Academic Advising Models in Faith-Based Colleges and Universities

Roger D. Wessel
Ball State University

Jenni L. Smith
Ball State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pillars.taylor.edu/acsd_growth

Part of the Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Educational Leadership Commons, Higher Education Commons, Higher Education Administration Commons, and the Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons

Academic Advising Models in Faith-Based Colleges and Universities

By Roger D. Wessel and Jenni L. Smith

Abstract

This study examined how academic advising is conducted among private, faith-based colleges and universities. In addition to developing a profile of academic advising at these campuses, academic advising organizational models used by these institutions were examined. Academic advising responsibilities at these institutions incorporated prescriptive and developmental advising methods. Seventy percent of the institutions utilized the "Faculty-Only" advising model. Benefits of using faculty members as advisors include the emphasis that private colleges place on faculty-student contact, enabling students to have a deeper relationship with their professors. Negative implications when utilizing faculty advisors include that they have other job responsibilities and priorities that often come before academic advising.

Academic Advising Models in Faith-Based Colleges and Universities

Academic advising is an important academic and student affairs function on college campuses. Once an unspecified responsibility at many institutions (e.g., Gaw [1933] indicated that academic advising was the "most common occurrence on any campus" [p. 180]), academic advising has emerged as a defined profession, and the existence of academic advising centers on college campuses has become the norm. University administrators have turned to academic advising as a means to increase student retention and university satisfaction rates. Advising provides students with academic information and helps them focus on developing and achieving goals and acquiring decision-making skills.

Because academic advising occupies a strategic role in college student development, the manner in which institutions deliver advising services is important. The roles academic advising performs and the advising model utilized may be significant factors in determining the effectiveness of academic advising. This study sought to develop a profile of academic advising and the advising models used among private, faith-based colleges and universities.

Functions and Roles of Academic Advising

The theoretical framework for the functions and roles of academic advising rests in the student development literature, specifically Nevitt Sanford's (1979) ideal of readiness, challenge, and support and Alexander Astin's (1985a) commitment to student involvement in the learning process. The role of academic advising is to challenge and support students so that they are fully engaged in the learning process. The role of academic advising was not clearly defined until after the 1950s. The "continued formalization of academic advising on most campuses was one response to two forces: student populations that were increasingly numerous and diverse, and faculties that were devoted to research" (Frost, 2000, p. 11). The arrival of elective courses and the widening gap between faculty and students contributed to the development of

GROW✝H

advising as a profession. Decreases in enrollment, low retention rates, and student demand for advising encouraged development of the advising field. Academic advising became a means for universities to meet student satisfaction and retention needs (Frost, 1991; Tuttle, 2000; Waggenspack & Hensley, 1992). Academic advising became an organized profession with the formation of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) in 1979 (Frost, 1991). NACADA helped "promote the quality of academic advising in institutions of higher education, and to this end, it is dedicated to the support and professional growth of academic advising and advisors" (Beatty, 1991, p. 5).

Academic advisors believed institutions should encourage holistic student development rather than focusing solely on academic goals (Jordan, 2000). The profession emphasized the importance of developmental advising, which incorporated the idea of developing the whole student. Ender, Winston, & Miller (1982) provided one of the first definitions of developmental advising:

> Developmental advising both stimulates and supports students in their quest for an enriched quality of life; it is a systematic process based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of institutional and community resources. (p. 8)

Developmental advising, in which maintaining the proper balance of challenge and support to encourage student growth was encouraged, became the cornerstone of academic advising (Jordan, 2000). Astin (1985b) said that academic advising was one of the weakest aspects of student services on college campuses and an area in which students expressed the most dissatisfaction. He recommended that all members of the campus community, including faculty and professional staff, participate in academic advising in order to maintain contact with students.

In complete contrast to developmental advising, prescriptive advising did not promote holistic student development as the desired goal. Crookston (1972) described the prescriptive advising method, where "the advisor is the doctor and the student the patient. The patient comes in with some ailment. The doctor makes a diagnosis, prescribes something, or gives advice" (Crookston, 1994, pp. 5-6). Prescriptive advising primarily provided information for students, but the students received little help with developmental questions such as vocational goals or needs.

Developmental advising expanded the functions and roles of academic advising. Since the functions of academic advising differed among institutions, Creamer and Creamer (1994) discussed the necessity of a framework to guide developmental advising. Promoting student growth was the essential component of advising, in which advisors helped students set career goals, strengthen self-esteem, broaden interests, clarify personal values, and enhance reasoning skills. Working with the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS, 2005), NACADA set standards to provide a framework for advising programs to use (Gordon, 1998). NACADA also comprised a list of Core Values for their members to use as standards. The NACADA Core Values stated that the purpose of academic advising should focus on student learning and personal development and should help students realize, develop, and achieve vocational and life plans (Creamer, 2000; NACADA, 2004).

