

Survey of Undergraduate Academic Advisers at Iowa State University – 2006

Prepared By:

Subcommittee, University Academic Advising Committee

Members: Cindy Frederickson (chair)
Mary Goodwin
Jane Jacobson
Gail Nonnecke
Lynn Sandeman
Karen Zunkel

University Academic Advising Committee

Members: Jane Jacobson (co-chair)
Gail Nonnecke (co-chair)
Phil Caffrey, ISU Admissions
Kurt Earnest, Department of Residence
Carmen Flagge, Minority Student Affairs
Cindy Frederickson, College of Human Sciences
Mary Goodwin, College of Engineering
Chad Grotegut, Athletic Academic Services
Suzanne Harle, College of Design
Monica Howard-Martin, College of Vet Medicine
Char Hulsebus, Registrar's Office
Brenda Kutz, Advisers Exchange
Terry Mason, Student Counseling Service
Virginia McCallum, International Educ Services
Deborah Noll, College of Business
Heather Phillips, Academic Success Center
Michael Retallick, College of Agriculture
Lynn Sandeman, College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Karen Zunkel, Provost's Office

Submitted: July 2006

INTRODUCTION

The University Academic Advising Committee (UAAC) began discussions in Fall 2004 regarding the need for information about undergraduate advising at Iowa State University. It had been a decade since the last university advising survey. In the past decade the use of P&S Academic Advisers has increased and there has also been greater involvement by advisors in recruitment and retention activities. The UAAC felt it was important for the university to understand the status of undergraduate advising from the perspective of advisers. As part of another study, the UAAC also surveyed undergraduate students about advising in spring 2006. (Information on that survey should be available in late 2006.)

A draft survey was constructed by a subcommittee of UAAC members during the spring of 2005. Funding was provided by the Office of the Provost and the survey was then edited and prepared for web administration by the Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (CSSM) during the summer of 2005. Final UAAC committee approval was secured in Fall 2005, resulting in web administration of the survey by CSSM in November of 2005. In addition to the survey, adviser workload information was tabulated based on adviser assignments from records provided by the Office of the Registrar. The following report outlines the methodology of the survey, the results, and recommendations regarding undergraduate advising at Iowa State University.

Part A: Recommendations for Action

The findings of this survey suggest that advisers at Iowa State are satisfied with their work and value their advising experience even though their advising responsibilities are numerous. In addition, the response rate to this survey (59% return) indicates advisers certainly have opinions about their roles and responsibilities that they want to share with administrators and other members of the Iowa State community. Based on the results of the survey and the additional data provided by the Office of the Registrar, the UAAC makes the following recommendations:

1) Establish guidelines for advising work load. The data and comments suggest that the university should establish guidelines for the maximum number of advisees per adviser for both faculty and P&S advisers. The National Academic Advising Association suggests that 250 students should be considered an appropriate advising assignment for full-time staff advisers. At Iowa State, 41% of the P&S advisers surveyed have more than 250 advisees, with approximately 25% having 350+ advisees. Of the P&S advisers with over 250 advisees, 100% had recruitment responsibilities, 96% taught courses, 96% had responsibilities for orientation, and 85% had additional retention activity responsibilities. It is difficult, to say the least, to provide quality advising to such a large number of students as well as to perform additional student services-related activities as assigned by their department or college unit.

For faculty, over 40% of the faculty respondents said that their position description allocated 0% of their time for academic advising. In addition, the workload assignment process for advising is inconsistent, with some faculty having significantly more advising responsibilities than other faculty. Faculty should be given a prescribed advising load within their position responsibility statements to allow equitable release time for their advising duties.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, with the complexities and ever changing issues affecting advisers and to increase efficiency, the university should discuss the possibility

of recommending a minimum number of advisees for faculty who advise. Selected faculty members comments say: “since advising is such a small part of my job, it is difficult to keep with everything I need to be a good advisor” and “it is inefficient to have every faculty member advise a few students.”

2) Position Responsibility Statements should recognize advising and student service-related activities. For most faculty, recruitment and other student services-related activities are not included in position responsibility statement, nor are they factored into workload/time. For P&S advisers, it is critical that student service activities (such as committee participation, recruitment and retention programs, etc.) are also included into job responsibilities and that release time is allocated to perform these activities.

3) Advising must be valued. The data sample suggests that most P&S advisers hold at least a masters degree or higher (82%) and are P13-P14 on the pay matrix (68%), with a majority of respondents (55%) in the first third of their pay matrix. Faculty comments indicate that they feel their job is important to students and to the institution, but that it is often not valued by the unit, nor does advising appear as a component of their job performance evaluations. Steps need to be taken to adequately recognize and to compensate individuals who advise undergraduate students. The UAAC has recently forwarded recommendations on to the Office of the Provost which would revise awards and recognition opportunities, but compensation/salary issues must also be addressed at some point.

4) Review P&S classification structure for academic advisers. It is time to examine the established position descriptions and pay-levels for academic advisers and to seek answers to the following issues:

- There are very few Adviser I positions on campus. This may be an out-dated/unnecessary classification for adviser.
- The majority of advising positions are a combination of advising with significant expectations for recruitment, retention, committee work and teaching expectations. The existing classification system may not reflect the positions adequately Perhaps these positions be elevated within the P-grade system.
- There are currently individuals with academic advising responsibility who have a variety of position titles besides ‘academic adviser’, such as student service specialist or program coordinator. How do these positions fit into the classification process?
- 80% of the P&S advisers are early career professionals (less than 10 years of advising). There are limited opportunities to advance within the advising ranks, since higher P-level advising positions require supervision and/or administrative responsibilities. Opportunities for ‘promotion’ within the advising system are important for retaining experienced advisers in student services roles.

5) Create gender and cultural balance within the advising system. The data sample suggests that advising in both faculty and P&S groups do not reflect the diversity of the ISU student body. Most advisers are Caucasian. In addition, there needs to be better balance in male and female advisers in both groups surveyed - 69% of faculty advisers are male, while 68% of P&S advisers are female.

6) Increase opportunities for training and support for advisers. The majority of both P&S and faculty advisers say they are ‘too busy’ to attend the various adviser training/development activities. To ensure that students are receiving excellence in academic advising, it is critical that advisers are up-to-date on issues, and prepared to handle the diversity of situations they may encounter. Therefore initial and on-going support for academic advisers is critical. To address this need, the UAAC is investigating alternative methods for training and supporting academic advisers and to make it easier for departments to deliver critical training to new advisers in their units. It is important for department chairs to support training and to allow faculty and staff the time and/financial support to attend various training programs.

The University Academic Advising Committee will follow up in 2006-07 with further discussion of the results of this survey and will begin implementation of initiatives to address some of the issues highlighted within this survey. In addition to the results of this survey, UAAC has undertaken a second survey which will collect information from the undergraduate student population which will collect information on the effectiveness they feel advising is in their educational pursuits. This data was collected March-April of 2006 and is currently being analyzed.

