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ABSTRACT

The theory of learning centered academic advising states that the purpose of advising is to teach undergraduate students about the logic and purpose of their education. Previous scholarship on learning centered advising has focused on the theoretical or on implementation by faculty at small colleges and universities. Methods for supporting learning centered advising in other contexts are lacking. This mixed methods, action research study investigates the efficacy of FaculTea, a professional development program designed to promote learning centered advising practices among professional academic advisors at a large state university. The study also measured frequency of learning centered advising and student perceptions of learning centered advising. Participants were 57 academic advisors in a liberal arts and sciences college at a large state university, who reported on their advising practices. In addition, the investigator interviewed four advisors, and observed them during 15 advising appointments. Also, six students were interviewed to determine their response to learning centered academic advising. Results showed the FaculTea program model was effective in promoting learning centered advising. In addition, advisors used learning centered advising to a moderate extent, depending upon the context of the appointment, the developmental level of the student, and experience level of the advisor. Student responses varied. These findings suggest learning centered advising can be incorporated into various academic advising contexts and structures and that FaculTea is an excellent model for learning centered academic advisor professional development.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Academic advising means different things to different people. As an activity, it has been compared to customer service (Spicuzza, 1992), counseling (Cook, 2009), hermeneutics (Hagen, 2008), coaching (McClellan & Moser, 2011), and teaching (Crookston, 1972/1994). Depending upon the context, advising is delivered by faculty members, full time ‘professional’ advisors, graduate students, undergraduate peers, or, clerical staff (Carlstrom, in press). Opinions on the proper role for academic advisors within higher education vary within and among groups of students, administrators, practitioners, and scholars of advising.

One school of thought holds that academic advising is an academic activity, with student “learning at the core” (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999). This theory of learning centered academic advising states that the advisor’s role is to teach students about the whole of their education, about how to experience the most learning from their courses (Lowenstein, 1999, 2000, 2010). Over the last decade, scholarship in academic advising has begun to advocate and expand on this theory of advising (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999, 2003, 2005; Laff, 2006; Lowenstein, 1999, 2000, 2010; Reynolds, 2010). The theory of learning centered academic advising emerges from advising’s history as a faculty-led activity, as well as the fact that faculty members still provide a main source of undergraduate academic advising at American universities (Carlstrom, in press). However, while the view that academic advising as an integral part of the academic role of the university is gaining adherents, its acceptance is still far from widespread.
A look at Arizona State University’s (ASU), “Academics and Advising” webpage ("Academics," n.d.), for example, suggests that academic advising concerns itself solely with the rules and regulations that govern moving students through their major courses towards a timely graduation. This reinforces a common perception of academic advisors as walking, talking undergraduate catalogs – valuable only for their knowledge of the rules, policies, and procedures that structure the institution (Reynolds, in press). It may be no surprise then, that the first site to which online visitors are referred when searching for “academic advising” at the ASU website takes a narrow view of advising, implying that advising consists of choosing an appropriate major, enrolling for the courses needed to stay on track towards earning a degree, and having access to the academic catalog. No mention is made of advising as supporting student learning, or as a personal relationship through which students might better understand the meaning and purpose of their courses or of their education as a whole.

While the website for ASU’s College of Liberal Arts and Sciences does a little better, describing academic advisors as “your guides at ASU” who can assist students in “find(ing) special learning opportunities in the classroom, research opportunities with faculty or an internship in the community,” (‘Advising,’ n.d.) clearly, the message remains that academic advising supports student learning, but is not a source of student learning. As a result, students may progress through ASU, even graduating, without an understanding of how their classes relate to each other, with no sense of the whole of their education. This is of special concern in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

A major in the liberal arts and sciences is viewed with some skepticism during the best of times. With a sagging economy, there is an even greater fear of paying for a
college education with no specific vocational outcome. Students must be better prepared to articulate the skills, knowledge, and attitudes they have gained through their coursework. Advisors, who interact with their students over the entire course of their college careers, are ideally suited to guide students in reflecting on connections between courses and how students have changed as a result of their educational experience. Thus, academic advisors, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences especially, have the potential to be among a student’s most important teachers.