Organizational Models of Academic Advising

Seven organizational structures for advising were developed with the intention that "those structures would have general institutional applicability" (Habley, 1983, p. 535). The models, helpful in explaining characteristics and functions of academic advising programs (Habley & McCauley, 1987), satisfied program goals set according to the NACADA Core Values and CAS Standards for academic advising programs (Habley & Morales, 1998). These academic advising models were categorized by degrees of centralization. In decentralized advising models, faculty or academic departments provided academic advising services, while a central advising center was utilized in centralized advising models. In shared advising models, "the advising function is divided between department advisors (faculty or staff) and staff in a central administrative unit" (Pardee, 2000, p. 196).

- Decentralized organizational models included the "Faculty-Only" and the "Satellite" models. In the "Faculty-Only" model, all students were assigned to faculty advisors in their major or area of study. In the "Satellite" model, academic departments on campus maintained control of advising for students in their areas of study.

- The single centralized organizational model, the "Self-Contained" model, described a university in which all academic advising took place in a centralized location, such as an advising office.

- Shared models consisted of four model types which had characteristics of both decentralized and centralized models. In the "Supplementary" model, students were assigned to faculty advisors in their area of study and had access to a central advising office which acted as a clearinghouse for information. The "Split Advising" model combined faculty advisors and an advising office. Faculty and professional advisors helped students who had declared majors and the advising office assisted undecided students. In the "Dual Advising" model, faculty advised students on issues related to their area of study; however, the advising office continued to provide information related to general education requirements. The "Total Intake" model gave advising responsibility of all students to the advising office. When a student met certain conditions, such as declaring a major or fulfilling a number of credit hours, jurisdiction of advising transferred from the advising office to the student's academic department (Habley, 1983; Habley & McCauley, 1987).

The Fifth and Sixth National ACT Surveys of Academic Advising combined efforts between the NACADA and the American College Testing (ACT) program to "provide a baseline for practitioners to assess the quality of advising on their own campuses" (Habley & Morales, 1998, p. 1), and examined advising models and programs at two-year public, two-year private, four-year public, and four-year private colleges. Habley (1997) noted a decrease in the use of the most decentralized ("Faculty-Only") and the

GROW✝H

most centralized ("Self-Contained") models of advising from the Fourth to Fifth ACT National Surveys. These changes were attributed to trends that blended the two models together. Two-thirds of private, four-year institutions tended to utilize the "Faculty-Only" and "Supplementary" models, and private religiously-affiliated universities with a population less than 2,500 students utilized the "Faculty-Only" model a majority of the time (Habley, 1997; Habley & McCauley, 1987). In small colleges and universities, most advisors were faculty, and it was unusual for these institutions to have an advising center or a professional advising staff (Hemwell & Trachte, 2003).

The Sixth National Survey found that "99% of campuses used instructional faculty to advise in at least some departments" (Habley, 2004, p. 25) and discovered that faculty members continued to play a major role as the primary deliverer of advising services in most institutions. Though faculty remained in an important advising role, the use of the "Faculty-Only" model continued to decline gradually. At the same time, the use of full-time academic advisors or full- and part-time non-teaching advisors increased dramatically from 22% in 1987 to 53% in 2003 in all types of institutions. Academic advising organizational model trends demonstrated movement toward shared responsibility.

> The pattern may reflect the maturation of the field of advising where neither a totally decentralized (traditional) or centralized model is interpreted as the best overall method for meeting student needs. Rather, it appears that campuses are moving toward models that blend the attributes of the Faculty-Only Model with the positive aspects of more centralized models. (Habley, 1997, p. 43)

No matter the trend, Habley concluded that he was unable to attribute certain characteristics of institutions, such as size or type, to a particular organizational model because any institution could utilize any given model.

Academic Advising in the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities

Among the more than 4,300 institutions of higher learning in the United States, 1,746 are private, not-for-profit colleges or universities (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2007). The majority of these private institutions are religiously affiliated. The Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU, 2006) has a commitment to integration of scholarship, biblical faith, and service in an intentional Christian environment with full regional accreditation and broad curricula rooted in the arts and sciences. It had a membership of 105 institutions. These institutions, primarily four-year comprehensive colleges or universities from 28 denominations, were located in 30 states and three Canadian provinces. They had enrollments ranging from 400 to 28,000 students.

Academic advising was identified in the Quality Retention Project as one of three issues that could improve quality and retention on CCCU campuses (Schreiner & Shopp, 1999, 2000). The project examined best practices of academic advising in the CCCU based on Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) results from over 17,000 students on 76 campuses. The SSI measured satisfaction with advisors in four areas: approachability, concern for the individual student, setting goals with students, and knowledge about major requirements. The findings indicated that effective advisors

had the common qualities of viewing advising as a mission, developing a rapport with students, viewing each student as an individual, and advocating for the student. The inventory found that CCCU institutions tended to use faculty advisors because of their small institutional size. The SSI also indicated that training, recognition and reward, and a manageable advisee load were needed for faculty to be successful advisors. Academic advising was listed as one of the factors that influenced students' decisions to remain at or leave an institution. Walter (2000) found that satisfaction with academic advising contributed positively to persistence to graduation.