Part B: Methodology of Adviser Survey

A study of the experiences of Iowa State University undergraduate student advisers was conducted by the University Academic Advising Committee (UAAC), through a Web survey implemented in November of 2005. The instrument used for the survey was developed by the UAAC. The Center for Survey Statistics and Methodology (Center) was contacted to assist in adapting and programming the survey for Web application and in coordinating its implementation.

Design and Procedures:

The sample for this study was comprised of current Iowa State University undergraduate advisers secured from a list provided by the Registrar's Office. The questionnaire was developed by the UAAC and programmed and tested as a Web survey by Center staff. To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, unique usernames and passwords were assigned to each adviser in the sample and data were stored on a secure server. Center staff contacted 571 advisers in the sample by letter sent through campus mail on Friday, November 3, 2005 and by e-mail on Monday, November 6, 2005. Both the letter and the e-mail contained a description of the study and its purpose as well as instructions for accessing the survey on-line. An e-mail reminder was sent to non-responders on November 14 and again on November 28.

Center staff maintained the Web site and monitored the progress of the survey. Frequencies were run and the data set was cleaned. Twenty-four cases were not eligible because it was determined that those faculty or staff members were not involved in advising undergraduate students. Open-ended comments from the survey were entered into an Access file. Data, frequencies, and a codebook were recorded and delivered to the UAAC subcommittee.

The UAAC subcommittee reviewed the frequencies and percentages obtained from the Center during the spring of 2006. In many instances the responses from faculty and P&S were different, due to the nature of the positions, percentage of time spent advising, etc. These differences were expected. Since our goal was not to draw conclusions between faculty and P&S, but to assess the overall status of advising, tests for significant differences between the two groups were not conducted.

In addition to the survey completed by advisers, a list was obtained from the Registrar's Office which contained the adviser's name, department, and college as well as the name of each student advised by the listed adviser. From this list, it was possible to generate the number of advisers per college, the job classification (P&S or faculty), rank (if faculty) and the number of advisees/adviser for all advisers at Iowa State. This information was collected as supplemental information, beyond the contexts of the survey, to add other descriptive information to define the status of advising at Iowa State.

Part C: Results of Adviser Survey

Sample and Response Rate

Of the 571 advisers in the sample, 24 were not eligible to be included (did not advise undergraduate students). A total of 322 eligible surveys were completed, for a **response rate of 59%** (based on an eligible sample of 547).

Reported sample percentages are statistically valid within +/- 5% at the 95% confidence level. This means that if a sample percentage in all groups is 54% answering a certain question affirmatively; the true percentage in the overall population has a 95% chance to be between 49 and 59%.

Total Number of Advisers	Surveys Completed	Not Eligible	No Response
571	322	24	225

Demographics of Respondents

Survey questions 1 through 9 collected information from the survey respondents related to job classification (faculty or P&S), college, department, rank (faculty) or P-level (P&S), degree obtained, gender, age, ethnicity and years in advising at Iowa State. (See Table 1, which follows, for select demographic characteristics of faculty and P&S respondents. See Section 2 of the Appendix for a detailed breakdown of these characteristics.)

There were a total of 249 faculty respondents with the greatest number of responses from the Colleges of LAS (75) and Agriculture (71). Regarding faculty rank, 67% of faculty respondents were either associate or full professors. Gender, age and ethnicity of faculty respondents were 69% male, 51% 50+ years of age and 84% Caucasian. Approximately 50% of faculty respondents have advised undergraduate students at ISU for 11+ years, with 29% of these respondents having advised for more than 20 years.

There were a total of 66 P&S respondents with the largest number of responses from the Colleges of LAS (21), Human Sciences (14), Engineering (13) and Agriculture (12). Personnel classification levels of P&S respondents show that 68% are P13-P14, with 55% of respondents in the First Third of their pay matrix. 82% of P&S respondents hold a masters degree or higher. Gender, age and ethnicity indicate that 68% were female, 36% were less than 40 years of age and 92% are Caucasian. Over 80% of P&S respondents have advised for 10 years or less.

Table 1. Select demographic characteristics of faculty and P&S respondents.

Characteristics	Faculty #	Faculty %	P&S #	P&S %
Job Classification	249	77%	66	23%
Faculty Rank				
* Full Prof	85	34%		
* Assoc Prof	81	33%		
* Asst Professor	22	25%		
P-Level				
* P11-12			5	8%
* P13-14			45	68%
* P15 +			9	15%
Gender				
* Male	171	69%	21	32%
* Female	78	31%	45	68%
Age				
* 39 or less	42	17%	24	36%
* 40-49	78	31%	20	30%
* 50 +	127	51%	22	33%
Ethnicity				
* Caucasian	208	84%	61	92%
Years of Advising				
* 10 or less	123	49%	53	80%
* 11-20 yrs	51	20%	11	17%
* 21 + yrs	73	29%	2	3%

Type of Student Advised and Advising Workload

Survey questions 10 through 16 collected information from respondents regarding the classification of student they most often advise (first year vs. transfer students), their advising workload and how load is assigned, time spent in advising students, and how advisers feel about their advising workload. (See table 2, which follows, for Selected responses regarding type of student advised and advising workload. See Section 3 of the Appendix for a complete list of responses.

Faculty respondents more often advise third- and fourth-year students (94+%) and less often advise first-year (53%) or second-year (77%) undergraduate students; they advise a significant number of transfer students (55%). When asked how many advisees they have per semester, 73% of faculty respondents advise less than 25 students.

Advising workload is most often determined by the “department chair/administrator” (51%), however one-third (33%) of faculty respondents indicate "other" methods of assigning workload are utilized. When asked if their job responsibilities include a designated percentage of time given for advising, 72% indicate that less than 10% of time is given for advising duties (40% indicate that 0% of time is given for advising). When asked how much time was actually spent advising undergraduate students, 86% indicate that they spent less than 25% of their time advising (59% indicate they spend 5% or less in advising).

Faculty respondents were asked if they had too many advisees or if the advising workload was appropriate. Two-thirds (66%) of faculty respondents indicate that the advising load is appropriate ("about right"), while 16% indicate that they meet their advisees needs with difficulty.

P&S respondents show a more equal distribution of classification of students that they advise, with 89% responding that they work with first-year and fourth-year students and 96-97% with second-year and third-year students, respectively. Most P&S respondents work with transfer students (94%).

P&S respondents show a significantly heavier workload regarding advisee assignment. 41% of respondents have an advisee load of 250+ students per semester (24% of respondents advise 350+ students). Advising load for this group is most often determined by the “department chair/administrator” (49%) with 32% indicating load was determined by "other" methods. For both faculty and P&S respondents, open-ended comments indicate that many (25) do not know how advisee load is determined and 40 respondents indicate that advisee load is determined by need or simply by the number of the students in that particular academic program.