Professional Context

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) is the largest of ASU’s 14 degree-granting colleges and schools. ASU offers courses at four different physical campuses in the Phoenix-metro area, as well as through an on-line campus; CLAS is housed at the Tempe campus and also offers degrees through ASU On-line. The College offers Bachelor of Arts degrees, Bachelor of Science degrees, and a Bachelor of Science in Planning in a total of 84 different majors. Overall, in fall 2012, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences enrolled over 18,000 undergraduate students (data retrieved January 26, 2013 from ASU Dashboards, https://webapp6.asu.edu/corda/dashboards/EnrollmentTracking/main.dashxml).

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences employs approximately 60 academic advisors housed in 19 different academic units. The academic units vary in size from as few as 29 undergraduate majors to over 2,700. The number of advisors per department ranges from a single half-time employee to up to eight full-time academic advisors. Ratios of advisors to undergraduate majors also vary across the academic units from a
low of 1 to 60, up to 1 advisor for every 623 students\(^1\). Advising offices are physically located in the academic departments. Each unit has its own culture and idiosyncrasies. These facts are what make administrating academic advising in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences so fascinating, but can also make implementing change a challenge.

The Office of Student and Academic Programs (OSAP), is an arm of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office. This office coordinates enrollment management, recruitment, student engagement, academic policies, and academic advising. While OSAP provides guidance to the advisors in the academic units, the advisors do not report to the Office of Student and Academic Programs.

**Researcher role.** As Director of Academic Advising in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, I work in the Office of Student and Academic Programs. I am responsible for, among other things, providing pre-service and in-service training for academic advisors new to our College. I also support, develop and deliver on-going professional development for our experienced advisors. While I participate in hiring decisions and give input, as requested, on the management of academic advisors in the units, my responsibilities do not include writing performance reviews for the 63 advisors in the College. As a result of this organizational structure, advisors may choose whether or not to attend professional development programs without fear that it might affect their annual performance review.

**Structure of academic advising.** The structure of academic advising in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is, most simply, a decentralized model (Pardee, 2004a).

---

\(^1\) For the sake of comparison, advising literature recommends a student to advisor ratio of 300 students per one advisor. (Habley, 2004a)
to be useful, however, a description of advising in CLAS needs to include information on who is advised, how advising responsibilities are divided, where advising is done and who is doing the advising (Miller, 2011). So, more specifically, advising responsibilities are split among the 19 academic units and the Office of Student and Academic Programs. While the Office of Student and Academic Programs advises students who are transitioning between majors and those academically disqualified from the College, it is the advisors in the academic units who are otherwise responsible for advising all students with majors in their unit from matriculation to graduation\(^2\). Unit advisors work with students at all academic levels (freshmen to seniors) and admission types (first-time, transfer, or readmitted). Their case loads include students who are underprepared for college, on academic probation, high achieving, or in the Honors College. If a unit offers a degree through ASU On-line, the unit advisors advise the on-line students in addition to their on-ground students. Advisors’ offices are physically located with or near the administrative office of each academic unit.

Academic advisors are physically and administratively housed in the departments and schools that make up the College. Each reports to a supervisor within her specific department, usually the department chair or school director, or an associate chair or director. The College currently has just three faculty advisors, and no graduate assistant or peer advisors, although some units within the college utilize undergraduate peers to assist with freshman orientation programs. Thus, the majority of academic advisors in CLAS are professional advisors, hired specifically to support undergraduate academic

---

\(^2\) The Undecided/Exploratory major is not part of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. At ASU, students with this official designation are part of the University College.
success and learning. All but three of the academic advisors in the College have either a masters or doctoral degree. Twenty-seven of the advisors held their highest degree in a liberal arts or science discipline, some within the disciplines for which they advise. Twenty-five had earned their graduate degrees in education. A small minority hold graduate degrees in other academic areas such as business, social work, and public affairs. Advisors in the College have a wide range of experience in advising – half have five years of experience or less. The other half have been advising from anywhere from six to 23 years.