To summarize the related literature, as colleges and universities became more comprehensive institutions and offered more learning opportunities, academic advising became an organized profession. Although prescriptive advising was a necessity, developmental advising became the desired norm. Several academic advising models emerged and private, religiously-affiliated institutions tended to use decentralized organizational advising models that focused on heavy faculty involvement.

Method

The purpose of this study was to examine the manner in which academic advising was conducted among private, faith-based institutions, specifically those with membership in the CCCU. The study examined organizational advising models, as classified by Habley (1983), utilized by these institutions and the extent to which they utilized developmental advising methods. The study sought answers to the following questions: How is academic advising conducted among institutions in the CCCU? To what extent do CCCU institutions achieve developmental academic advising goals, as articulated by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) for advising and the core values of the NACADA? What types of organizational advising models and methods are utilized at these institutions?

Design of the Study

The population for this study was defined as the chief academic advisor for undergraduates at 105 member institutions of the CCCU. This population was chosen because it is representative of many other private, religiously-affiliated colleges and universities. The sample consisted of the chief advising officers for undergraduates at all 105 member institutions of the CCCU; thus, the sample equaled the population. CCCU member institutions were identified through the CCCU's Web site listing of member institutions. The researchers searched each of the 105 CCCU member institution Web sites to locate the person responsible for coordinating undergraduate academic advising on these respective campuses. If no such person was easily identifiable on the Web site, the researchers personally contacted the institution. The researchers were able to identify an individual on each campus who was responsible for coordinating the academic advising function for undergraduates.

Data Collection

Quantitative research methodology was chosen because it enabled the researchers to profile how academic advising was conducted among this population (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). Survey methodology was used to gather descriptive data that was generalized from the sample (Mitchell & Jolley, 1988). After reviewing the related literature, the

GROW✝H

researchers developed a survey instrument to obtain the desired information, based on the Tailored Design Method as recommended by Dillman (2000). A web-based online survey was constructed in order to provide specific information to answer the research questions.

In addition to gathering profile information, the survey was designed to help determine the title and role of the individual coordinating advising services and to determine whether or not academic advising operated as a stand-alone office. The survey also contained sections which addressed the delivery of advising services, roles, and functions of academic advising, student development goals for academic advising, and organizational models. A panel of experts reviewed the instrument to assess content validity, readability, and clarity. The panel included an experienced director of academic advising, experienced student affairs administrators, and professors skilled in survey development. The instrument was revised based upon their recommendations. The instrument was then pilot tested for reliability with experienced academic advisors and revised based on their feedback. The section in the instrument entitled "Organizational Models" was based on five of the seven academic advising models developed by Habley (1983). The researchers simplified the organizational models, as defined by Habley, to include only five of the organizational models to make distinctions among the models more apparent. The models were renamed to assist survey participants in better understanding the differences between the models. The section entitled "Student Development Goals for Academic Advising" was based on ideal student development outcomes, as articulated by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (2005) for academic advising.

Pre-notice letters, explaining the purpose of the survey, were sent by mail to each person responsible for academic advising at the 105 CCCU member institutions. Surveys then were distributed by e-mail through an attached link. A follow-up reminder e-mail was distributed a week after the receipt of the original e-mail. The researcher sent out a second follow-up e-mail to nonrespondents which suggested they return the survey or, if they preferred, return an attached Microsoft Word version of the survey. Data collection occurred in April and May of 2007. Of the 105 CCCU member institutions in the population and sample, 67 individuals primarily responsible for coordinating or directing academic advising in those institutions, the individuals who were most knowledgeable about academic advising on those campuses, responded to the survey, yielding a response rate was 63.8%. Not all of the respondents answered every question. The researchers were seeking to develop a profile of how academic advising was conducted on private, faith-based colleges and universities. Since the sample was inclusive of the entire population, the data were analyzed into frequencies and percentages so that trends could easily be observed.

Findings
The findings are organized into three sections: a profile of academic advising in CCCU institutions, student development outcomes, and organizational models.

Profile of Academic Advising in CCCU Institutions
A majority (59.7%) of the respondents came from institutions with an enrollment of 1,000 to 2,999 students. Among the remaining respondents, 25.4% had enrollments of

less than 1,000 students, and 14.9% had enrollments of 3,000 to 9,999 students. Nearly 48% reported that their institution had 26-50 majors/minors available for students. The remaining respondents reported that their institutions offered 51-75 majors/minors (23.9%), 76-100 majors/minors (13.4%), 1-25 majors/minors (10.4%), or 101 or more majors/minors (4.5%).

Nearly 36% of the respondents had the job title Director of Academic Advising, and 34.3% were titled Registrar. Other titles listed were Associate or Assistant Vice President or Dean of Academic Affairs (13.4%), Vice President or Dean of Academic Affairs (4.5%), and 12% listed other titles. Respondents were asked if their institution had a stand-alone office with the singular purpose of providing academic advising, such as an Office of Academic Advising. Nearly 81% reported they did not have a stand-alone office, and 19.4% reported they did have a stand-alone office for academic advising. The majority of respondents (58.2%) reported directly to the Vice President or Dean of Academic Affairs. The remaining respondents reported to the Associate Vice President or Dean of Academic Affairs (13.4%), Vice President or Dean of Student Affairs (7.5%), Registrar (4.5%), or other (16.4%).