Over 60% of P&S respondents indicate that advising responsibilities assigned in their work contract are 50-100% of their job assignment which is not surprising and 75% indicate that they actually spend 50-100% of their time advising students.

Regarding how P&S respondents feel about their advising workload, 59% feel that they either have "too many advisees to meet their needs" or that they "meet their needs with difficulty". Only 26% of P&S respondents feel that their advising load is "about right".

Table 2: Selected responses regarding type of student advised and advising workload.

Characteristics	Faculty #	Faculty %	P&S #	P&S %
Advisee Classification				
* 1st-yr	132	53%	59	89%
* 2nd-yr	192	77%	64	97%
* 3rd-yr	237	95%	63	96%
* 4th-yr	233	94%	59	89%
* Transfer	137	55%	62	94%
Advisee Load				
* less than 25 students	181	73%	8	12%
* 25-49	44	18%	2	3%
* 50-149	19	8%	10	15%
* 150-249			19	29%
* 250-35-			11	17%
* 350 +	2	.8%	16	24%
Feel about Advising Load				
* Too many students	5	2%	11	17%
* Difficult to meet needs	40	16%	28	42%
* Load about right	165	66%	17	26%

Other Student Services Job Responsibilities

Survey questions 17 through 26 asked respondents to comment on specific job responsibilities and assignments they have related to student services and serving undergraduate students. Respondents were asked about their advising responsibilities, participation in recruitment and retention activities and programs, teaching assignments related to student adjustment and development, orientation programs, committees and other advising responsibilities. (See Table 3, which follows, for chart of student services responsibilities and frequency of involvement. See Section 3 of the Appendix for a complete summary of responses.)

Survey respondents were asked to mark the advising tasks they participate in from a list of eight advising-related tasks. Tasks included course selection/planning, career/major discussions, transfer credit assessment, degree requirements, professional development, personal concerns, special student needs/accommodations, and support letters. For both faculty and P&S respondents, most show involvement in all of the above tasks, with least involvement by faculty respondents in work with special student needs/accommodations (25%) and assessment of transfer credits (47%).

Recruitment activities were surveyed, with respondents asked to indicate activities which they regularly participate in from a list of four: on-campus programs, off-campus programs, special programs and daily campus activities. Faculty respondents show less frequent involvement in any of these four activities (14-37%) when compared with P&S respondents (33-86%).

Retention activities were also surveyed with respondents asked to indicate activities which they regularly participate in from a list of five: learning communities, ambassador/peer mentor programs, career development, ISU retention projects, and

newsletters to students. Faculty respondents show little involvement in all of the retention activities above (3-21%) with most frequent involvement in learning community activities (21%). P&S respondents are somewhat to often involved in all five retention activities (23-61%) with most frequent involvement in learning communities (61%).

The survey asked respondents about teaching responsibilities within department orientation classes, intern/job search courses and career development courses. P&S respondents are more frequently involved in department orientation classes (71%), but also indicate some involvement in career development (26%) and intern/job search (15%) courses. Faculty respondents show little involvement in any of these courses (8-9%).

Involvement in student orientation programs was surveyed, with respondents asked to indicate activities which they regularly participate in from a list of four: first-year summer orientation, transfer student orientation, Destination Iowa State, and other (Apex, Carver, Hixson) programs. Faculty respondents show little involvement in any of the four activities (6-26%), while P&S respondents show less to frequent involvement (29%-80%). P&S respondents show frequent involvement in first-year summer orientation and transfer student orientation (80%) and some involvement in Destination Iowa State (41%) and other programs (29%).

Involvement in other student enrichment activities was also surveyed, with responses requested regarding these three areas: study abroad programs, honors, department clubs/student organizations. P&S respondents are more frequently involved in all three categories of student enrichment when compared to faculty respondents (50-68% and 35-52%, respectively). Both faculty and P&S respondents are most often involved in department clubs/student organizations (52% and 68%, respectively).

Administrative duties were also surveyed regarding involvement in ten different student service-related tasks, ranging from maintaining advisee records, to curriculum and catalog, and department scholarship administration and selection to name a few. P&S respondents are more frequently involved in administrative duties (35-89%) than faculty respondents. Faculty respondents are more frequently involved in curriculum and catalog duties (56%), maintaining records and tracking advisees (37%) and in department scholarship administration and selection (37%). P&S respondents were most frequently involved in maintaining records and tracking advisees (89%), curriculum and catalog duties (76%) and graduation approvals (76%).

Student services committee involvement was also surveyed where respondents were to indicate involvement in four committee areas: curriculum, student awards, ISU recruitment/retention and other. Both faculty and P&S respondents show some to frequent involvement in student services-related committees (6-52% and 32-50%, respectively). Faculty respondents are most often involved in curriculum (52%) and students awards committees (30%). P&S respondents are most often involved in curriculum (50%), student awards (33%) and recruitment/retention (32%). P&S respondents also indicated significant involvement in "other" committee work (42%).

When asked about release time given for the student services work indicated above, 74% of faculty respondents indicate that no release time is given for such work. P&S

respondents (56%) indicate that release time is given for these student services responsibilities.

Table 3. Student services responsibilities and frequency of involvement.

Activity	Faculty #	Faculty %	P&S #	P&S %
Recruitment				
* on-campus programs	78	31%	56	85%
* off-campus programs	34	14%	22	33%
* special programs	43	17%	31	47%
* daily activities	91	37%	57	86%
Retention				
* learning community	52	21%	40	61%
* ambassador/peer mentor programs	15	6%	23	35%
* career development programs	40	16%	28	42%
* ISU retention initiatives	16	6%	15	23%
* newsletters- current students	7	3%	22	33%
Student Services courses taught				
* department orientation	23	9%	47	71%
* intern/job search	20	8%	10	15%
* career development	23	9%	17	26%
Orientation Programs				
* First-year Summer	65	26%	53	80%
* Transfer Student	45	18%	53	80%
* Destination Iowa State	39	16%	27	41%
* Apex, GWC, Hixson	14	6%	19	29%
Student Enrichment Programs				
* Study Abroad	87	35%	39	59%
* Honors	103	41%	33	50%
* Dept clubs/student organizations	129	52%	45	68%
Student Services Committees				
* Curriculum	129	52%	33	50%
* Student Awards	75	30%	22	33%
* ISU Recruit/Retention	15	6%	21	32%
* Other	35	14%	28	42%
Release Time?				
* Yes	11	4%	37	56%
* No	184	74%	26	39%
* No responsibilities assigned	53	21%	3	5%

How Respondents Feel About Advising

Questions 27 thru 31 asked the respondents about how they feel about their work as advisers. Questions were asked regarding the busiest times of the semester, adviser training, how much they like their role as an adviser and what conditions/situations make their job difficult. (See Section 5 of the Appendix for a detailed summary of the responses.)

