

# **Survey of Undergraduate Students Regarding Academic Advising at Iowa State University - Spring 2006**

## **Prepared By:**

Subcommittee, University Academic Advising Committee

Members: Mary Goodwin (chair)  
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 Flage, 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  
Mike Retallick, Agriculture  
Deb Sanborn, Academic Success Center  
Lynn Sandeman, Liberal Arts and Sciences  
Karen Zunkel, Provost Office

**Submitted: April 30, 2007**

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>Part A: Recommendations for Action</b> .....	3
<b>Part B: Summary of Additional Findings</b> .....	5
<b>Part C: Methodology</b> .....	6
<b>Part D: Results of Student Survey</b> .....	6
<b>Appendix A: Supplemental Tables</b> .....	24
 <b>Open Ended Comments from Question 22:</b> The one thing that would most improve academic advising at Iowa State University would be	
<b>Appendix B: If advisors had more time....knew who I was</b> .....	45
<b>Appendix C: If advisors were more knowledgeable</b> .....	96
<b>Appendix D: Nothing can be improved, everything is fine</b> .....	123
<b>Appendix E: More email contact</b> .....	132
<b>Appendix F: Miscellaneous/not sorted yet into a category</b> .....	135

## INTRODUCTION

The University Academic Advising Committee (UAAC) began discussions in the fall of 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 advisers 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 undergraduate students. As part of another study, the UAAC also surveyed academic advisers about advising during the fall of 2005.

A draft survey was constructed by a subcommittee of UAAC members during the fall of 2005. Funding was provided by the Office of the Provost and the survey was then edited and prepared for web administration by Information Technology Services during the spring of 2006. 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

- 1. Colleges and departments should re-evaluate adviser to advisee ratios, to align them with national guidelines based on other assignments/duties of individuals who are serving as advisers.**

In the quantitative data there was a general theme of the importance and expectation of advisers making a personal connection with their students. This shows up in the expectation of mentoring, getting to know me as a person, writing letters of recommendations for students and contacting them about important events. In the qualitative data, roughly half of the students in the open-ended responses on how advising could be improved made statements to the effect of wanting more time with their adviser and indicating a desire that their adviser would get to know them as a person. It is clear from this data that ISU students have the expectation that their adviser will have the time to get to know them as individuals.

This type of personal advising takes an on-going time commitment from advisers. This expectation when coupled with the excessive advising workload issue raised in the Survey of Academic Advisers report (September, 2006) creates a strong disconnect between student expectations and staffing decisions related to advising.

- 2. Increased discussion and sharing of best practices related to advising after the first year.**

In several categories, it became apparent that ISU has done a good job of advising and connecting with first year students. However, in some areas there are significant differences in the perceptions of our seniors. For example, the “quality of advising” question from National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) shows that the decline in perception of quality at ISU between first year and senior year is significantly greater than for our peers (e.g. Peers: 58% to 55%, ISU 84% to 70%). This also was reflected in

other survey items. ISU has invested significant time and resources into the first year experience. From a raw retention rate scenario, this is the appropriate place to invest significant resources. However, if we are going to continue to serve students, it is important that the advising experience evolves as the students evolve across their entire academic career. It is recommended that UAAC offer professional development opportunities that will enhance adviser knowledge of expectations and issues surrounding advising upper-class students.

### **3. Increase knowledge and resources for advisors and advisees.**

#### **A. Development of basic knowledge of financial aid area among advisers.**

There is a strong expectation among all respondents regardless of year in school that academic advisers should be knowledgeable about financial aid issues. According to the Office of Financial Aid Since about 83.5% of ISU undergraduates receive some type of financial aid, it makes sense that advisers should be aware of the basic issues related to financial aid, especially when progress towards their degree affects aid. The Office of Student Financial Aid annually presents a mini-conference on issues. We need to encourage the increased participation of advisers in this program. We also recommend that UAAC work with the Office of Student Financial Aid to develop 'top ten' listing of issues that all advisers need to be aware of related to financial aid.

#### **B. Increase knowledge among advisers (and information for advisers and students) about all majors at ISU.**

Since ISU has a distributed advising system for undergraduate students, there is a high likelihood that an adviser in a department may not be familiar with other majors across campus. Yet 93% of the students responding that it was important that their advisers knew about other majors on campus and what careers those majors might lead towards. This need presents an opportunity for a partnership with UAAC, Career Services, and Admissions, to develop a one-stop information source (website) that highlights all the degree programs on the ISU campus, with links to contact individuals in specific departments. There are 'pieces' of this information available from different sources currently. Some of this information is available in the catalog, on the advising resources page and on the admissions pages. However, pulling these pieces together and enhancing the content would be a valuable assistance for advisers and students in meeting this expectation. There may be other strategies on how to address this issue, but this is a recommended first step.