Respondents identified all campus groups involved with academic advising at their institution. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents reported faculty was involved with advising, and 26.9% had full-time and/or part-time professional advisors. Paraprofessionals and staff (e.g., graduate assistants, clerical staff) were advisors at 19.4% of the institutions. Faculty advisors were the primary group responsible for academic advising (89.5%), followed by full-time and part-time professional advisors (9.0%), and other (1.5%).

Respondents reported the average number of undergraduate advisees assigned to faculty advisors. Approximately 44% of respondents reported 21-30 advisees. The remaining respondents recorded 1-10 advisees (4.7%), 11-20 advisees (40.6%), 31-40 advisees (7.8%), and 40 or more advisees (3.1%). Respondents also reported the average number of advisees assigned to full-time professional advisors. The majority of respondents (58.2%) did not have full-time professional advisors. The remaining respondents recorded that their full-time professional advisors were assigned 11-20 advisees (4.0%), 21-30 advisees (12.0%), 31-40 advisees (4.0%), or 40 or more advisees (80.0%).

Respondents reported common job responsibilities associated with academic advising at their institution. Thirteen job responsibilities were listed, and respondents checked all that applied. Nearly all of the respondents indicated that advisors provided students with information regarding general education and major requirements (98.5%, see Table 1). Ninety-seven percent reported that advisors assisted students with course registration, helped students develop an educational plan (85.1%), made referrals to other institutional resources and services (83.6%), and provided students with information regarding institutional policies and procedures (82.1%). Slightly more than 73% of the advisors assisted students in assessing their interests and abilities, maintained advising records for students (61.2%), and assisted with freshman and/or transfer orientation (53.7%).

Respondents identified circumstances in which students were required to meet with an academic advisor. A majority of respondents reported that students were required to meet with an advisor for class registration (92.5%), dropping classes (68.7%), and

GROW✝H

adding classes (65.7%). Students were also required to meet with an advisor when changing a major (44.8%) and declaring a major (40.3%). Nearly 2% of respondents reported students were not required to meet with an advisor for any reason.

Student Development Outcomes

Respondents were asked to what extent their institution's advising program achieved the six ideal student development outcomes for academic advising programs as articulated by the CAS and the NACADA Core Values. The respondents chose the response (i.e., achieves desired outcome, partially achieves desired outcome, or does not achieve desired outcome) which best matched their opinion for each outcome.

- Intellectual Growth describes an outcome in which the student understands academic information and institutional policies and demonstrates an understanding of the institutional mission and purpose of higher education. For this outcome, 65.6% of respondents reported their advising program partially achieved the desired outcome, 32.8% achieved the desired outcome, and 1.6% did not achieve the desired outcome (see Table 2).

- Nearly 60% of respondents reported that they partially achieved the Personal and Educational Goals desired outcome in which students set and pursue individual goals and use those goals to guide decisions. The remaining respondents reported their advising programs achieved (35.9%) or did not achieve (4.7%) this outcome.

- Realistic Self-Appraisal describes an outcome in which students evaluate their skills, interests, and abilities in order to establish an educational plan and develop decision-making skills. Nearly 30% achieved the outcome, 60.9% partially achieved the outcome, and 9.4% did not achieve the outcome.

- Nearly 36% felt their advising program achieved the Clarified Values outcome, in which students demonstrate the ability to evaluate and articulate personal goals. Nearly 55% partially achieved the outcome, and 9.4% did not achieve the outcome.

- Career Choices describes a goal in which students make career and major choices based on interests, values, and abilities and make connections between classroom and out-of-classroom learning. Nearly 60% of the respondents reported they partially achieved the desired outcome, 39.1% achieved the goal, and 1.6% did not achieve the goal.

- Nearly 68% reported their advising programs had partially achieved the Independence outcome, which describes students who act independently by attending advising sessions, seeking the advice of an advisor, and applying their educational plans. Nearly 28% achieved the desired goal, and 4.6% did not achieve the desired goal.

Organizational Models

Respondents were asked to identify which of five academic advising organizational models most closely matched the academic advising which took place on their campuses. The following descriptions of academic advising organizational models were provided.

- Academic Advising Office Model (centralized): All academic advising, from student matriculation to graduation, takes place within a centralized location, such as an academic advising office. The advising function may exist in conjunction with other student services, such as academic support or career services.

- Faculty-Only Model (decentralized): All academic advising from matriculation to graduation takes place by faculty members inside academic departments. Students often are assigned to a faculty advisor based on their major. No central advising office exists, although the college or university may have a coordinator of academic advising responsible for making advising assignments.

- Satellite Model (decentralized): All students are advised by decentralized academic advising offices located within each academic department. These offices advise students who major in that department. Advisors may be full-time or part-time professional advisors or faculty advisors. Undecided students are not served by a centralized advising office. Instead, they are dispersed throughout the satellite offices.