Regarding busiest time of the semester, both faculty and P&S respondents indicate that course registration is the busiest time of the year (88% and 74%, respectively). A larger percentage of P&S respondents feel that they are busy all year (49%) when compared to faculty respondents (27%).

Although various adviser training opportunities are available, both faculty and P&S respondents indicate they are too busy to participate (53 % and 61%, respectively). When asked to identify from a list of seven adviser training opportunities the activities they most often utilize, approximately 1/3 of P&S respondents identified that they use six of the seven activities listed and seem to most often use the advisernews listserv for information (68%). Faculty respondents most often utilize department workshops/seminars (30%) and the advisernews listserv (27%) for their adviser training and information. (See the following table for a summary of responses about adviser training. See

Table 4. Adviser Training - Utilization Rates and Resources Used.

Characteristic	Faculty #	Faculty %	P&S #	P&S %
Adviser Training Opportunity				
* Not aware of training opportunities	55	22%	5	8%
* Too busy to participate	131	53%	41	62%
* Participate, but want more	12	5%	10	15%
* Participate frequently	27	11%	8	12%
Training Utilized				
* Fin Aid Mini-conference	2	1%	20	31%
* UAAC workshops/seminars	17	8%	22	34%
* ISU Advisers Exchange	11	5%	22	34%
* Advisernews listserv	67	27%	44	68%
* Dept. workshops/seminars	74	30%	20	31%
* Off-campus workshops/conferences	6	2%	25	39%
* Other	14	6%	10	16%

Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point scale how much they like academic advising, with 1 being "don't like" and 5 being "like much". Both faculty (57%) and P&S (91%) responded that they like academic advising (4-5 rating). In general, there are few faculty (11%) and P&S (3%) respondents that rated their advising role as a 1 or 2 on the scales presented.

Respondents were asked to identify conditions/situations which make advising difficult from a list of seven items. Approximately one-third (30%) of the faculty respondents indicate "no difficulties" in their advising work, while only 9% of the P&S respondents indicate there are "no difficulties". P&S respondents indicate that "advisee load" (33%) and "time involved" (30%) make advising difficult, while faculty respondents indicate "time involved" (32%) as the condition that makes advising difficult. An open-ended comment section reveals that 15 respondents felt that advising is not recognized or valued within their unit. Twelve respondents suggest that students who are unmotivated or who have poor academic preparation make the job of advising difficult. Other comments include lack of pay/advancement, lack of release time, little clerical support, poor

physical space, availability of information make the job more difficult. (Table 5 summarizes the results of the satisfaction part of the survey.)

Table 5. Satisfaction with advising role and conditions/situations which make advising difficult.

Characteristic	Faculty #	Faculty %	P&S #	P&S %
Like Advising				
* 1 - Don't like	9	4%	0	
* 2	19	8%	2	3%
* 3	74	30%	3	5%
* 4	89	36%	20	30%
* 5 - Like much	52	21%	40	61%
Difficult Conditions/situations				
* No difficulties	73	30%	6	9%
* Advisee load	31	13%	33	33%
* Time involved	78	32%	30	30%
* Lack of support/training	26	11%	14	22%
* Department supervision	9	4%	6	9%
* Accountability	16	7%	3	5%
* Other	48	19%	19	29%

APPENDIX

Section 1: Survey Instrument

Section 2: Demographics of Respondents

Section 3: Adviser Workload

Section 4: Student Services Responsibilities

Section 5: How Do Respondents Feel About Advising?

Section 6: General Comments of Interest

Section 1: Survey Instrument

The University Academic Advising Committee (UAAC) requests your time in completing the following survey. This survey is intended to assess the various responsibilities you have as an academic adviser and the services you provide to students, within your department and to the university in assisting undergraduate students. **THANK YOU!**

Adviser Survey

Please record the following background information.

1. Your College at Iowa State University: (If you have a split appointment, please record both colleges involved.)

- Agriculture
- Business
- Design
- Engineering
- Human Sciences
- Liberal Arts & Sciences
- Veterinary Medicine

2. Your ISU Department: (If you have a split appointment, please record all departments involved.)

[OPEN-ENDED]

3. What is your position title at ISU?

- Full Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Graduate Research/Teaching Assistant
- P&S Staff

- 4a. If you are P&S Staff, please record your P level.

- P11
- P12
- P13
- P14
- P15
- P16
- P17
- P18
- P19
- P20

4b. If you are P&S staff, where does your salary fall on the pay matrix?

- First third
- Midpoint
- Top third
- Don't Know

5. What is the highest degree you have obtained?

- Bachelors
- Masters
- PhD

6. Please record your gender.

- Male
- Female

7. Please record your age.

- Less than 30
- 30 – 39
- 40 – 49
- 50 – 59
- 60 years or older

8. Please record your race or ethnic group. (You may select more than one answer.)

- White, Caucasian
- Black, African American
- Hispanic, Latino
- American Indian, Alaska Native
- Asian, Pacific Islander
- Other (Please describe: _____)

9. How many years have you been an academic adviser at ISU?

- 1 – 5 years
- 6 – 10 years
- 11 – 15 years
- 16 – 20 years
- More than 20 years

10. Which classifications of student do you advise? (Check all that apply.)

- Freshmen
- Sophomores
- Juniors
- Senior

11. Do you advise incoming transfer students?

- Yes
- No

12. On average, how many undergraduates do you advise per semester?

- Less than 25
- 25-49
- 50-149
- 150-249
- 250-350
- 350 and above

13. How is your undergraduate student advising workload determined?

- Departmental formula (X advisees = X % assignment)
- Determined by department chair/administrator
- Other (Please describe: _____)

14. According to your contract or position description, what percentage of your work time is designated for academic advising?

15. About what percentage of your work time do you actually spend on academic advising?

16. Which of the following statements best describes your advising workload?

- I have too many advisees to adequately meet their needs.
- I meet the needs of my advisees with difficulty.
- My advising workload is about right.
- Other _____

17. Are you given release time for other student services responsibilities? (This includes recruitment or retention activities, etc.)

- Yes
- No
- I don't have any other student services responsibilities.

We are interested in the responsibilities you have as an academic adviser.

18. Do you advise students in the following areas? (Check all that apply.)

- Course selection and long-term plans.
- Planning future career and/or exploring alternative majors
- Assessment of transfer credits
- Application of courses to degree programs
- Student's professional development
- Personal issues and student concerns
- Special populations, such as learning disabled, at risk, etc.
- Writing letters of support for students for Financial Aid, jobs, reinstatement, scholarships, etc.