#### **C. Review, update, and expand on-line sources of information.**

Electronic media (e-newsletters and websites) are the second highest source of information for students. Half of the respondents referred to these sources for advising related information. Since students are turning to these sources at significant levels, it is important that departments, colleges, and the university review, update and expand what is currently provided. Also, it is important to leverage the efforts of individuals who have already made significant progress in this area. We need to replicate best practices and information from one department to another and to

expand these offerings in an efficient manner. We recommend that UAAC develop a subcommittee or task force of individuals from across the campus, to review and make recommendations on how to enhance this area of advising.

**D. Clarifying the role of advising to students.**

Develop a set of expectations for students of what they can expect from advisers. This should take a developmental approach and be integrated into all orientation programs and linked to learning outcomes for advising.

**4. Further investigation into the 21% of students who disagreed that their adviser had positively impacted their continued enrollment.**

Although 79% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that their adviser had positively affected their continued enrollment at ISU, about 21% of the students disagreed. One out of every five respondents saying that their adviser or advising experience negatively impacted their retention is too high. We recommend that UAAC further investigate this through a thorough review of the qualitative data and other avenues (focus groups, etc.) to determine if there are patterns or common themes that the university can address to improve this percentage.

**5. Commitment to repeat this survey (and the adviser survey) in 2011 and every five years after.**

This survey is a benchmark. It is the beginning of a conscious effort to assess and improve academic advising.

## **Part B: Summary of Additional Findings**

1. It is a positive finding that over 75% of the respondents indicated that they only had one or two advisers. Considering that in most cases a change of degree program or major will necessitate an adviser change, this finding shows that our students have a fairly high continuity with their advisers.
2. The expectation is that students on probation will meet with their adviser. This survey was done prior to when the new academic probation policy had been in effect. This high expectation of proactive advising contact for probation students reinforces the decisions to implement the new early intervention strategies for students. Therefore, the new Academic Probation policy and practices are in alignment with the expectations of students.
3. The survey supported National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data. ISU advisers meet or exceed the U.S. average for adviser availability, accurate and up to date information, and quality of advising. ISU students rely on their advisors as their primary source of academic information at a significantly higher rate than other U.S. institutions. While ISU seniors rated their quality of advising higher than the national average, there was a drop in the perception of advising quality compared to first-year students.

## **Part C: Methodology of Student Survey**

During the spring 2006 semester, the University Academic Advising Committee (UAAC) conducted an undergraduate student survey of academic advising services. This web survey was available to all undergraduate students from mid-March through mid-April. The instrument used for the survey was developed by the UAAC, administered by Information Technology Services, and funded by the Office of the Provost.

### **Design and Procedures**

The survey was sent to all undergraduates enrolled for spring 2006 as identified by the Office of the Registrar. The questionnaire was developed by the UAAC and programmed and tested as a Web survey by ITS web services. To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, unique usernames and passwords were assigned to each student in the sample and the data was stored on a secure server.

ITS maintained the Web site and monitored the progress of the survey. Frequencies were run and the data set was cleaned. Data, frequencies, and a codebook were recorded and delivered to the UAAC subcommittee.

## **Part D: Results of Student Survey**

### **Demographics of Respondents**

About 21% of the student population responded to this survey during the spring of 2006. At that time student enrollment was 18,932. Almost 40% of the respondents were seniors, 26% were juniors, 19% sophomores and 15.5% were freshmen (Table 1).

College participation ranged from 16% to 24%. Engineering and LAS had the largest percentage of respondents with over 900 and 1100 respondents respectively. This is about twice as many respondents compared to the number of respondents in the colleges of Agriculture, Business and Human Sciences and about four times as many as the College of Design. Over 95% of the respondents were full-time students.

Close to 60% of the respondents' averaged between a 3.00 and 4.00 grade point average (GPA) and almost 37% between a 2.00 and a 3.00 GPA. Just 4% or 170 respondents out of 3971 self-identified as having a GPA between a 1.00 - 1.99 and eleven students indicated they had a GPA of less than 1.00.

