i> = 70		<i>n</i> = 24*	
Mission Statement	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Yes	131	54.8	17	56.7	42	56.8	67	75.3	66	56.4	83	65.4	46	65.7	12	50.0
No	92	38.5	9	30.0	30	40.5	18	20.2	48	41.0	37	29.1	21	30.0	10	41.7
Don't know	15	6.3	4	13.3	2	2.7	4	4.5	3	2.6	7	5.5	3	4.3	1	4.2

Note. Fewer than 50 respondents; interpret with caution.

Table 13.4

ACADEMIC ADVISING MISSION STATEMENT BY MANDATORY ADVISING

Mission Statement	Yes		No		For some	
	<i>n</i> = 330		<i>n</i> = 264		<i>n</i> = 176	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Yes	206	62.4	146	55.3	112	63.6
No	106	32.1	102	38.6	57	32.4
Don't know	17	5.2	15	5.7	7	4.0

Table 13.5

ACADEMIC ADVISING MISSION STATEMENT BY FULL-TIME (FT) ADVISING PERSONNEL

Mission Statement	FT professional advisors		FT faculty		Both FT pros and faculty	
	<i>n</i> = 168		<i>n</i> = 142		<i>n</i> = 460	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Yes	98	58.3	64	45.1	302	65.7
No	56	33.3	67	47.2	142	30.9
Don't know	12	7.1	11	7.7	16	3.5

Table 13.6

ACADEMIC ADVISING MISSION STATEMENT BY ADVISING SITUATION (N = 795)

Mission Statement	Institution		College, school, division		Department	
	<i>n</i> = 547		<i>n</i> = 206		<i>n</i> = 42*	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Yes	340	62.2	119	57.8	21	50.0
No	182	33.3	72	35.0	16	38.1
Don't know	23	4.2	15	7.3	5	11.9

Note. Fewer than 50 respondents; interpret with caution.

Table 13.7

ASSESSMENT EFFORTS (N = 770)

Assessment Effort	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction survey	291	37.8
Program goals/outcomes	176	22.9
Job performance criteria	165	21.4
Advising S L Os	131	17.0
None in place but in development	48	6.2
None in place and no plans	22	2.9
Doing some and developing more	23	3.0
Faculty needs	3	0.4
Student expectations	2	0.3
Advisor satisfaction survey	2	0.3
External formal assessment	1	0.1
Administration satisfaction survey	1	0.1
Other	4	0.5
Don't know	6	0.8
Did not respond	341	44.3

Table 13.8

ASSESSMENT EFFORTS BY SIZE OF INSTITUTION

Assessment Effort	Small		Medium		Large	
	<i>n</i> = 425		<i>n</i> = 258		<i>n</i> = 84	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction survey	144	33.9	112	43.4	35	41.7
Program goals/outcomes	89	20.9	61	23.6	25	29.8
Job performance criteria	68	16.0	72	27.9	24	28.6
Advising S L Os	57	13.4	50	19.4	24	28.6
None in place but in development	30	7.1	12	4.7	6	7.1
None in place and no plans	12	2.8	6	2.3	4	4.8
Doing some and developing more	10	2.4	9	3.5	3	3.6
Did not respond	206	48.5	103	39.9	30	35.7

Note. Small = 5,999 or fewer; medium = 6,000-23,999; large = 24,000 or more undergraduate enrollments. *S L Os* represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.9

ASSESSMENT EFFORTS BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

Assessment Effort	2-year		Public bachelor		Private bachelor		Public master		Private master		Public doctorate		Private doctorate		Proprietary	
	<i>n</i> = 239		<i>n</i> = 30*		<i>n</i> = 74		<i>n</i> = 89		<i>n</i> = 117		<i>n</i> = 127		<i>n</i> = 70		<i>n</i> = 24*	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction survey	75	31.4	8	26.7	33	44.6	31	34.8	35	29.9	65	51.2	32	45.7	12	50.0
Program goals/outcomes	43	18.0	3	10.0	16	21.6	18	20.0	30	25.6	41	32.3	18	25.7	7	29.2
Job performance criteria	39	16.3	5	16.7	11	14.9	14	15.7	18	15.4	48	37.8	18	25.7	12	50.0
Advising S L Os	31	13.0	2	6.7	14	18.9	20	22.5	10	8.5	34	26.8	13	18.6	7	29.2
None in place but in development	12	5.0	0	0.0	7	9.5	6	6.7	8	6.8	9	7.1	5	7.1	1	4.2
None in place and no plans	9	3.8	1	3.3	4	5.4	1	1.1	3	2.6	3	2.4	1	1.4	0	0.0
Doing some and developing more	6	2.5	1	3.3	1	1.4	2	2.2	4	3.4	5	3.9	3	4.3	1	4.2
Don't Know	2	0.8	0	0.0	1	1.4	1	1.1	0	0.0	2	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not respond	128	53.6	19	63.6	23	31.1	42	47.2	60	51.3	31	24.4	30	42.9	8	33.3