19. Please check the recruitment activities you participate in on a regular basis. (Check all that apply.)

- On-campus programs**, such as Experience Iowa State student ambassador programs which assist with prospective student visits, athletic recruitment efforts, etc.
- Off-campus programs**, such as college fairs, community college visits, etc.
- Special programs** (on or off campus), such as "Taking the Road Less Traveled", middle school experience, high school minority student visits, etc.
- Daily activities**, such as phone calls, emails, or letters to prospective students, parents, and guidance counselors, etc.

20. Are you involved in any of the following retention activities or efforts?
(Check all that apply.)

- Learning Communities
- Ambassador/Peer Mentor Programs
- Career Development Projects, Workshops or Presentations
- Special University Retention Initiatives such as the calling project or the University retention committee
- Newsletters (electronic or printed) to current students

21. Do you teach any of the following courses? (Check all that apply.)

- Department based ISU orientation course
- Field experience/job search course or workshop
- Career development course or workshop (resumes, etc.)

22. Are you involved in any of the following Student Orientation Programs?
(Check all that apply.)

- First-year student summer orientation program
- Transfer student orientation programs
- Destination Iowa State
- Other (Apex, Carver Academy, MVP, Hixson, GWC, etc.)

23. Are you involved in promoting or facilitating any of the following programs?
(Check all that apply.)

- Study Abroad Program
- Honors Program
- Department clubs or student organizations

24. Which of the following administrative duties within your department have you been assigned? (Check all that apply.)

- Maintain record of advisees, track advisees
- Assign advisees to advising staff, manage advising staff
- Train new advisers
- Develop forms used for special student academic requests
- Assist with curriculum or catalog changes
- Assist with DARS updates as catalog change
- Work with DARS review for graduation approval
- Assist with course management – class/number of sections needed projections
- Help in department scholarship process – advertising and selection of student recipients
- Assist in the development of marketing brochures, web information and other materials for current/prospective students.

25. Which of the following student services related committees do you routinely serve on?

- Curriculum committee
- Student award committees
- University recruitment or retention committees
- Other (Please describe: _____)

26. What other academic advising responsibilities do you have within your department or college that have not been mentioned above?

27. What are your busiest times of year related to advising students? (Check all that apply.)

- Start of the semester
- Course registration
- End of the semester
- Summer orientation
- No one busiest time; I am busy all year advising students.

28. Is “adviser training” (support which helps you do a better job advising students) available to you?

- I am not aware of any adviser training opportunities available to me
- I am aware of training opportunities but am usually too busy to participate.
- I participate in adviser training opportunities, but there are not enough of them available.
- I participate in adviser training opportunities frequently.

29. Which of the following types of adviser training opportunities do you routinely utilize? (Check all that apply.)

- Annual Student Financial Aid Mini-Conference
- Academic Advising Committee's professional development seminars/workshops
- The Advisers' Exchange; the informal, monthly, brown-bag gathering of ISU advisors
- Advisernews Listserv
- Departmental workshops and seminars
- Professional advising conferences/workshops (off-campus)
- Other (Please describe: _____)

SECTION 2: DEMOGRAPHICS OF RESPONDENTS

The sample for this study was comprised of all current ISU undergraduate academic advisers. CSSM staff contacted 571 advisers by letter and email. Of the 571 advisers in the sample, 24 were not eligible (no longer advised undergraduate students). A total of 322 eligible surveys were completed.

Q1: Respondents – By Classification and College

** RESPONDENTS: 547 eligible respondents ("advisers")
 322 respondents
 225 non-respondents

** RETURN RATE of 59%.

** FACULTY: 249 or 77% of respondents.

Agriculture	71	28.5%
Business	22	8.8%
Design	29	11.7%
Engineering	34	13.7%
Human Science	21	8.4%
LAS	75	30.1%
Vet Med	6	2.4%

** 32 respondents did not ID dept; some respondents have a split appointment and were counted in both colleges.

** P&S: 66 or 23% of respondents

Agriculture	12	18.2%
Business	7	10.6%
Design	5	7.6%
Engineering	13	19.7%
Human Science	14	21.2%
LAS	21	31.8%
Vet Med	1	1.5%

Q2: Respondents By Department:

** 32 did not ID department: some respondents have split appointments and were counted in both departments.

** 63 departments responded to the survey, with the most respondents from the following five depts.:

Agronomy	(22)
CCEE	(22))
Economics	(13)
BBMB	(13)
EEOB	(12)

Q3: Respondents By Position/Title:

FACULTY:	Full Professor	85	34.1%
	Assoc Professor	81	32.5%
	Ass't Professor	61	24.5%
	Instructor/Lecturer	22	8.8%

** 166 (67%) of FACULTY respondents were either assoc or full professors; 61 (25%) were assistant professors.

P&S: all respondents in this category are “staff”.

Q4: P-Level of P&S respondents:

P11	3	4.6%
P12	2	3.0%
P13	25	37.9%
P14	20	30.3%
P15	7	10.6%
P16	2	3.0%
P18	1	1.5%
Unknown	6	9.1%

** 45 (68%) of P&S respondents were P13-14, 10 (15%) were higher and 5 (8%) were lower classification. Six staff indicated they did not know their P-Level.

Salary Position in Pay Matrix of P&S respondents:

First Third	36	54.6%
Midpoint	7	10.6%
Top Third	1	1.5%
Unknown	22	33.3%

** 36 (55%) of P&S respondents fall in the first third of the pay matrix, while 8 (12%) fall in the mid-to upper third of the matrix. One- third of the respondents (22) did not know where they fell in the pay matrix.

Q5: Highest Degree Obtained by Respondent:

FACULTY:	Bachelors	2	.8%
	Masters	34	13.7%
	PhD	212	85.1%
P&S:	Bachelors	11	16.7%
	Masters	45	68.2%
	PhD	9	13.6%

** 212 (85%) of FACULTY respondents hold PhD's.

** 54 (82%) of P&S respondents hold masters degrees or higher.

Q6: Respondents by Gender:

FACULTY:	Male	171	68.7%
	Female	78	31.3%
P&S:	Males	21	31.8%
	Females	45	68.2%

Significantly more male FACULTY respondents (69%), while there were more female P&S respondents (68%).

Q7: Respondents by Age:

FACULTY:	Less than 30	2	.8%
	30-39	40	16.1%
	40-49	78	31.3%
	50-59	92	37%
	60 or older	35	14.1%
P&S:	Less than 30	6	9.1%
	30-39	18	27.3%
	40-49	20	30.3%
	50-59	20	30.3%
	60 or older	2	3%

** The 50 and older group for FACULTY is much larger when compared to P&S respondents (51% and 33%, respectively).

** A similar percentage of FACULTY and P&S respondents are in the 40-49 age group (31% and 30%, respectively).

** a much smaller percentage of FACULTY respondents are 39 and younger when compared to P&S respondents (17% and 36%, respectively).