**Table 1. Classification**

Classification	# Enrolled	# Respondents	% of Respondents	% of their class
Freshmen	3305	616	15.5% (616/3971)	18.6% (616/3305)
Sophomore	3760	751	18.9	20.0
Junior	4550	1038	26.1	22.8
Senior	6974	1566	39.4	22.5
Specials	343			
Total	18,932	3971	21.0	

**Table 2. College Breakdown**

College	# Enrolled	Respondents	% of Respondents
Agriculture	2305	500	21.7% (500/2305)
Business	3278	571	17.4
Design	1613	265	16.4
Human Services	2643	530	20.1
Engineering	3914	931	23.8
LAS	5179	1174	22.7
Total	18932	3971	21.0

**Table 3. Enrollment Status**

	# of Respondents	%
Full-Time	3791	95.5
Part-Time	180	4.5

**Table 4. Grade Point Average (GPA)**

GPA	Overall		1 <sup>st</sup> year		Sophomore		Junior		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Less than 1.0	11	0.3	5	0.8	2	.3	2	0.2	2	0.1
1.00-1.99	170	4.3	65	10.6	50	6.7	35	3.4	20	1.3
2.00-2.99	1448	36.5	226	36.7	258	34.4	389	37.5	575	36.7
3.00-4.00	2342	59.0	320	51.9	441	58.7	612	59.0	969	61.9
Total	3971		616		751		1038		1566	

**Number of Academic Advisers**

Survey question number five asked students about the number of academic advisers that they have had since entering ISU (Table 5). Overall, 75% responded that they had just one or two advisers, and about 92% had three or fewer academic advisers. Seniors (Table 5A) responded at a rate of 66% that they had one or two academic adviser with 26% of seniors indicating that they had only one adviser. As would be expected, 93% of first year students and about 80% of sophomores had two advisers or less.

**Table 5. Question #5: Number of academic advisers since entering ISU**

# Advisers	Respondents	%
1	1369	34.5
2	1603	40.4
3	668	16.9
4	236	6.0
5	66	1.7
6 or more	22	0.6
Total	3964	

**Table 5A. By Classification**

#	1 <sup>st</sup> Year	%	Sophomores	%	Juniors	%	Seniors	%
1	330	53.6	286	37.9	345	33.3	408	26.1
2	245	39.8	317	42.0	413	39.8	628	40.2
Total	575	<b>93.4</b>	603	<b>79.9</b>	758	<b>73.0</b>	1036	<b>66.3</b>

\* See Appendix A for full tables.

### Curriculum, Procedures, Content Knowledge Areas for Advisers

Questions asked students about their expectations of academic advisers regarding curriculum and university procedures. The results of four of these questions are shown below in Tables 6-9. Over 90% of the students agreed or strongly agreed that they expected advisers to assist with course selection/planning, to be knowledgeable about careers that apply to their major, to be familiar with alternative majors, and to be knowledgeable about university, college, and departmental policies.

**Table 6. Question 6a: I expect academic advisers at Iowa State to; a) assist with course selection/planning.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	2663	70.8
Agree	1016	27.0
Disagree	63	1.7
Strongly Disagree	18	0.5

**Table 7. Question 6b; be knowledgeable about careers that apply to my major.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	2666	70.9
Agree	1028	27.3
Disagree	56	1.5
Strongly Disagree	10	0.3



**Table 8. Question 6c; be familiar with alternative majors.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	1343	35.7
Agree	2146	57.1
Disagree	258	6.9
Strongly Disagree	13	0.4

**Table 9. Question 6k; be knowledgeable about university, college, and departmental policies, procedures, and deadlines.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	2838	75.5
Agree	861	22.9
Disagree	47	1.3
Strongly Disagree	14	0.4

**Help With Personal Issues**

For the expectation that advisers would help with “personal issues and concerns”, the percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed dropped to 58.5% (Table 10). First year students and sophomores agreed or strongly agreed on an average of 63% and 61%, slightly higher than the overall average, however, the overall average is influenced by the heavy weighting of the seniors and juniors who took the survey (66%). Only about 56% of the seniors agreed or strongly agreed with the expectation.

Students whose GPA’s ranged from 1.00 to 1.99 held a higher expectation (averaged 73% except for seniors) that advisers will help them with personal issues. Students whose GPA ranged between 2.00-2.99 averaged about 62% and 3.00 to 4.00 GPA students averaged 55% in agreeing or strongly agreeing with the expectation that advisers will help them with personal concerns.