Note. *Fewer than 50 respondents; interpret with caution. S L Os represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.10

ASSESSMENT EFFORTS BY MANDATORY ADVISING

Assessment Effort	Yes		No		For some	
	<i>n</i> = 330		<i>n</i> = 264		<i>n</i> = 176	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction survey	133	40.3	84	31.8	74	42.0
Program goals/outcomes	68	20.6	57	21.6	51	29.0
Job performance criteria	60	18.2	53	20.1	52	29.5
Advising S L Os	53	16.4	43	16.3	35	19.9
None in place but in development	22	6.7	13	4.9	13	7.4
None in place and no plans	11	3.3	4	1.5	7	4.0
Doing some, and developing more	10	3.0	6	2.3	7	4.0
Did not respond	137	41.5	140	53.0	64	36.4

Table 13.11

ASSESSMENT EFFORTS BY ADVISING PERSONNEL

Assessment Effort	FT professional advisors		FT faculty		Both FT pros and faculty	
	<i>n</i> = 168		<i>n</i> = 142		<i>n</i> = 460	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction survey	71	42.3	51	35.9	169	36.7
Program goals/outcomes	46	27.4	26	18.3	104	22.6
Job performance criteria	53	31.5	15	10.6	97	21.1
Advising S L Os	31	18.5	15	10.6	85	18.5
None in place but in development	9	5.4	8	5.6	31	6.7
None in place and no plans	2	1.2	6	4.2	14	3.0
Doing some, and developing more	3	1.8	4	2.8	16	3.5
Did not respond	69	41.1	67	47.2	205	44.6

Note. S L Os represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.12

ASSESSMENT EFFORTS BY MISSION STATEMENT

Assessment Effort	Mission statement		No mission statement	
	<i>n</i> = 464		<i>n</i> = 265	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction survey	198	42.7	87	32.8
Program goals/outcomes	145	31.3	29	10.9
Job performance criteria	120	25.9	45	17.0
Advising S L Os	113	24.4	17	6.4
None in place, but in development	19	4.1	29	9.8
None in place and no plans	5	1.1	16	6.0
Doing some and developing more	14	3.0	9	3.4
Did not respond	197	42.5	117	44.2

Note. S L Os represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.13

ASSESSMENT EFFORTS BY ADVISING SITUATION

Assessment Effort	Institution		College, school, division		Department	
	<i>n</i> = 547		<i>n</i> = 206		<i>n</i> = 42*	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction survey	189	34.6	107	51.9	10	23.8
Program goals/outcomes	119	21.8	60	29.1	4	19.5
Job performance criteria	102	18.6	65	31.6	7	16.7
Advising S L Os	91	16.6	43	20.9	3	7.1
None in place but in development	30	5.5	15	7.3	4	9/5
None in place and no plans	13	2.4	8	3.9	2	4.8
Doing some and developing more	16	2.9	6	2.9	1	2.4
Did not respond	267	48.8	57	27.7	23	54.8

Table 13.14

ASSESSMENT USES (N = 770)

Assessment	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction	307	39.9
Retention/persistence to grad	237	30.8
Advisor job performance	165	21.4
Program goals/outcomes	116	15.1
Advising S L Os	78	10.1
None in place but in development	39	5.1
None in place and no plans	20	2.6
Faculty needs	1	0.1
Student expectations	1	0.1
Administration satisfaction	1	0.1
External formal assessment	1	0.1
Advisor satisfaction	1	0.1
Don't know	4	0.5
Did not respond	343	44.5

Table 13.15

ASSESSMENT USES BY SIZE OF INSTITUTION

Assessment	Small		Medium		Large	
	n = 425		n = 258		n = 84	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Student satisfaction	152	35.8	120	46.5	35	41.7
Retention/persistence to grad	119	28.0	87	33.7	30	35.7
Advisor job performance	68	16.0	70	27.1	26	31.0
Program goals/outcomes	48	11.3	49	19.0	19	22.6
Advising S L Os	30	7.1	28	10.9	20	23.8
None in place but in development	25	5.9	12	4.7	2	2.4
None in place and no plans	9	2.1	5	1.9	6	7.1
Did not respond	207	48.7	103	39.9	30	35.7

Note. Small = 5,999 or fewer; medium = 6,000-23,999; large = 24,000 or more undergraduate enrollments.