Q8: Respondents by Ethnicity:

FACULTY:	White, Caucasian	208	83.5%
	Black, African Amer	4	1.6%
	Hispanic, Latino	3	1.2%
	Amer Indian, Alaska	1	.4%
	Asian, Pacific Islander	23	9.2%
	Other	4	
P&S:	White, Caucasian	61	92.4%
	Black, African Amer	3	4.6%
	Hispanic, Latino	3	4.6%
	Amer Indian, Alaska	2	.4%
	Asian, Pacific Islander	1	1.5%

** Both FACULTY and P&S respondents are predominantly Caucasian with 84% and 92%, respectively.

** FACULTY respondents show the largest minority group to be Asian, Pacific Islander with 9% or 23 respondents indicating this group.

Q9: Respondents by Years of Advising at ISU:

FACULTY:	1-5	83	33.3%
	6-10	40	16.1%
	11-15	25	10%
	16-20	26	10.4%
	>20	73	29.3%
P&S	1-5	40	60.6%
	6-10	13	19.7%
	11-15	6	9.1%
	16-20	5	7.6%
	>20	2	3%

** A significant number of FACULTY have advised 20+ years when compared to P&S (29% and 3%, respectively).

** A large percentage of P&S respondents have advised for 5 years or less when compared to FACULTY respondents (61% and 33%, respectively).

SECTION 3: ADVISER WORK LOAD

Q12: Advisees Per Semester:

FACULTY:	< 25	181	72.7%
	25-49	44	17.7%
	50-149	19	7.6%
	150-249	0	
	250-350	0	
	350+	2	.8%
P&S:	< 25	8	12.1%
	25-49	2	3%
	50-149	10	15.2%
	150-249	19	28.8%
	250-350	11	16.7%
	350+	16	24.2%

** 181 (73%) FACULTY respondents advise less than 25 students per semester.

** 27 P&S respondents (41%) advise 250 or more students per semester.

Q 13: How Advising Workload is Determined:

FACULTY:	Dept. formula	25	10%
	Dept. chair/administrator	128	51.4%
	Other	82	33%
P&S	Dept. formula	8	12.1%
	Dept. chair/administrator	32	48.5%
	Other	21	31.8%

** According to both FACULTY and P&S respondents, most often workload is assigned by the dept. chair/administrator (51% and 49%, respectively).

** One-third of the respondents in both groups indicated OTHER means were used to determine workload.

Select Comments (responses to "Other")

** 25 respondents said they do not know how advising assignments are made.

** 40 respondents said that advisees were assigned by need or # of students in a specific program/major.

** 11 respondents said advisees are self-assigned, or that they volunteer to advise, or that advising is just expected with no credit given by their department.

** others comments included assignments were random, or done by the dept. secretary, or that students select them as their adviser, or that the dept. balanced the load.

Q14: According to contract, the percent of time designated for advising:

FACULTY:	0-24%	187	75.1%
	25-49%	7	2.8%
	50-100%	4	1.6%
	No response	51	20.5%
P&S	0-24%	12	18.2%
	25-49%	10	15.2%
	50-100%	40	60.6%
	No response	4	6.1%

** 100 FACULTY respondents (40%) said that 0% of time was actually assigned for advising. 178 FACULTY (72%) said that less than 10% time was given.

** 40 P&S respondents (61%) said that over one-half of their assignment was advising.

Q15: Percentage of time actually spent on advising:

FACULTY:	0-24%	215	86.3%
	25-49%	11	4.4%
	50-100%	8	3.2%
	No response	15	6%
P&S	0-24%	9	13.7%
	25-49%	6	9.1%
	50-100%	50	75.8%
	No response	1	

** 215 FACULTY respondents (86%) indicated they spend less than 25% of their time with advising students. 147 FACULTY (59%) responded that they spent 5% or less of their time on advising.

** 50 P&S respondents (76%) indicated that they spend 50% or more of their time on advising.

Q16: Statement which best describes how respondent feels about advising workload:

FACULTY;	Too many advisees to meet need	5	2%
	Meet needs with difficulty	40	16.1%
	Advising load is about right	165	66.3%
	Other	36	14.5%
P&S:	Too many advisees to meet need	11	16.7%
	Meet needs with difficulty	28	42.4%
	Advising load is about right	17	25.8%
	Other	10	15.2%

** 39 P&S respondents (59%) felt that they were meeting student needs with difficulty or had too many advisees to meet their needs. 45 FACULTY respondents (18%) felt student needs were met with difficulty or they had too many advisees.

** 165 FACULTY respondents (66%) felt their advising load was appropriate, while 17 P&S respondents (26%) felt load was appropriate.

Select Comments:

- * 5 respondents indicated that load was light and could handle more. Some indicated that they had plenty of time if the students would come in.
- * 5 respondents indicated that advising was an added job and they do not have time to keep up with changes.
- * 3 respondents indicated that they must work overtime to complete all tasks.
- * some indicated that a small number of advisees make learning the system too inefficient.
- * some commented on lack of reward for advising and that it took time away from scholarship or other rewarded job assignments.

SECTION 4: STUDENT SERVICES RESPONSIBILITIES

Q 17: Given release time for other student services responsibilities?

FACULTY:	Yes	11	4.4%
	No	184	73.9%
	No SS responsibilities	53	21.3%
	No response	1	
P&S:	Yes	37	56.1%
	No	26	39.4%
	No SS responsibilities	3	4.6%

** 53 FACULTY respondents (21%) have no Student Services responsibilities beyond advising, while only 3 P&S respondents (5%) have no added Student Services responsibilities beyond advising.

** 37 P&S respondents (56%) are given release time for Student Services responsibilities.

** 184 FACULTY respondents (74%) have Student Services responsibilities and are given NO release time for these tasks.

Q 18: Does respondent advise students in the following areas?

FACULTY:	Course selection/planning	239	96%
	Future careers, alternate majors	215	86.4%
	Assess transfer credits	116	46.6%
	Course application to degree rqmts	206	82.7%
	Student professional development	207	83.1%
	Personal issues/student concerns	194	77.9%
	Special popn's (at risk, learn disabled)	62	24.9%
	Support letters (scholarships, jobs, aid)	220	88.4%
P&S:	Course selection/planning	65	98.5%
	Future careers, alternate majors	60	90.9%
	Assess transfer credits	60	90.9%
	Course application to degree rqmts	63	95.5%
	Student professional development	57	86.4%
	Personal issues/student concerns	61	92.4%
	Special popn's (at risk, learn disabled)	51	77.3%
	Support letters (scholarships, jobs, aid)	60	90.0%

** More than 75% of FACULTY and P&S respondents engage in all of the tasks above with the exception of FACULTY respondents who show less frequent involvement in the assessment of transfer credits (47%) and work with special populations (25%).