**Advisor roles.** The shift to almost all professional advisors is still relatively recent in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Until 2006, many more CLAS units utilized faculty or graduate assistants as academic advisors for their undergraduate students. Since that time, university administration has shown support for expanding professional advising. Yet, at the same time, they have slowly redefined the role of academic advising at ASU.

Since 2003, changes to academic advisors’ job classifications and titles reflect the administration’s changing approach to advising, documenting the shift away from advising as an academic activity and towards advising as a student service. Changes over that time include changing human resources classifications for full time advisors from faculty lines to service professionals, and evolution in titles from faculty associate to academic success specialist. University administrators view advising as a mechanism for tracking student progress, and triaging problems that impede that progress (Marcus, 2012). These actions demonstrate administrators’ understanding of the purpose of advising: to support students in amassing the credits required to graduate.
Teaching students how to navigate the path to graduation is an aspect of advising, to be sure, but this narrow focus on requirements and regulations denies students access to the powerful, highly personal learning that can result from interactions with an academic advisor. Students would lose the opportunity to reflect on their learning in a way that creates connections across the curriculum. In turn, without administrative support and effective professional development, advisors would focus their advising narrowly on rules and requirements, missing the opportunity to address the real questions students rarely ask aloud: “What courses should I take that would be meaningful to me?”; “How do these courses relate to each other?” and “Why are these classes relevant to my future?” Such a learning centered approach teaches students about how their courses fit together to form a meaningful whole and encourages self-reflection. Learning centered advising helps students experience the most learning from their college experience.

**Action Research.**

To create a culture of learning centered academic advising in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University, academic advisors must develop the skills and knowledge needed to transform academic advising into a recognized source of student learning. If they are to apply the philosophy of learning centered advising to their practice, academic advisors will need access to training and professional development programs that provide information on the curriculum, the academic disciplines, and the purpose of higher education.

The local nature of this problem lends itself to the action research approach. Action research is a community based method for methodically questioning current practices and improving outcomes. Through repeating cycles of planning, acting,
observing, and reflecting, action research encourages reflective practice both for the individual practitioner and the collective (McTaggart, 1991). As a method for empowering local decision makers to implement improvements based on scholarly literature and to document the results of those changes through rigorous data collection in the field, action research is gaining popularity in fields such as social work, public policy, and education. Generalizability is not the goal. Rather, action research examines program outcomes within a specific context (Stringer, 2007).

While not yet well represented in the academic advising literature, action research has much to offer. What constitutes excellent academic advising is dependent upon many variables such as student population and institutional mission. Indeed, two separate task forces convened by the NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising, the premiere professional organization of academic advising in the world, were unsuccessful in their charge to develop even a universal definition of academic advising. Instead, their efforts led to a ‘concept’ of advising, adaptable to many contexts and needs (NACADA, 2003, 2006). Clearly, standards and expectations of academic advising are highly context specific. Due to this incredible variety across the practice of academic advising, it is reasonable that a context specific approach to research is well-suited to make a contribution to our knowledge of the field. Here, the outcomes of a new professional development program designed to promote a more learning centered approach to academic advising in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University are examined using the action research approach.

This study documents the implementation of the FaculTea professional development program series. The FaculTea program model brought together academic
advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences with faculty from various disciplines within the College. At each monthly FaculTea session, advisors learned about the faculty member’s academic discipline, their most recent research, and why all students, especially non-majors, could benefit from learning more about the discipline in question.

**Cycle one.** The first cycle of action research on the FaculTea program model took place in the spring of 2011. Five FaculTea sessions were held from December 2010 to April 2011. Thirty-eight advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences attended at least one program during that time. Advisor and faculty participants were asked to read *Academic Advising and the Logic of the Curriculum* by Marc Lowenstein (2000) and *Advising as Liberal Learning* by Ned Laff (2006).

Results from cycle one indicated that the FaculTea professional development program was valuable to advisors. Responses to individual session evaluations indicated advisors planned to use what they had learned when they met with students. Advisors enjoyed learning across the curriculum as well as the opportunity to interact with faculty in an academic atmosphere. Unfortunately, advisors indicated that they were often prevented from engaging in learning centered advising practices due to the high volume of students to be helped and the short time frame for student interactions.