S L Os represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.16

ASSESSMENT USES BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

Assessment	2-year		Public bachelor		Private bachelor		Public master		Private master		Public doctorate		Private doctorate		Proprietary	
	<i>n</i> = 239		<i>n</i> = 30*		<i>n</i> = 74		<i>n</i> = 89		<i>n</i> = 117		<i>n</i> = 127		<i>n</i> = 70		<i>n</i> = 24*	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction	74	31.0	10	33.3	32	43.2	32	36.0	39	33.3	74	58.3	34	48.6	12	50.0
Retention/persistence to grad	44	18.4	7	23.3	26	35.1	33	37.1	37	31.6	54	42.5	25	35.7	11	45.8
Advisor job performance	39	16.3	1	3.3	12	16.2	22	24.7	19	16.2	46	36.2	16	22.9	10	41.7
Program goals/outcomes	31	13.0	1	3.3	5	6.8	20	22.5	12	10.3	27	21.3	15	21.4	5	20.8
Advising S L Os	15	6.3	2	6.7	4	5.4	14	15.7	8	6.8	22	17.3	9	12.9	4	16.7
None in place but in development	15	6.3	0	0.0	5	6.8	3	3.4	6	5.1	4	3.1	5	7.1	1	4.2
None in place and no plans	7	2.9	0	0.0	3	4.1	2	2.2	1	0.9	7	5.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Did not respond	129	54.0	19	63.3	23	31.1	42	47.2	60	51.3	31	24.4	30	42.9	8	33.3

Note. *Fewer than 50 respondents; interpret with caution. S L Os represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.17

ASSESSMENT USES BY MANDATORY ADVISING

Assessment	Yes		No		For some	
	<i>n</i> = 330		<i>n</i> = 264		<i>n</i> = 176	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction	140	42.4	85	32.2	82	46.6
Retention/persistence to grad	112	33.9	60	22.7	65	36.9
Advisor job performance	68	20.6	45	17.0	52	29.5
Program goals/outcomes	45	13.6	33	12.5	38	21.6
Advising S L Os	28	8.5	28	10.6	22	12.5
None in place but in development	20	6.1	10	3.8	9	5.1
None in place and no plans	6	1.8	8	3.0	6	3.4
Did not respond	137	41.5	141	53.4	64	36.4

Table 13.18

ASSESSMENT USES BY ADVISING PERSONNEL

Assessment	FT professional advisors		FT faculty		Both FT pros and faculty	
	<i>n</i> = 168		<i>n</i> = 142		<i>n</i> = 460	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction	78	46.4	54	38.0	175	38.0
Retention/persistence to grad	59	35.1	42	29.6	136	29.6
Advisor job performance	44	26.2	19	13.4	102	22.2
Program goals/outcomes	30	17.9	13	9.2	73	15.9
Advising S L Os	24	14.3	4	2.8	50	10.9
None in place but in development	4	2.4	8	5.6	27	5.9
None in place and no plans	1	0.6	5	3.5	14	3.0
Did not respond	70	41.7	67	47.2	205	44.6

Note. S L Os represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.19

ASSESSMENT USES BY MISSION STATEMENT

Assessment	Mission statement		No mission statement	
	<i>n</i> = 464		<i>n</i> = 265	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction	206	44.4	95	35.8
Retention/persistence to grad	161	34.7	72	27.2
Advisor job performance	111	23.9	52	19.6
Program goals/outcomes	98	21.1	18	6.8
Advising S L Os	63	13.6	14	5.3
None in place but in development	18	3.9	21	7.9
None in place and no plans	5	1.1	12	4.5
Did not respond	198	42.7	117	44.2

Note. S L Os represents student learning outcomes.

Table 13.20

ASSESSMENT USES BY ADVISING SITUATION

Assessment	Institution		College, student, division		Department	
	<i>n</i> = 547		<i>n</i> = 206		<i>n</i> = 42*	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student satisfaction	203	37.1	109	52.9	9	21.4
Retention/persistence to grad	151	27.6	82	39.8	13	31.0
Advisor job performance	102	18.6	64	31.1	6	14.3
Program goals/outcomes	75	13.7	45	21.8	3	7.1
Advising S L Os	54	9.9	26	12.6	2	4.8
None in place but in development	28	5.1	10	4.9	2	4.8
None in place and no plans	9	1.6	10	4.9	2	4.8
Did not respond	268	49.0	57	27.7	23	43.8

Note. *Fewer than 50 responses; interpret with caution. *S L Os* represents student learning outcomes.