Q 19: RECRUITMENT activities participated in on a regular basis:

FACULTY:	On-campus programs	78	31.3%
	Off-campus programs	34	13.7%
	Special programs	43	17.3%
	Daily activities	91	36.6%
P&S:	On-campus programs	56	84.9%
	Off-campus programs	22	33.3%
	Special programs	31	47%
	Daily activities	57	86.4%

** FACULTY respondents are less frequently involved in recruitment activities of any kind (14-37%) when compared with P&S respondents (33-86%).

** P&S respondents are more frequently involved in recruiting on-campus (85%) and in daily activities (86%), as were FACULTY respondents (31% and 37%, respectively).

** P&S respondents are also frequently involved in special programs (47%).

Q20: RETENTION activities involvement:

FACULTY:	Learning Communities	52	20.9%
	Ambassador/Peer Mentor Programs	15	6%
	Career Development Programs	40	16.1%
	ISU retention initiatives	16	6.4%
	Newsletters to current students	7	2.8%
P&S:	Learning Communities	40	60.6%
	Ambassador/Peer Mentor Programs	23	34.9%
	Career Development Programs	28	42.4%
	ISU retention initiatives	15	22.7%
	Newsletters to current students	22	33.3%

** P&S respondents are more often involved in Learning Community activities when compared to FACULTY (61% and 21%, respectively).

** P&S respondents were more frequently involved in the retention activities above (23-61%, respectively) when compared to FACULTY respondents (3-21%, respectively).

Q 21: Student Service-related courses taught:

FACULTY:	Dept. Orientation course	23	9.2%
	Intern/job search course	20	8%
	Career Development course	23	9.2%
P&S:	Dept. Orientation course	47	71.2%
	Intern/job search course	10	15.2%
	Career Development course	17	25.8%

** P&S respondents were more frequently involved in teaching the student services-related courses above (15-71%, respectively) than were FACULTY respondents (8-9%).

** P&S respondents frequently teach orientation courses (71%).

Q 22: Involvement in Student Orientation Programs:

FACULTY:	1st Year Summer Orientation	65	26.1%
	Transfer Student Orientation	45	18.1%
	Destination Iowa State	39	15.7%
	Other (Apex, Carver, Hixson, GWC, etc.)	14	5.6%
P&S:	1st Year Summer Orientation	53	80.3%
	Transfer Student Orientation	53	80.3%
	Destination Iowa State	27	40.9%
	Other (Apex, Carver, Hixson, GWC, etc.)	19	28.8%

** P&S respondents were more frequently involved in orientation programs (29-80%) than were FACULTY respondents (6-26%).

Q23: Involvement in other Student Enrichment Activities:

FACULTY:	Study Abroad Program	87	34.9%
	Honors Program	103	41.4%
	Dept. clubs/student organizations	129	51.8%
P&S:	Study Abroad Program	39	59.1%
	Honors Program	33	50%
	Dept. clubs/student organizations	45	68.2%

** P&S respondents were more frequently involved in the student enrichment activities above (50-68%) than were FACULTY respondents (35-52%).

** FACULTY respondents were more often involved in Study Abroad (35%), Honors (41%) and Dept. Clubs/student organizations (52%).

** P&S respondents were most often involved in Study Abroad (59%), in Honors (50%) and in dept clubs/student organizations (68%).

Q24: Student Services - Administrative duties:

FACULTY:	Maintain advisee record, track	93	37.4%
	Assign advisees, manage adv staff	19	7.6%
	Train new advisers	26	10.4%
	Develop forms used for acad requests	14	5.6%
	Assist with curriculum and catalog	140	56.2%
	Assist with DARS/updates	53	21.3%
	Graduation approvals	63	25.3%
	Course management-course projections	54	21.7%
	Dept. scholarship-admin and selection	92	37.0%
Develop marketing materials	67	26.9%	
P&S:	Maintain advisee record, track	59	89.4%
	Assign advisees, manage adv staff	23	34.9%
	Train new advisers	29	43.9%
	Develop forms used for acad requests	28	42.4%
	Assist with curriculum and catalog	50	75.8%
	Assist with DARS/updates	44	66.7%
	Graduation approvals	50	75.8%
	Course management-course projections	38	57.6%
	Dept. scholarship-admin and selection	37	56.1%
Develop marketing materials	44	66.7%	

** P&S respondents were more frequently involved in administrative duties (35-89%) than FACULTY respondents (6-56%).

** FACULTY respondents were most frequently involved in curriculum and catalog duties (56%), maintaining advisee records and tracking advisees(37%) and in dept, scholarship administration and selection (37%).

** P&S respondents were most frequently involved in maintaining advisee records and tracking (89%), curriculum and catalog duties (76%) and graduation approvals (76%). Many were also involved in DARS/updates (67%) and the development of marketing materials (67%).

Q25: Student Services COMMITTEE involvement:

FACULTY:	Curriculum Committee	129	51.8%
	Student Awards Committee	75	30.1%
	ISU Recruit/Retention Committee	15	6%
	Other	35	14.1%
P&S:	Curriculum Committee	33	50%
	Student Awards Committee	22	33.3%
	ISU Recruit/Retention Committee	21	31.8%
	Other	28	42.4%

** FACULTY and P&S respondents indicated they are frequently involved in student service-related committee work (6-52% and 32-50%, respectively).

** FACULTY respondents are most often involved in Curriculum committee work (52%) and Student Awards Committees (30%).

** P&S respondents are often involved in Curriculum committee work (50%), Student Awards (33%) and Recruitment/Retention (32%).

** P&S respondents (42%) indicate they are involved in Other student services committees, while 14% of FACULTY respondents indicate Other committee work. See "select comments" section.

Select Comments:

* respondents listed service on 40+ different departmental, college and university committees, taskforces, and various groups that relate to undergraduate student issues.

* some responded that they serve on 5+ committees each semester.

* most frequent committees listed were:

college advisory committees, councils

curriculum, learning outcomes and assessment groups, ISUComm

learning community committees

academic affairs, AUJ

dept. scholarship and awards

honors program

academic standards

recruitment and retention committees

Orientation committees

Admissions

Diversity

Disabilities

Technology, computer fees committees

Career guidance and placement groups

Study Abroad

Q 26: Other advising responsibilities which have not been mentioned:

- * Internship/practicum advising
- * Senior portfolio class
- * dept. website development
- * course advertising, bulletin boards and displays
- * develop web-based instruction materials (WebCT) for orientation class
- * develop electronic newsletters for alumni
- * maintain relations with industry/employers
- * develop advising procedures and routines for dept.
- * senior exit interviews
- * manage adviser evaluations for dept.
- * manage test-out exams for dept.

SECTION 5: HOW DO RESPONDENTS FEEL ABOUT ADVISING?