In addition, a five-item questionnaire administered as a pre-test/post-test showed a significant increase in learning centered advising practices among advisors who attended at least one FaculTea session. The five items asked advisors how frequently during their work with students they discussed:

- the purpose of a liberal arts education (besides getting a job or going to graduate school)
• the purpose of the College requirements (second language and/or science and society)
• the purpose of the ASU general studies requirements (e.g. literacy, mathematics)
• skills students are learning in the courses outside their major, and
• how the courses student are taking relate to one another.

Advisors responded on a 10-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (never) to 10 (almost always). These five items measured the intended outcomes of the FaculTea program model. Only advisors who attended at least one of the five scheduled FaculTea sessions were asked to complete the pre-test/post-test questionnaire.

To measure the effects of the FaculTea program on advising practice, t-tests were conducted to compare pre-test means to post-test means. To determine if repeated exposure to the program was a factor, separate t-tests were conducted on advisors who attended one or two FaculTea sessions and on advisors who attended three or more sessions.

The t-test statistic was used to compare the differences between the means of pre-test and post-test results, because the population standard deviation was unknown. The t-test for dependent means was used because the samples were related in a repeated measures design (Coladarci, Cobb, Minium & Clarke, 2011). While the sample means show that advisors who attended one or two sessions did discuss these topics more frequently with students, the t-test, based on n=17 pairs of scores ($\bar{X}_{pre} = 7.07$, SD = 1.45) ($\bar{X}_{post} = 7.33$, SD = 1.96) was not statistically significant, $t = -.89$, $p = .39$. In contrast, advisors who attended three or more sessions also showed an increase in learning
centered discussions. In this case, the $t$-test, based on $n=15$ pairs of scores ($\bar{X}_{\text{pre}} = 6.20$, $\text{SD} = 1.81$) ($\bar{X}_{\text{post}} = 7.59$, $\text{SD} = 1.58$) was statistically significant, $t = -3.93$, $p = .002$.

Thus, there was evidence to support the conclusion that the FaculTea program model did influence advising practice of those who attended. Specifically, attendance led to an increase in the types of learning centered advising discussions targeted as outcomes by the FaculTea program model. These results supported the continuation of the FaculTea program and informed this second cycle of action research.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF SUPPORTING SCHOLARSHIP

Providing academic advising that focuses on academic outcomes and student learning requires advisors to possess and share knowledge of disciplines across the academic spectrum. To set the stage for the planned innovation in advisor professional development, this literature review examines the theory of learning centered advising, advisor training and development practices and, finally, practices of measuring student learning outcomes.

Theory of Learning Centered Advising

Current literature in academic advising advocates a learning-centered philosophy of advising; a philosophy that sees advising as an academic process responsible for teaching students about the meaning and purpose of higher education and guiding them in reflection upon the knowledge and skills they are gaining through their coursework (Lowenstein, 2011). While the theory of learning centered academic advising has not yet displaced developmental advising as the pre-eminent theory in the field, interest continues to grow in how learning centered advising applies to the scholarship and practice of academic advising. First proposed in the late 1990’s, learning centered advising holds potential not only for increasing student understanding about the curriculum, but also as a way to re-engage faculty interest in academic advising. Learning centered advising contrasts with two other approaches to advising: prescriptive and developmental.

The prescriptive approach to academic advising is rarely promoted, yet often practiced. The focus of prescriptive advising is to provide students with specific
information directly and efficiently. Prescriptive advising interactions involve little
discussion of anything beyond the students’ required courses for upcoming terms and
related policies and procedures. Students are told what they must do and are expected to
carry out the prescription (Crookston, 1994). While for some advising situations, or with
certain students, the prescriptive approach has its place, conducting academic advising in
this manner reduces advising to a clerical task.

