

South Dakota State University  
Assessment of Undergraduate Academic Advising Effectiveness  
Summary of plan being developed by sub-committee of AAAC  
March 2005 (Updated July 2005)

It is evident from several studies and documents (see references below) that there is a need to assess the quality of academic advising (performance and process) at SDSU. The desired outcomes of such assessment are to improve academic advising, improve the student experience at SDSU, increase retention, provide documentation and recognition on PSEs, and to assist in program development. A flexible assessment plan will assist the university in charting the future for undergraduate academic advising assessment at SDSU. Currently, there is no regular plan to evaluate or assess undergraduate advising and a simple, effective academic advising assessment plan is necessary to meet the needs and concerns expressed by many committees, task forces, and researchers.

### Purpose

- Develop and implement a plan to assess the effectiveness of undergraduate academic advising.

### Progress

- Information, data, and recommendations from several reports regarding undergraduate advising at SDSU have been reviewed.
- Strengths and weaknesses of advising at SDSU, and opportunities and threats related to assessment of advising at SDSU were delineated.
- Already in place at SDSU to facilitate assessment of advising is:
  - Statement of the “Role of Academic Adviser” in the University bulletin.
  - List of “Responsibilities of the Academic Adviser” in the University bulletin.
  - Standards of Performance related to academic advising are provided in the standards document, Excellence in Faculty Roles.
  - The mechanism for the advisor to document advising assessment exists through the PSE.
- Two assessment instruments are being developed; one is an advisor self-assessment and the other for the advisee to assess the advisor.

### Tentative Process

- Evaluation of advisor completed by every student at pre-registration at least one time per year
- Advisor self evaluation held at least one time per year (e.g., spring semester or part of the PSE requirements, not required to share results with department head).
- Survey results are only given to advisor.
- Information may be shared with the department head on a voluntary basis (not required).

- Summary information on a department's advising program will be given to each department but no individual information is included.
- Summary information on a college's advising program will be given to each department but no individual department information is included.
- Summary information on the University's advising program will be given to the AAAC and the Academic Council but no individual college information is included.
- Confidentiality will be maintained.

### Tentative Timeline

- Feb-Apr (2005) – Develop assessment instruments (drafts to be piloted)
- Feb (2005) – Share status and obtain approval for continued development of plan, process, and instruments.
- May-June (2005) Finalize the assessment instruments for fall semester pilot.
- Sep-Nov (2005) – Pilot test the instruments.
- Dec (2005)-Jan (2006) – Evaluate the pilot program.
- Feb-Mar (2006) Report on findings and make recommendations to Academic Council, Academic Senate. Seek formal approval of the process.
- Fall semester (2006) – implement for the entire University, if approved, or a larger pilot group (based on results of initial pilot data)

### References on Advising at SDSU

1. Academic Advising Task Force (AATF). 2001. Final Report. SDSU Office of Academic Affairs.
2. Erdmann, K. 2004. Faculty Advisors' Perceptions of a Developmental Advising Model at a Midwestern Land-Grant University
3. Hegge, M. 1999. Alumni Comments Related to Advising Excerpted from AEA Survey of Alumni: Fall 1999. SDSU Academic Evaluation and Assessment Office.
4. Hegge, M. 2000. SDSU results of National Survey of Student Engagement, Inaugural Study: 2000. SDSU Academic Evaluation and Assessment Office.
5. Maras, J. 2000. Summary of Research Results Regarding Advising as a Retention Infrastructure Designed to Retain Domestic Minority Students at Predominantly White Campuses.
6. Mendelson, R. 1992. SDSU Academic Advising Project, Academic Council Report.
7. SDSU Academic Advising Group. 1996. Advising Planning Report. SDSU Office of Academic Affairs.
8. Wicks III, Z.W. 2001. Survey of SDSU undergraduate students. SDSU Academic Senate.