- Dual Advising Model (shared): Faculty advisors and an advising office share responsibility for all students. Most often, faculty advise students in their area of study, and the advising office is responsible for advising all students on general education requirements and institutional policies and procedures.

- Shared Model (shared): Advising functions are shared by a central advising office and academic departments. Upon enrollment, students are assigned to a central advising office. Once the student has met a certain set of conditions, advising responsibility transfers from the advising office to faculty advisors or full-time advisors in the student's major (academic department).

A majority of respondents (70.0%) reported that their institution followed the Faculty-Only Model (see Table 3). The second most utilized model was the Dual Advising Model (16.7%). Other respondents reported using the Shared Model (6.7%), Satellite Model (5.0%), and Academic Advising Office Model (1.7%).

Discussion

A limited amount of research exists regarding academic advising and organizational advising models in faith-based colleges and universities. This study may have several implications for these types of institutions as they compare academic advising methods utilized through organizational models. This information may help institutions develop and implement more effective advising programs.

GROW†H

Developmental and Prescriptive Advising

Advisor responsibilities within the CCCU incorporated both prescriptive and developmental advising methods. Prescriptive advising is necessary in order to ensure that students receive proper information regarding general education and major requirements and institutional policies and procedures, and to assist with course registration (Crookston, 1972, 1994). Though advising should provide students with this basic academic information, the advising profession and its professional organization in particular, the National Academic Advising Association, has tended to emphasize a more developmental method to advising. Developmental advising is "a systematic process based on a close student-advisor relationship intended to aid students in achieving educational and personal goals through the utilization of the full range of institutional and community resources" (Ender, et al., 1982, p. 8). A majority of institutions within the CCCU not only provide prescriptive elements of advising for their students, but over 70% indicated that they assist students in assessing their interests and abilities, help them develop an educational plan by establishing academic, career, and life goals, and make referrals to other areas on campus, all of which are developmental responsibilities or methods according to the above definition.

Though many of the advisor responsibilities coincide with developmental advising definitions, all of the CCCU institutions reported that they have not completely achieved the six student developmental goals based on the CAS for advising programs. The establishment of CAS Standards for advising programs and the NACADA Core Values were meant to provide guidance for developmental advising (Creamer & Creamer, 1994). In order to serve their students well, institutions who currently are not meeting CAS Standards and NACADA Core Values should place priority on making the necessary changes to meet these best practices.

One concern regarding this perception is that a range of only 25-35% of CCCU institutions reported achieving student developmental outcomes, even though over 70% of the same institutions stated that their advisors do have developmental advising responsibilities such as developing a goal-oriented educational plan with students. The prevalence of developmental advising responsibilities should translate into achievement of successful student development outcomes.

In order to understand why a majority of institutions were only partially achieving these outcomes, it would be helpful for these institutions to set a goal of achieving the professional standards set for advising programs. If institutions understood fully the CAS Standards for advising programs and NACADA Core Values, they could use these as benchmarks to establish their own developmental advising mission and goals. Once established goals are in place, they would be more likely to work toward these goals and may be successful in achieving these student development outcomes. Once a mission and goals for advising have been created, institutions may evaluate whether their current method or model of advising adequately meets those goals. If the advising method is not meeting developmental goals, the institution should reevaluate the manner in which academic advising is conducted. A good place to start would include how advising is coordinated and situations in which students are required to meet with an advisor.

A majority of the CCCU institutions reported that academic advising was coordinated through the Registrar's office, which at most institutions is primarily responsible for enrolling students in classes and maintaining student records. This additional

responsibility for advising can take many forms depending on the specific needs of the institution. In some institutions, the Registrars' role in advising may be only to assign students to advisors. Since the main function of the Registrar's office is to enroll students in classes, and the importance placed on advising differs with each institution, it is important to realize some potential negative implications that may exist by coordinating academic advising through this office. When advising is coordinated through the Registrar's office, the goals of advising may change. Nearly 93% of CCCU institutions reported that students are required to meet with an advisor for class registration. Over 60% reported that students are required to meet with an advisor to drop and add classes. Both of these situations are generally prescriptive in nature. The advisor checks to make sure students are on track, and if the schedules are appropriate, the students are sent on their way.

In comparison to these high percentages for more prescriptive advising situations, only 40.3% reported that students were required to meet with an advisor when declaring a major and 44.8% when changing their major. These percentages are lower, especially considering that these are circumstances in which developmental advising would be extremely useful. Changing or declaring a major are potential opportunities for institutions to utilize developmental advising methods such as discussing vocational goals, developing an educational plan, and referring students to other areas on campus that can enhance their learning. The achievement of student development is in danger when students associate academic advising solely with course registration and the Registrar's office. Students need to understand that meeting with an advisor involves more than scheduling classes. Meeting with an advisor can help students to learn goal setting, to create educational plans, and to discuss career and major decisions.