In contrast, the developmental approach to academic advising is based on theories
from the psychology, sociology, and student development literatures. First proposed in
depicts the purpose of academic advising as supporting students’ personal development.
The developmental approach advocates identifying students’ current levels of cognitive
and emotional development and then providing an appropriate blend of support and
challenge to help them identify and reach their career and personal goals (King, 2005).
Advising is viewed as a form of personal counseling or coaching; the curriculum is
simply the means of bringing the advisor and the student together. While in the early
literature developmental advising is referred to as teaching, its’ ultimate goal is not
learning, but rather the student’s personal development.

The alignment with counseling that underlies the developmental approach to
academic advising is off-putting to many faculty advisors, whose expertise lies in other
areas. While the ranks of professional academic advisors have continued to grow, faculty
have always been the primary practitioners of academic advising at colleges and
universities in the United States (Carlstrom, in press; Habley, 2004b). The expertise of
faculty advisors lies in their own academic disciplines; if academic advising is defined, at
its best, as nurturing students’ personal development, then how can faculty be expected to
be successful as academic advisors (Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2010)? Thus, while the
developmental theory of advising has contributed much to both the practice and the
scholarship of advising (Cook, 2009), some scholars of academic advising suggest that
its’ usefulness as a tool for generating new questions and deepening understanding about
academic advising has run its course (Lowenstein, personal communication, October
2010).

In the late 1990’s academic faculty from a variety of disciplines who were also
academic advisors began to seriously examine the idea that advising was a form of
teaching. The resulting scholarship connected the literature on classroom pedagogy with
what these faculty/advisors did when meeting with their advisees (Hemwall and Trachte,
1999, 2005; Reynolds, 2010). Based on a constructivist view of student learning and
focused on the academic curriculum, the heart of any student’s university experience, this
theory of advising is referred to as learning centered advising. Advisors engage students
in constructing an understanding of their whole curriculum, as an instructor would
engage them in constructing an understanding of the content of a single course
(Lowenstein, 2005). Per the theory of learning centered advising, the purpose of
academic advising is, “facilitating the student’s ability to interact with and draw
maximum benefit from the academic program and curriculum” (Lowenstein, 1999). From
this perspective, academic advising is an academic activity, more similar to college
teaching than counseling (Lowenstein, 1999).

The next question then, to paraphrase Lowenstein (2005), is, if academic advising
is a teaching and learning process, what do advisors teach? And what should students be
learning? Through their interactions with students, academic advisors may teach them the purpose and meaning of the curriculum (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999), the mission of the institution, higher and lower order thinking skills (Hemwall & Trachte, 2003, 2005), the importance of general education and liberal learning (Laff, 2006), the benefits of engaging in scholarly inquiry (Grigsby & Givans, 2006), relationships among the courses they take (Lowenstein, 2000), the purpose of higher education, the importance of educational choices (Schulenberg and Lindhorst, 2010), and to compare and contrast the way knowledge is constructed in different academic disciplines (Lowenstein, 2010). As these topics indicate, a learning centered paradigm of academic advising has the potential not only to shape each student’s education through reflective course selection, but also to shape how students understand and value their education.

Indeed in many cases, academic advisors are the only representatives of the institution who talk with students about the entirety of their curriculum (Lowenstein, 2005). Without the guidance of an academic advisor, students may progress through college putting little thought into their course selection. Today’s degrees offer many opportunities for choice – few colleges or universities have a core curriculum that exposes all undergraduate students to the same foundational course work. When making decisions regarding courses, students need a knowledgeable teacher to guide them in reflecting on what courses might be meaningful to them, how their courses relate to each other, and how to select classes which will be relevant to their future. If students neglect to meet with their academic advisor, or if the advisor’s knowledge and skills are not sufficiently developed, students may graduate having accumulated a set of courses that have little or nothing in common and no sense of how the building blocks of their courses
combine (or don’t combine!) to create a meaningful education greater than the sum of its parts (Kronman, 2007). No wonder, then, that research based on interviews with hundreds of students reveals academic advising to be one of the most important, yet most under-estimated, components of a successful undergraduate experience (Light, 2001).