**Table 10\*. Question 6d: help me with personal issues and concerns.**

	Overall		1st Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	486	12.9	87	15.0	162	11.0
Agree	1715	45.6	279	47.9	659	44.7
Total	<b>58.5</b>		<b>62.9</b>		<b>55.7</b>	

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 10A. Question 6d: By Grade Point Average (GPA)**

GPA	0.00-1.99		2.00 - 3.00		3.00 - 4.00	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	37	22.6	198	14.5	251	11.3
Agree	82	50.0	654	47.8	979	44.0
Total	<b>72.6</b>		<b>62.3</b>		<b>55.3</b>	

## Knowledgeable About Financial Aid

Table 11 shows the results from question 6e; “I expect my adviser to be knowledgeable about financial aid”. Over 83% either strongly agreed or agreed with this expectation. There was a general decrease in expectations with the upper classmen. First year students averaged 92% while seniors averaged 79% (Table 11A). On average, as the grade point average decreased, the expectation increased (Table 11B).

**Table 11. Question 6e; be knowledgeable about financial aid.**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	1145	30.5
Agree	2001	53.2
Disagree	562	15.0
Strongly Disagree	52	1.4

**Table 11A. By Classification**

<b>By Class</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Year</b>		<b>Sophomores</b>		<b>Juniors</b>		<b>Seniors</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	223	38.3	231	32.6	306	30.8	385	26.1
Agree	310	53.3	380	53.7	529	53.2	782	53.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>91.6</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>86.3</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>1167</b>	<b>79.1</b>

**Table 11B. By GPA**

<b>GPA</b>	<b>1.00-1.99 GPA</b>		<b>2.00-2.99 GPA</b>		<b>3.00-4.00 GPA</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	62	40.0	436	31.8	642	28.8
Agree	78	50.3	727	53.1	1194	53.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>90.3</b>	<b>1369</b>	<b>85.0</b>	<b>2227</b>	<b>82.4</b>

## Serve as Mentors

The results from the question regarding students’ expectations of advisers as mentors are shown below in Table 12. Over 79% either agreed or strongly agreed with this expectation. This percentage of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed was consistent across all classifications. However, students whose grades ranged from 1.00 to 1.99 indicated a higher expectation, ranging from 85% to 91%, excluding the seniors. It should be noted that the number of respondents in the GPA range of 1.00-1.99 is only 155, just 7% of the total number of respondents in the 3.00 to 4.00 GPA (2227) range and therefore does not significantly affect overall percentages.

**Table 12\*. Question 6f; serve as mentors.**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	1032	27.5
Agree	1947	51.8
Disagree	711	18.9
Strongly Disagree	70	1.9

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 12A. By Class and GPA range of 1.00-1.99**

<b>1.00-1.99 GPA</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Year</b>		<b>Sophomore</b>		<b>Juniors</b>		<b>Seniors</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	20	32.8	13	31.0	12	36.4	8	42.1
Agree	32	52.5	24	57.1	18	54.6	6	31.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>85.3</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>88.1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>91.0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>73.7</b>

**Table 12B. By GPA.**

<b>By GPA</b>	<b>1.00 – 1.99 GPA</b>		<b>2.00 – 2.99 GPA</b>		<b>3.00 - 4.00 GPA</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	53	34.2	385	28.1	590	26.5
Agree	80	51.6	691	50.5	1173	52.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>85.8</b>	<b>1076</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>1763</b>	<b>79.2</b>

### Letters of Recommendations, Contacting Students

Regarding the expectation students have that their advisers will write letters of recommendations for them, over 87% either agreed or strongly agreed with that statement (Table 13). With regard to question 6h on whether students expect advisers to contact them about upcoming events and opportunities, over 78% either agreed or strongly agreed (Table 14). This expectation ranged from 79-81% among first year students through juniors and dropped to 75% with seniors.

In regards to question 6i; the expectation that advisers will “contact me if I’m on academic probation”; over 95% either strongly agreed and agreed (Table 15). However, it should be noted (see Table 4) that 95% of the respondents had a GPA in the range of 2.00-4.00 and may have never been on probation. (Note: this survey was completed prior to the implementation of the new academic probation policy. It supports the new approach of requiring probation and warning students to meet with their adviser.)

**Table 13\*. Question 6g; write letters of recommendation.**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	1507	40.1
Agree	1766	47.0
Disagree	444	11.8
Strongly Disagree	43	1.1

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 14\*. Question 6h; contact me about upcoming events and opportunities.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	1000	26.6
Agree	1947	51.8
Disagree	730	19.4
Strongly Disagree	83	2.2

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 15. Question 6i; contact me if I'm on academic probation.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	2371	63.1
Agree	1213	32.3
Disagree	152	4.0
Strongly Disagree	24	0.6

### Know Me as a Person

Table 16 shows the results of question 6j; the expectation that advisers will “get to know me as a person”. Close to 85% either agreed or strongly agreed. First year students had the highest expectation at 87%. Across differing grade point averages, the expectations were all near 85%.