An advising program should emphasize the establishment of goals and an educational plan based on those goals. Though CCCU institutions report that their advisors undertake this responsibility, somehow it is not translating into the outcomes they expect when viewed from a developmental advising approach. Out of all the CCCU institutions, several may have placed the coordination of advising in the Registrar's office for no other reason than because course registration and advising seem to be a good fit. In many ways, they are. But if these institutions want to do more than partially achieve student developmental outcomes, they may need to reconsider where advising is coordinated, what they want their advising goals to accomplish, how the students' views of advising affect these outcomes, and what type of organizational model is best for their institution.

Academic Advising Models

The findings reported that 70% of CCCU institutions utilized the Faculty-Only model of advising. This finding is consistent with other research that showed that private, religiously-affiliated universities with a population less than 2,500 used the Faculty-Only model a majority of the time (Habley, 1997; Habley & McCauley, 1987). Therefore, it is easy to see why faculty was shown to be the main group responsible for advising in this study. In fact, the Sixth National ACT Survey reported that faculty members continue to play a major role as the primary deliverers of advising services in most institutions (Habley, 2004). Research also showed that most advisors were faculty, and therefore it was unusual for small colleges and universities to have an advising center

GROW✝H

or a professional advising staff (Hemwell & Trachte, 2003). Correspondingly, only 19.4% of respondents reported having a stand-alone office for academic advising.

Ninety-seven percent of respondents reported that their institution utilized faculty advisors in some way. Utilizing a Faculty-Only model or a majority of faculty advisors has several implications. Some benefits of using faculty as advisors include the emphasis that smaller institutions place on faculty-student contact (Walter, 2000). Smaller institutions generally tend to have reduced class sizes, enabling students to have a deeper relationship with their professors. According to Astin (1985), students benefit from this out-of-classroom interaction. Astin described academic advising as a form of student involvement. His theory of student involvement stated that the greater the student's involvement, the more the student learned and developed. Students may be more comfortable talking to an advisor with whom they are acquainted within the classroom setting. In addition to the benefit of faculty-student contact, faculty advisors may be more knowledgeable than others about specific major requirements and career options in their own field of study. The use of faculty as advisors is also beneficial to the institution itself. Utilizing faculty advisors reduces the cost of services for the institution (Pardee, 2000).

Though faculty-student interaction and knowledge about major requirements are important, there are also negative implications when utilizing faculty advisors a majority of the time. Most importantly, faculty advisors have other job responsibilities and priorities that come before academic advising. Since CCCU institutions have curricula focused in the liberal arts, the primary responsibility for most faculty is to teach. Therefore, nearly all of their time inside and outside of the classroom may be consumed by this endeavor. Also, some faculty members may be involved in other tasks ranging from research to committee assignments. The time spent on academic advising may be at the bottom of their priority list, especially if they are not compensated for the responsibility. Additionally, multiple responsibilities may limit the time that faculty are available to the students they advise. The limited time given to students, therefore, restricts the more expanded time needed for utilizing developmental advising methods, including the discussion of deeper topics such as student goals, interests, and assessment of abilities. According to the respondents, some of the faculty advisors were assigned up to 40 advisees. If faculty advisors have limited time available, and a large advisee load, they more than likely cannot take the time to go over developmental advising issues. In comparison, the survey findings reported that the average advisee load for professional advisors was 40 or more students. However, it is professional advisors' full-time jobs, rather just one of many responsibilities.

The ways in which students are assigned to faculty advisors may also be a concern. If faculty advisors have knowledge primarily in their own field of study, they might have limited knowledge and lack up-to-date information on other disciplines, general education requirements, and policies and procedures. Since many students remain undecided in their major and career choice during the first year or two, faculty advisors may not be able to meet these students' needs adequately for major or career guidance. Assigning undecided students to faculty advisors may not be the best way to serve this population properly.

Pardee (2000) stated that faculty must have "availability, competence, and willingness… to perform the advising function" (p. 202). If faculty members are not

willing to advise or receive little recognition or rewards for advising, they may not dedicate significant time or effort to making their advising effective. Some faculty may be required to advise and may not be competent advisors, no matter how much training they receive. Faculty members may lack proper training in academic advising. Institutions in the CCCU must realize the importance of these issues and address them. Faculty members also need to realize the value of academic advising to the institution and student development. If CCCU institutions continue to use the Faculty-Only model or a majority of faculty advisors, extensive training on developmental advising methods should be established. Methods to evaluate and assess the quality of the advising students receive also should be developed. In order to provide incentives for quality faculty advising practices, it would be beneficial to have some form of reward or recognition system in place (Schreiner & Shopp, 1999).

Even though small institutions tended to use the Faculty-Only model a majority of the time, research reported that the use of this model was in a gradual decline. The use of professional advisors in institutions of all sizes increased 31% from 1987 to 2003 (Habley, 2004). Trends in advising organizational models have moved toward a shared system of responsibility, in which institutions have determined the need to incorporate aspects of both a decentralized and centralized model and in which "campuses are moving toward models that blend the attributes of the Faculty-Only Model with the positive aspects of more centralized models" (Habley, 1997, p. 43).