The theory of learning centered advising is a normative theory, describing what academic advising should be, when practiced at its best (Hagen & Jordan, 2008; Lowenstein, 2007), but how can this theory be applied to daily advising interactions? While many scholars have embraced and expanded upon this theory (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999, 2003; Hurt, 2007; Lowenstein, 1999, 2000, 2005; Melander, 2005; Reynolds, 2010; Schulenberg & Lindhorst, 2008, 2010), few have provided guidance on how to translate this theory into practice. Of the few techniques suggested for engaging students in reflection upon their learning, most have come from faculty advisors at small colleges and universities (Hurt, 2007; Reynolds, 2010). While these techniques, such as asking students to spend one minute writing about the role of general education in their college experience (Hurt, 2007) actively engage students in reflection and learning (Reynolds, in press), the context in which they are applied, and by whom, must be kept in mind. So, while they provide a strong foundation for applying learning centered principles to real advising situations, it remains to be seen if they can be effective for professional advisors at much larger institutions with larger student to advisor ratios. Questions remain regarding how the theory of learning centered advising may be enacted in different academic advising contexts.

Advisor Training and Professional Development
There is also a gap in the literature regarding just how academic advisor training and professional development programs might support the philosophy of learning centered advising. Despite the lack of details, advocates of learning centered advising clearly encourage that advisors remain active consumers and creators of knowledge throughout their careers, just as disciplinary faculty do (Hagen, 2008), so ongoing professional development is a must. The best professional development programs include all three components of academic advisor training and professional development: informational, conceptual, and relational learning (King, 2000). Thorough reading reveals clues on learning centered professional development which, when coupled with the scholarship on academic advisor training and development, provides some guidelines regarding content, delivery method, and assessment of professional development programs to support learning centered academic advising.

Lowenstein (1999, 2011) hints at the proper content of professional development to support learning centered advising when he advocates that advisors, whether primarily ‘professional’ or faculty, are best prepared for their role when they have a broad liberal arts education. A background in liberal arts prepares an advisor to teach students about the relationships of ideas, theories and knowledge across the curriculum, a key aspect of learning centered advising. While some advisors will already possess a background in liberal arts upon their hiring, many – especially from the professional advisor ranks – will not. Indeed, from the normative perspective of learning centered advising, professional advisors may be at a disadvantage, as they may, rightly or wrongly, be perceived by students as having less knowledge of the academic disciplines (Hugget, 2004). Meeting with faculty members, sitting in on class sessions, and reviewing syllabi with students are
just a few ways advisors may expand their knowledge of the liberal arts curriculum (Folsom, 2008). However it is approached, professional development to support learning centered academic advising should enhance advisors’ informational knowledge about the liberal arts and sciences.

In addition to including content across the liberal arts disciplines, Lowenstein (2011) also describes preparing advisors to work in a learning centered context by exposing them to different theories of academic advising. This is the conceptual component of advisor training and development. One way of engaging advisors with the theories of advising is by consuming scholarly works through a common reading program. A highlight of the National Academic Advising Association annual conference since 2008, a common reading gives advisors an opportunity to learn not only from the text, but also from each other as they discuss ideas and implications from the reading (Schulenberg, Larson, & Bermudez, 2010). In addition, common reading programs have the potential to break down status barriers in the workplace (Zaigier, 2010), an outcome that could be beneficial in the hierarchical university setting. The learning gains to be made through a common reading, coupled with the possibility of creating interpersonal connections, make it an excellent method of delivering professional development on theories of academic advising.

The informational and conceptual aspects of academic advising are necessary, but not sufficient, components of developing learning centered advisors. In this case, professional development cannot limit itself to presenting what advisors must know and why learning centered advising is important, it must also cover how advisors can incorporate learning centered discussions into their interactions with students – the
relational component. The literature provides a variety of suggestions, from asking
students probing questions about how their courses connect to each other or providing
written assignments on such topics (Reynolds, in press) to role plays, case studies, and
secondary readings (Kelley, 2008). As most of these suggestions, appropriately, reflect
techniques commonly used in the classroom, academic advisors with less classroom
experience will especially need proper professional development to build the relational
skills required to effectively provide learning centered advising.