**Table 16\*. Question 6j; get to know me as a person.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	1200	31.9
Agree	1993	53.0
Disagree	503	13.4
Strongly Disagree	64	1.7

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 16A. By Classification**

	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	190	32.6	474	32.1
Agree	318	54.6	776	52.6
Disagree	64	11.0	195	13.2
Strongly Disagree	10	1.7	30	2.0
Total	582		1475	

### Study Skills

Question 6l asks if student’s expectations of advisers included receiving assistance from advisers with study skills. Overall, only 54.2% either agreed or strongly agreed (Table 17). However,

first year students and sophomores' expectations were higher and averaged about 60%. By the senior year, it dropped to about 49%. As the grade point average increased the expectation decreased.

**Table 17. Question 6l; assist me, if needed, with study skills such as note-taking, test-taking, and time management.**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	525	14.0
Agree	1513	40.2
Disagree	1483	39.4
Strongly Disagree	239	6.4

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 17A\*. Question 6l; By Classification**

<b>Class</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Year</b>		<b>Sophomores</b>		<b>Juniors</b>		<b>Seniors</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	103	17.7	118	16.7	129	13.0	175	11.9
Agree	250	43.0	315	44.5	403	40.5	545	37.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>60.7</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>61.2</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>53.5</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>48.8</b>

\*See appendix A for full tables

**Table 17B. Question 6l; by Grade Point Average**

<b>GPA</b>	<b>3.00 – 4.00</b>		<b>2.00 – 2.99</b>		<b>1.00-1.99</b>		<b>0.00-0.99</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	253	11.4	223	16.3	43	27.7	6	66.7
Agree	878	39.4	566	41.3	68	43.9	1	11.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>1131</b>	<b>50.8</b>	<b>789</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>71.6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>77.8</b>

### Summary of Interactions

Tables 18 - 21 summarize the differing forms of interactions students had with their adviser. Over 58% of respondents met with their academic adviser in a one-on-one meeting during an academic year at least three times and over 50% of the students met in a group or class situation with their adviser one to three times over the academic year.

The majority of students reported that an academic adviser initiated contact with them at least once or twice and more than half the students e-mailed their academic adviser at least three times during an academic year.

**Table 18. Question 7; the number of times I met with an academic adviser in a one-on-one meeting this academic year.**

# of one on one meetings	#	%
1	511	14.4
2	965	27.1
3	790	22.2
4-5	871	24.5
6	157	4.4
7 or more	258	7.3

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 19. Question 8; the number of times I met with an academic adviser in a group or class situation this academic year.**

# of Times	#	%
0	1	0.1
1	365	30.7
2	170	14.3
3	75	6.3
4	58	4.9
5	72	6.1
6	42	3.5
7 or more	408	34.3

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 20. Question 9; number of times an academic adviser initiated contact with me this academic year.**

# of Times	#	%
1	667	29.7
2	742	33.0
3	267	11.9
4	124	5.5
5	166	7.4
6 or more	282	12.5

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 21. Question 10; number of times I e-mailed an academic adviser this academic year**

# of Times	#	%
1	459	15.1
2	648	21.3
3	509	16.8
4	290	9.6
5	418	13.8
6	170	5.6
7 or more	543	17.9

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

## Satisfaction

The next set of questions has to do with the student's level of satisfaction with their interactions with their adviser. With regard to the statement; "Academic advisers respond to my e-mail promptly," over 89% of all the students either agreed or strongly agreed (Table 22) and first year students averaged about 94% for those respondents who felt the question was applicable. Regarding the statement, "Meeting with my academic adviser at least once a semester is valuable to me" (Table 23), over 89% either agreed or strongly agreed, with first year students and sophomores averaging 91% and 94% respectively.

**Table 22\*. Question 11; academic advisers respond to my e-mail promptly.**

Overall	#	%	% *
Strongly Agree (1)	1489	40.0	45.2
Agree (2)	1453	39.0	44.1
Disagree	253	6.8	7.7
Strongly Disagree	101	2.7	3.1
Does Not Apply	429	11.5	
Total (1 & 2)		<b>79.0</b>	<b>89.3</b>

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

\*\*After removing the "Does Not Apply" category

**Table 23. Question 13; meeting with my academic adviser at least once a semester is valuable to me.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	1936	52.0
Agree	1345	36.1
Disagree	285	7.7
Strongly Disagree	104	2.8
Does Not Apply	55	1.5

## Time Spent with Adviser is Adequate

For question 14; "The amount of time adviser has to spend with me is adequate" (Table 24), over 85% either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. First year students were the highest at 89% and seniors averaged 83%. Overall, juniors and seniors were the lowest regardless of grade point average.