According to other reported uses of organizational models and comments made by respondents in the survey, the movement toward a shared organizational model may be where CCCU institutions are headed. The second most utilized organizational model among respondents was the Dual Advising model, in which faculty advisors and an advising office share responsibility for all students. According to Habley (1983), the Dual Advising model is classified as a shared organizational model. The third most utilized model among CCCU respondents was what the researchers defined as the Shared model, in which a central advising office and academic departments share advising functions. The use of the Dual Advising model and Shared model indicate that CCCU institutions are indeed utilizing shared organizational models. If this trend toward using shared models continues, the number of CCCU institutions using these models may also increase. In order to combine the benefits of using both faculty and professional advisors (Habley, 1997), it would be beneficial for these institutions to gradually move toward a shared organizational advising model as time and institutional resources allow.

Determining the appropriate organizational model to use depends on many factors related to the institutional culture, including the number of majors offered, the type of institution (in this case, private), specificity of degree requirements, the role of faculty, and the needs of the student body (Habley & Morales, 1998). Some institutions may find it easier to use a decentralized model. Others would benefit from having advising coordinated through a central office. The needs of the student body may also play a role in the manner in which advising is organized. If the institution has a large number of students who have not declared a major, they would be best served by professional advisors who are trained to meet those needs. Similarly, institutions may discover the need to utilize a different model or type of advisor if they have a large number of international students, first-generation students, or even honors students, all of whom

GROW✝H

are well served by developmental academic advising (Habley & Morales, 1998).

No matter what type of model these institutions choose to utilize, it is extremely important to use their established mission and goals for advising to create an institutional consensus for academic advising. Academic advising is affected by how the institution as a whole views advising. Advising cannot be effective if there are differing viewpoints on the way in which advising should be conducted (Tukey, 1996). Faculty, staff, and administration need to agree on advising methods and understand how academic advising is coordinated

One way to establish consensus is to look at institutional policies regarding advising. Academic advising should find its purpose within the institutional mission statement. If student development is important to an institution, academic advising should utilize a developmental advising approach. Once the advising program reflects the institutional mission, then institutions may measure whether or not they are meeting their advising goals and evaluate the effectiveness of their academic advising model. Current advising practices at these institutions could continue to be utilized, but even small changes in the implementation of advising may promote student development and help fulfill the university's mission.

Recommendations and Limitations

This study was limited to the 105 private Christian institutions with membership in the CCCU. If this study were replicated, it may be helpful to survey other private, religiously-affiliated universities to determine if academic advising is conducted in similar ways. If this were the case and the size of the sample increased, it may be helpful to use a more complex statistical analysis to evaluate the manner in which academic advising is conducted among institutions with similar enrollment numbers. The researcher did not use a more complex statistical analysis in this study because the purpose was to present a profile of how academic advising was conducted among institutions in the CCCU. However, it may have been beneficial to ask respondents if they were members of the National Association for Academic Advising (NACADA). Statistical analysis could be used to determine if members of NACADA utilized developmental academic advising methods or achieved student development goals differently from those who were not members.

Roger D. Wessel serves as an Associate Professor of Higher Education at Ball State University. He holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Higher Education from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Jenni L. Smith holds a Master of Arts in Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education from Ball State University.

References

Astin, A. W. (1985a). Student involvement: The key to effective education. In A. W. Astin (Ed.), *Achieving educational excellence* (pp. 133-157). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1985b). *Achieving educational excellence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Beatty, J. D. (1991). *The National Academic Advising Association: A brief narrative history.* (NACADA Monograph No. 11). Manhatten, KS: NACADA.

Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS). (2005). *Academic advising: CAS standards and guidelines.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/Research_Related/CASStandardsForAdvising.pdf

Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. (2006). *Mission and organization.* Retrieved from http://www.cccu.org/about/about.asp

Creamer, D. G. (2000). Use of theory in academic advising. In V. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 18-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Creamer, D. G., & Creamer, E. G. (1994). Practicing developmental advising: Theoretical contexts and functional applications. *NACADA Journal, 14*(2), 17-24.

Crookston, B. B. (1972). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 13,* 12-17.

Crookston, B. B. (1994). A developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *NACADA Journal, 14*(2), 5-9.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed). New York: John Wiley.

Ender, S. C., Winston, R. B., Jr., & Miller, T. K. (1982). Academic advising as student development. In R. B. Winston, Jr., S. C. Enders, & T. K. Miller (Eds.), *Developmental approaches to academic advising* (pp. 3-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Frost, S. H. (1991). *Academic advising for student success: A system of shared responsibility.* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3). Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.

Frost, S. H. (2000). Historical and philosophical foundations for academic advising. In V. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic Advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 3-17). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gaw, A. (1933). Advising means administration. *The Journal of Higher Education, 4*(4), 179-186.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (2nd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gordon, V. (1998). New horizons: Learning from the past and preparing for the future. *NACADA Journal, 18*(2), 5-12.