When planning professional development for academic advisors, training
coordinators should take time to consider the theory of advising their efforts promote;
professional development for learning centered advising will have different learning
outcomes than professional development informed by the theory of developmental
advising. As reported by Grites (in press), professional development for developmental
advising will support advisors in understanding student development theories, and in
being welcoming and non-judgmental when working with students. The focus is on
creating advisors who support students as they move through stages of personal
development. In contrast, the goal of professional development in a learning centered
advising context is to create advisors who can teach students about the purpose of and
connections between their courses, engage them in reflecting about their learning, and
guide them in understanding the purpose and meaning of higher education. Clearly,
theory makes a difference.

In summary, academic advisors are in a unique position to guide students towards
a greater understanding of the purpose of higher education and the logic and meaning of
the curriculum (Lowenstein, 2000; White & Schulenberg, 2012). But, they can only fill
this role effectively if they are properly trained and prepared to do so. An effective advisor training and development program designed to prepare learning centered advisors would incorporate the best features of any development program. For example, it would be on-going rather than being a single event, incorporate multiple delivery methods, and would have specific learning outcomes (Folsom, Shultz, Scobie & Miller, 2010). Only with appropriate training and professional development will academic advisors be able to enhance student learning about the curriculum and the meaning and purpose of higher education.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

Just as theory influences the expected outcomes of academic advisor training, so, too, will it influence the intended student learning outcomes of advising. The developmental theory of academic advising suggests student outcomes related to their personal development. Most specifically, developmental advising seeks to support students in developing their ability to solve problems independently and to “help the student take responsibility for his or her decisions and actions” (Frost and Brown-Wheeler, 2003, p. 234). Little, if any attention is paid to students’ academic growth.

In contrast, learning centered advising describes an ideal set of student learning outcomes that focus on increasing students’ academic growth. Lowenstein’s (2011) work, for example, tells us that from their advisors, students should be learning to reflect on their learning across the curriculum. This includes learning how the skills and knowledge they are acquiring apply not only to their other classes but also to their academic and career goals and, how to “construct for themselves an understanding of the world and their place in it that is informed by all the disciplines” (Core ideas: constructivism, para.
1). Other authors are more concrete, suggesting that learning centered advising leads to, for example, a demonstrated understanding of the importance of the general education courses/curriculum (Laff, 2006), and the ability to explain the purpose of a college education and the rationale of the institution’s curriculum (White & Schulenberg, 2012). Clearly, these expected student learning outcomes differ from those generated by the developmental theory of advising.

These are the expected effects of learning centered academic advising on student learning. Yet no scholarship to date has documented that a learning centered approach to academic advising produces these outcomes. The next steps, therefore, are to refine the student learning outcomes suggested by the theoretical literature and then seek to determine if those outcomes are being met.

When developing student learning outcomes, context is key – both the student’s context (Reynolds, in press) and the context of the institution (Martin, 2007; Schuh, 2008). Just as in the classroom, freshman students have different learning needs than seniors. Students in honors programs or who are the first-generation in their family to attend college have issues that must be taken into account when defining appropriate learning outcomes. So, too, student learning outcomes are most effective when created with the institution’s mission and values in mind (Martin, 2007). For example, a college committed to developing active, engaged citizens for a democratic society might seek to teach citizenship not only through the classroom but also through academic advising. In this same way, learning goals for academic advising should be tied to the national benchmarks most important to the institution, be they the learning domains identified by the Council for Advancement of Standards (2005) or the Association of American
Colleges and Universities’ (2011) goals for Liberal Education for America’s Promise. Learning goals must adhere to standards of quality, yet be general enough to apply or be adapted to various academic advising contexts.

Creating context specific learning goals that reflect advising theory and national goals for student learning is best done by advisors and administrators working together. Providing learning goals from “on high” is a demonstration of a top-down style of change that rarely leads to the best outcomes in educational settings (Reeves, 2009). Best practices in advising recommend that advisors and advising administrators come together to generate a manageable number of learning goals for academic advising in their setting (Martin, 2007). Included in these discussions should be plans for measuring whether students are achieving these outcomes.