**Table 24\*. Question 14; the amount of time my adviser has to spend with me is adequate.**

Overall	#	%
Strongly Agree	1346	36.1
Agree	1769	47.5
Disagree	402	10.8
Strongly Disagree	138	3.7
Does Not Apply	70	1.9

\*See appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 24A\*. Question 14; by Classification**

By Class	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	215	37.3	527	36.1
Agree	291	50.4	669	45.9

\*See appendix A for expanded tables.

**Table 24B. Question 14; 3.00 - 4.00 GPA**

3.00 - 4.00 GPA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	128	41.6	527	36.1
Agree	151	49.0	669	45.9

**Table 24C. Question 14; 2.00-2.99 GPA**

2.00-2.99 GPA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	60	29.3	201	37.9
Agree	110	53.7	230	43.4

**Table 24D. Question 14; 1.00-1.99 GPA**

1.00-1.99 GPA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	24	40.0	7	36.8
Agree	30	50.0	6	31.6

### Positive Impact

Over 79% either agreed or strongly agreed that advisers have “positively impacted my continued enrollment” and about 21% disagreed or strongly disagreed (Table 25). About 5% of the respondents felt the question did not apply.

Of first year students, 86.5% either agreed or strongly agreed while seniors averaged just 74%. First year students and sophomores were more likely to agree than seniors, although respondents with GPAs’ in the range of 1.00-1.99 averaged overall only 73%. Percentages decreased with age and with lower grade point averages.

**Table 25\*. Question 16; academic advisers have positively impacted my continued enrollment.**

Overall	#	%	%**
Strongly Agree	1216	32.6	34.3
Agree	1585	42.6	44.8
Disagree	550	14.8	15.5
Strongly Disagree	191	5.1	5.4
Does Not Apply	183	4.9	

\* See Appendix A for additional tables.

\*\*Percentages after removing the “Does Not Apply” category.



**Table 25A. Question 16; by Classification**

Class	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	213	36.9	434	29.8
Agree	253	43.8	600	41.2
Total	466	<b>80.7</b>	1034	<b>71.0</b>

**Table 25B. Question 16; by Grade Point Average (GPA)**

GPA	1.00 – 1.99 GPA		2.00 – 2.99 GPA		3.00 - 4.00 GPA	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	50	32.5	426	31.5	733	33.2
Agree	53	34.4	583	43.1	948	42.9
Total	103	<b>66.9</b>	1009	<b>74.6</b>	1681	<b>76.1</b>

**Table 25C. Question 16; 1.00-1.99 Grade Point Averages**

1.00-1.99 GPA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Sophomores		Juniors		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	21	35.0	13	31.0	9	27.3	7	36.8
Agree	22	36.7	12	28.6	14	42.4	5	26.3
Total	43	<b>71.7</b>	25	<b>59.6</b>	23	<b>69.7</b>	12	<b>63.1</b>

**Table 25D. Question 16; 2.00 – 2.99 Grade Point Averages**

2.00 – 2.99 GPA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	62	30.2	156	29.4
Agree	102	49.8	209	39.4
Total	164	<b>80.0</b>	365	<b>68.8</b>

**Table 25E. Question 16; 3.00 – 4.00 Grade Point Averages**

3.00 – 4.00 GPA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year		Seniors	
	#	%	#	%
Strongly Agree	127	43.5	270	31.1
Agree	129	44.2	385	44.4
Total	256	<b>87.7</b>	655	<b>75.5</b>

### National Survey of Student Engagement

The following four questions from the National Survey of Student Engagement were also included in the survey. For the first three questions the responses are slightly more positive than

the 2005 NSSE ISU sample. Responses for the third question are significantly more positive than the sample. In all three cases ISU responses are more positive than the benchmark American Association of Universities Data Exchange. This is most pronounced for question three.

1. The adviser(s) in your college or department is (are) available when you need to see her/him (them).
2. The information you've received from academic advisers has been accurate and up to date.
3. How would you rate the quality of academic advising you have received from your college or department at this university?
4. During the past year, from what source did you receive most of your academic advising?