Habley, W. R. (1983). Organizational structures for academic advising: Models and implications. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24,* 535-540.

Habley, W. R. (1997). Organizational models and institutional advising practices. *NACADA Journal, 17*(2), 39-44.

Habley, W. R. (Ed.). (2004). *The status of academic advising: Findings from the ACT sixth national survey.* (NACADA Monograph No. 10). Manhattan, KS: NACADA.

GROW✝H

Habley, W. R., & McCauley, M. E. (1987). The relationship between institutional characteristics and the organization of advising services. *NACADA Journal, 7*(1), 27-39.

Habley, W. R., & Morales, R. H. (1998). Advising models: Goal achievement and program effectiveness. *NACADA Journal, 18*(1), 35-41.

Hemwall, M. K., & Trachte, K. C. (2003). *Learning at the core: Theory and practice of academic advising in small colleges and universities.* (NACADA Monograph No. 8). Manhattan, KS: NACADA.

Jordan, P. (2000). Academic advising in the 21st century. *NACADA Journal, 20*(2), 21-30.

Mitchell, M., & Jolley, J. (1988). *Research design explained.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

NACADA. (2004). *NACADA statement of core values of academic advising.* Retrieved from http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/Core-Values.htm

Pardee, C. F. (2000). Organizational models for academic advising. In V. Gordon & W. R. Habley (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook* (pp. 192-209). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sanford, N. (1979). Student development and the American college student. In N. Sanford & J. Axelrod (Eds.), *College and character* (pp. 253-265). Berkeley, CA: Montaigne.

Schreiner, L., & Shopp, B. (1999, July). Wrapping up year two: Best practices in advising. *CCCU Quality Retention Project, 2,* 1-6.

Schreiner, L., & Shopp, B. (2000, February). Fall 1999 SSI results. *CCCU Quality Retention Project, 3,* 1-6.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2007). *Basic classification tables.* Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org

Tukey, D. D. (1996). Academic advising as a multisystem, collaborative enterprise. *NACADA Journal, 16*(1), 6-13.

Tuttle, K. N. (2000, Fall). Academic advising [Electronic version]. *New Directions for Higher Education, 111,* 15-24.

Waggenspack, B. M., & Hensley, W. E. (1992, October). The state of communication undergraduate academic advising [Electronic version]. *ACA Bulletin, 82,* 18-27.

Walter, K. (2000, May). Exploring the connection between student satisfaction and persistence. *Council for Christian Colleges and Universities Resource Center.* Retrieved from www.cccu.org/resourcecenter/resID.2366,parentCatID.130/rc_detail.asp

Table 1

Job Responsibilities of Academic Advisors

Responsibilities	Response	
Respondents were directed to check all that applied	N	%
Provide students with information regarding general education and major requirements	66	98.5
Assist students with course registration	65	97.0
Help students develop an educational plan by establishing short-term and long-term academic, career, and life goals	57	85.1
Make referrals to other institutional resources and services (e.g., counseling, career development, study abroad programs, etc.)	56	83.6
Provide students with information regarding institutional policies and procedures	55	82.1
Assist students in assessing their interests and abilities	49	73.1
Maintain advising records for students	41	61.2
Assist with freshman and/or transfer orientation	36	53.7
Conduct group advising sessions	23	34.3
Maintain degree audit for students	18	26.9
Clear students for graduation	14	20.9
Maintain transfer records	5	7.5
Other	3	4.5

GROW✝H

Table 2

Student Development Outcomes

Item	Achieves Desired Outcome	Partially Achieves Desired Outcome	Does Not Achieve Desired Outcome	Total
Intellectual Growth – Student understands academic information and institutional policies; demonstrates understanding of institutional mission and purpose of higher education.				
N	21	42	1	64
%	32.8	65.6	1.6	100.0
Personal and Educational Goals – Student understands academic information and institutional policies; demonstrates understanding of institutional mission and purpose of higher education.				
N	23	38	3	64
%	35.9	59.4	4.7	100.0
Realistic Self-Appraisal – Student evaluates skills, interests, and abilities to establish educational plan; develops decision-making skills.				
N	19	39	6	64
%	29.7	60.9	9.4	100.0
Clarified Values – Student demonstrates ability to evaluate and articulate personal goals.				
N	23	35	6	64
%	35.9	54.7	9.4	100.0
Career Choices – Student describes career and major choice based on their interests, values, and abilities; makes connections between classroom and out-of-classroom learning.				
N	25	38	1	64
%	39.1	59.4	1.6	100.0
Independence – Student acts independently by attending advising sessions, seeking the advice of an advisor, and applying their educational plan.				
N	18	44	3	65
%	27.7	67.7	4.6	100.0

Table 3

Organizational Advising Models

Institution Follows the Organizational Advising Model	Response	
	N	%
Faculty-Only model	42	70.0
Dual Advising model	10	16.7
Shared model	4	6.7
Satellite model	3	5.0
Academic Advising Office model	1	1.7
Total	60	100.0

GROW✝H