Q 27: Busiest times of the year as adviser:

FACULTY:	Start of semester	67	26.9%
	Course registration	218	87.6%
	End of semester	28	11.2%
	Summer orientation	26	10.4%
	Busy all year	19	7.6%
P&S:	Start of semester	37	56.1%
	Course registration	49	74.2%
	End of semester	13	19.7%
	Summer orientation	31	47%
	Busy all year	32	48.5%

** Course registration is most frequently indicated as the busiest time by both FACULTY respondents (88%) as well as P&S respondents (74%).

** A significantly larger percent of P&S respondents feel that they are busy all year (49%) when compared to FACULTY respondents (8%).

** More P&S respondents indicate that they are busy at the start of the semester (56%) when compared to the FACULTY respondents (27%).

** More P&S respondents indicate they are busy with summer orientation (47%) when compared to FACULTY respondents (10%).

Q 28: Adviser Training Opportunities:

FACULTY:	Not aware of training opps	55	22.1%
	Too busy to participate	131	52.6%
	Participate, but want more	12	4.8%
	Participate frequently	27	10.8%
	No response	24	
P&S:	Not aware of training opps	5	7.6%
	Too busy to participate	41	62.1%
	Participate, but want more	10	15.2%
	Participate frequently	8	12.1%
	No response	2	

** 41 P&S respondents (61%) and 131 FACULTY respondents (53%) are too busy to participate in training opportunities.

Q29: Adviser training opportunities most frequently utilized:

FACULTY:	Financial Aid Mini-Conference	2	.8%
	UAAC workshops and seminars	17	7.7%
	ISU Adviser Exchange	11	4.5%
	Advisernews listserv	67	27.1%
	Dept workshops and seminars	74	30%
	Off-campus workshops, conferences	6	2.4%
	Other	14	5.7%
P&S:	Financial Aid Mini-Conference	20	30.8%
	UAAC workshops and seminars	22	33.9%
	ISU Adviser Exchange	22	33.9%
	Advisernews listserv	44	67.7%
	Dept workshops and seminars	20	30.8%
	Off-campus workshops, conferences	25	38.5%
	Other	10	15.4%

Selected Other:

- * College adviser meetings and retreats are frequently used for training.
- * Many use other more experienced advisers as contacts for answers.
- * CELT training sessions and newsletter.
- * WebCT workshops.

Q 30: How much do you like academic advising?

FACULTY:	Don't Like	1	9	3.6%
		2	19	7.6%
		3	74	29.7%
		4	89	35.7%
	Like much	5	52	20.9%
	No response		6	
P&S:	Don't Like	1	0	
		2	2	3%
		3	3	4.6%
		4	20	30.3%
	Like much	5	40	60.6%
	No response		1	

** 52 FACULTY respondents (21%) indicated that they liked advising work very much, while 40 P&S respondents (61%) said they liked advising very much..

** In general, there are few FACULTY and P&S respondents who indicate they do not like advising. 28 FACULTY (11%) and 2 P&S (3%) respondents rated their advising role as 1 or 2 on the scale presented.

Q 31: What conditions/situations make advising difficult?

FACULTY:	No difficulties	73	29.6%
	Advisee load	31	12.6%
	Time involved	78	31.6%
	Lack of support/training	26	10.5%
	Department supervision	9	3.6%
	Accountability	16	6.5%
	Other	48	19.4%
P&S:	No difficulties	6	9.2%
	Advisee load	33	33%
	Time involved	30	30%
	Lack of support/training	14	21.5%
	Department supervision	6	9.2%
	Accountability	3	4.6%
	Other	19	29.2%

** 33 P&S respondents (33%) said that advising load makes the job difficult compared to 31 FACULTY (13%) respondents.

** 32% of FACULTY and 30% of P&S respondents said that the time involved makes advising difficult.

Select Comments:

- * 15 respondents commented about advising not being recognized or valued.
- * 12 responded that students who are unmotivated or who are of poor academic quality make the job more difficult.
- * 11 responded that learning the ropes and keeping up to date make the job difficult.
- * 11 responded that the job is harder because of the time that must be given to other job responsibilities
- * 6 indicated that lack of pay and advancement make the job harder.
- * other comments included: lack of release time, little clerical support, poor physical space, availability of information, personal counseling that is part of the job ... all of these factors make the job more difficult.

SECTION 6: GENERAL COMMENTS OF INTEREST:

There were many open-ended comments from respondents. Below is a sampling of some of the responses:

THE POSITIVES:

"The interior design program requires a very close one-to-one relationship between the instructor and the student in the studio and out of the studio. This allows me to get to know the student quickly and thoroughly. I am constantly consulted on personal and professional topics. In fact, I find myself advising even after graduation, especially during job searches or in between jobs. I feel advising allows me to touch young minds and careers in a very profound way. Advising is a crucial part of my teaching, creative activities and research. Without advising students, my teaching would have not been complete. I love it!"

"I feel we perform a very important job. Students and parents are quick to comment when they appreciate some effort we make."

"Advising students is an honor and pleasure. I could not imagine calling myself a "professor" if it did not include advising in each of the programs I participate."

"I believe that advising is a critical component to a faculty job at ISU. It engages faculty in the curriculum and campus life. Advising is not hard. In fact, it is very easy. I think more faculty should be engaged in undergraduate student advising."

THE ISSUES:

"Make systems and forms more universal across colleges. Improve pay systems for P&S staff - add additional levels or grades. Increase attention to the importance of advising and teaching of undergraduates institutionally, to make administration aware of the importance of those areas in recruitment and retention so as to place advising and teach in the same category with research and grant money."

"Advising should be considered another form of teaching and should be recognized and rewarded as such. Advising should be valued as one of the most important functions of the university. To be valued it must be evaluated and be made accountable just as teaching and research are made to be accountable in the academy."

"Since starting 12 years ago my job has changed drastically - advisers seem to be called upon to take on more and more responsibilities with little or no recognition through pay or reduced other responsibilities. The primary job responsibilities of time on task of advising has been diminished. It is harder and harder to feel like I am doing an adequate job."

"My salary is in the bottom third ... I am \$300 above the hiring range and this is after 14 years in this position and more than 25 years at ISU. I do not anticipate that I will ever reach the salary midpoint, regardless of how much I do, how long I do it, or how well it is done."

"Along with unrealistic advisee loads, advisers are being asked to do more and more administrative tasks and advisers job vary so much around campus. I think it is important that we establish a maximum number of advisees , more release time for administrative duties (recruiting, retention, committees) and upper administration needs to learn the many roles that adviser take on at this university."

IN CONCLUSION:

"Thanks for making this survey available I have been told on numerous occasions that advising is important (generally followed by a glance at wristwatch and the words 'sorry, I can't stay longer'). I am hopeful that enough has been said, and something will be done. Don't tell me, show me!"