### Availability

Close to 87%, either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement “the adviser(s) in my college or department is (are) available when I need to see her/him (them)”. First year students averaged over 91% and 3.00 to 4.00 GPA students averaged 88%. The lowest percentages were juniors and seniors with less than a 3.00 GPA (78-83%).

**Table 26. Question 12; the adviser(s) in my college or department is (are) available when I need to see her/him (them).**

Overall	Responses	%
Strongly Agree	1310	35.2
Agree	1882	50.5
Disagree	382	10.3
Strongly Disagree	107	2.9
Does Not Apply	44	1.2
Total	3725	

\* See Appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 26A. Question 12; First Year Students Only**

1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	2005 @ ISU		AAUDE*		Spring 2006 @ ISU	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 = Strongly Agree	159	31	198	18	219	38.0
2 = Agree	287	57	673	60	303	52.5
3 = Disagree	43	9	100	9	42	7.3
4 = Strongly Disagree	10	2	34	3	9	1.6
5 = Does Not Apply	6	1	110	10	4	0.7
Total	505		1115		577	
Total of 1& 2		<b>88.0</b>		<b>78.0</b>		<b>90.5</b>

\* American Association of Universities Data Exchange

**Table 26B. Question 12; Seniors Only**

Seniors	2005 @ ISU		AAUDE*		Spring 2006 @ ISU	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1 = Strongly Agree	140	27	229	24	503	34.5
2 = Agree	297	57	565	59	710	48.7
3 = Disagree	59	11	100	10	172	11.8
4 = Strongly Disagree	25	5	46	5	57	3.9
5 = Does Not Apply	2	0	20	2	16	1.1
Total	523		960		1458	
Total of 1& 2	<b>84.0</b>		<b>83.0</b>		<b>83.2</b>	

\* American Association of Universities Data Exchange

**Table 26C. Question 12; Spring 2006 Data; 3.00 – 4.00 GPA Students**

3.00 - 4.00 GPA	#	%
1 = Strongly Agree	806	36.5
2 = Agree	1117	50.6
3 = Disagree	201	9.1
4 = Strongly Disagree	61	2.8
5 = Does Not Apply	24	1.1
Total	2209	
Total of 1& 2	<b>87.1</b>	

**Table 26D. Question 12; Spring 2006 Data; By Grade Point Average & Classification**

	2.00-2.99 GPA Seniors		1.00 – 1.99 GPA Juniors	
	#	%	#	%
1 = Strongly Agree	178	33.6	6	18.2
2 = Agree	255	48.1	20	60.6
3 = Disagree	74	14.0	5	15.2
4 = Strongly Disagree	19	3.6	2	6.1
5 = Does Not Apply	4	0.8		
Total	530		33	
Total of 1& 2	<b>81.7</b>		<b>78.8</b>	

### Accurate and Up to Date

Close to 89% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement “the information I’ve received from academic advisers has been accurate and up to date”. The below tables show the results of the 2005 data along with the national NSSE data and then our recent spring 2006 results.

**Table 27. Question 15; the information I've received from academic advisers has been accurate and up to date.**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	1438	38.6
Agree	1825	49.0
Disagree	299	8.0
Strongly Disagree	111	3.0
Does Not Apply	52	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>3725</b>	

\* See Appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 27A. Question 15; First Year Students Only**

<b>1<sup>st</sup> Year Students</b>	<b>2005 @ ISU</b>		<b>AAUDE*</b>		<b>Spring 2006 @ ISU</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
1 = Strongly Agree	179	35.4	232	20.7	253	43.8
2 = Agree	284	56.2	651	58.0	280	48.5
3 = Disagree	30	5.9	96	8.5	27	4.7
4 = Strongly Disagree	3	0.6	35	3.1	13	2.3
5 = Does Not Apply	4	0.8	98	8.7	4	0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>500</b>		<b>1112</b>		<b>577</b>	
<b>Total of 1&amp; 2</b>		<b>91.6</b>		<b>78.7</b>		<b>92.3</b>

\*American Association of Universities Data Exchange

**Table 27B. Question 15; Seniors Only**

<b>Seniors</b>	<b>2005 @ ISU</b>		<b>AAUDE*</b>		<b>Spring 2006 @ ISU</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
1 = Strongly Agree	143	27.3	211	21.9	506	34.7
2 = Agree	304	58.0	543	56.3	702	48.1
3 = Disagree	53	10.1	125	13.0	163	11.2
4 = Strongly Disagree	21	4.0	56	5.8	62	4.3
5 = Does Not Apply	2	0.4	20	2.1	25	1.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>523</b>		<b>955</b>		<b>1458</b>	
<b>Total of 1&amp; 2</b>		<b>85.3</b>		<b>78.2</b>		<b>82.9</b>

\*American Association of Universities Data Exchange

### **Quality of Advising**

For the question, "I would rate the quality of academic advising that I've received from my college or department at Iowa State", over 75% of respondents rated it excellent or good (Table 28). However, 25% rated the quality of their advising as fair or poor.

**Table 28. Question 17; I would rate the quality of academic advising that I've received from my college or department at Iowa State as;**

<b>Overall</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Excellent	1446	38.8
Good	1356	36.4
Fair	633	17.0
Poor	282	7.6
Does Not Apply	8	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>3725</b>	

\* See Appendix A for additional tables.

**Table 28A. Question 17; Comparing First Year Students**

<b>1<sup>st</sup> Year Students</b>	<b>2005 @ ISU</b>		<b>AAUDE*</b>		<b>Spring 2006 @ ISU</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Excellent (1)	169	33.5	209	18.6	257	44.5
Good (2)	217	43.0	439	39.1	228	39.5
Fair	95	18.8	297	26.4	59	10.2
Poor	21	4.2	98	8.7	31	5.4
Does Not Apply	3	0.6	80	7.1	2	0.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>505</b>		<b>1123</b>		<b>577</b>	
<b>Total of 1&amp; 2</b>		<b>76.4</b>		<b>57.7</b>		<b>84.1</b>

\* American Association of Universities Data Exchange

**Table 28B. Question 17; Comparing Seniors**

<b>Seniors</b>	<b>2005 @ ISU</b>		<b>AAUDE*</b>		<b>Spring 2006 @ ISU</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Excellent (1)	115	21.9	185	19.2	519	35.6
Good (2)	211	40.3	346	35.9	498	34.2
Fair	141	26.9	284	29.5	286	19.6
Poor	56	10.7	139	14.4	152	10.4
Does Not Apply	1	0.2	10	1.0	3	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>524</b>		<b>964</b>		<b>1458</b>	
<b>Total of 1&amp; 2</b>		<b>62.2</b>		<b>55.1</b>		<b>69.8</b>

\* American Association of Universities Data Exchange

## Resources

The following questions ask about resources used by the students.

**Table 29. Question 18; during the past year, most of my academic advising has come from the following source (check one)**

Resources	#	%
advisers in my college or department	2164	58.5
instructors or staff not formally assigned as advisers	346	9.4
on-line registration and degree audit system	460	12.4
undergraduate catalog or other publications	346	9.4
friends or family	350	9.5
does not apply	33	0.9

**Table 29A. Question 18; during the past year, most of my academic advising has come from the following source (check one)**

1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	2005 @ ISU		AAUDE*		Spring 2006 @ ISU	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Advisers in my college or department	321	63.6	483	43.0	350	60.7
Instructors or staff members not formally assigned as advisers	38	7.5	94	8.4	49	8.5
On-line registration and degree audit system	17	3.4	97	8.6	28	4.9
Undergraduate catalog or other publications	24	4.8	127	11.3	45	7.8
Friends or family	96	19.0	274	24.4	97	16.8
Does Not Apply	8	1.6	40	3.6	5	0.9
<b>Total</b>	504		1115		574	

\* American Association of Universities Data Exchange

**Table 29B. Question 18; during the past year, most of my academic advising has come from the following source (check one)**

Seniors	2005 @ ISU		AAUDE*		Spring 2006 @ ISU	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Advisers in my college or department	297	56.7	461	47.8	799	54.8
Instructors or staff members not formally assigned as advisers	70	13.4	151	15.7	170	11.7
On-line registration and degree audit system	54	10.3	122	12.7	218	15.0
Undergraduate catalog or other publications	48	9.2	69	7.2	147	10.1
Friends or family	43	8.2	133	13.8	100	6.9
Does Not Apply	11	2.1	20	2.1	11	0.8
<b>Total</b>	523		956		1445	

\* American Association of Universities Data Exchange

**Table 30. Question 19; additional sources of advising information that I've utilized this academic year are (check all that apply).**

	<b>All Respondents</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Year</b>	<b>Seniors</b>
electronic newsletter from adviser	1119	188	409
electronic newsletter from college or department	1264	205	448
paper newsletter from adviser, college, or department	225	50	66
Iowa State DAILY	584	104	201
college and/or departmental web sites	2221	337	856
Multicultural Liaison Officer	94	19	32
student athlete counselor	48	12	14
bulletin boards	398	71	131
orientation binder	250	95	38
other	336	46	143