Student learning from academic advising can be measured using a variety of methods. Many institutions measure student learning using standardized instruments such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (Indiana University, 2011) or the Collegiate Learning Assessment (Council for Aid to Education, n.d.). While these assessments have the benefit of being nationally benchmarked to allow colleges and universities to compare themselves against one another, these instruments are designed to measure student learning on a larger scale. Attributing improvements on these measures to academic advising would be difficult. As a result, some advising offices create their own quantitative instruments. In such cases, care must be taken to ensure the instrument truly measures student learning, as opposed to student satisfaction with academic advising (Cuseo, 2008).
Qualitative methods are also an option. These might include asking students to respond in writing to prompts such as, “explain, in your own words, the importance of general studies courses in your college education,” and then scoring them against a rubric similar to those used in composition classes (Hurt, 2007). Along these same lines, the Division of Undergraduate Studies at The Pennsylvania State University use student scholarship essays to measure student learning from academic advising (White & Schulenberg, 2012). Focus groups or semi-structured interviews are also useful, especially as a method of formative assessment. Another method of assessing student learning outcomes from academic advising recommended both by Schuh (2008) and Lowenstein (2011) is through an electronic portfolio. Portfolios are individual to each student, providing an electronic repository not only for their best work from their courses, but also for their reflections on, for example, the connections they are discovering among their courses, how their courses have affected their world view, or how the skills they are learning relate to their futures. Qualitative measures of student learning have the benefit of documenting the diversity of experiences students have while at college.
Chapter 3

INNOVATION

The theory of learning centered academic advising, in conjunction with the literature on academic advising training and professional development and student learning outcomes of advising guided the creation and implementation of the FaculTea professional development program series for academic advisors. An innovation in academic advisor professional development, the FaculTea model brings faculty and professional advisors from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Arizona State University together to expand their knowledge of the theory and applications of learning centered advising, of academic disciplines across the college, and to discuss student learning goals for targeted groups of students.

Conceptual Framework

The FaculTea model is built upon the best practices in the advising literature, as outlined in the previous chapter. First, by inviting faculty members to meet with advisors to discuss their academic discipline and their current research, the program provided opportunities for advisors to broaden their informational knowledge of the academic areas within the college of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Broad knowledge of the academic disciplines is, in Lowenstein’s view (2011), the foundation of being a successful academic advisor. Folsom (2008) also recommends meeting with faculty members as a professional development activity for academic advisors. Thus, supporting advisors’ learning about the content of the disciplines is the cornerstone of FaculTea model.

In addition to hearing from the faculty about their research and disciplines, both faculty and advisors prepared for the individual FaculTea sessions by reading selected
articles that support and promote learning centered advising. Some months, video clips were substituted for articles as the method of laying the groundwork for the session. The readings laid the foundation for discussions about the academic disciplines, advising, and student learning. Providing a different reading for each session was a new aspect of the FaculTea program model, added to the program for cycle two. The inclusion of readings as part of the model builds upon the examples of common reading programs described earlier.

The FaculTea model was designed to prepare academic advisors to incorporate learning centered advising into their practice. As recommended by Folsom, et. al (2010), FaculTea was an on-going program series that included multiple delivery methods. The FaculTea model also addressed all three components of academic advisor training and professional development: informational, relational, and conceptual (King, 2000). Readings laid the conceptual foundation, providing advisors with an understanding of the theory of learning centered advising. In contrast, the content of each session focused on delivering information from faculty members regarding their disciplines. The intent was to broaden advisors’ knowledge across the liberal arts and sciences. The discussion among advisors and faculty provided a relational component to the FaculTea model. Combining these elements into one professional development program series provided advisors who attended the FaculTea sessions with a comprehensive immersion in learning centered advising.

Indeed, the learning outcomes of the FaculTea program series focused on increasing the frequency of learning centered advising. The program was designed to improve advisors’ knowledge of the academic disciplines, courses throughout the college,
the theory of learning centered advising, and how learning centered advising can benefit student learning. As a result of attending the sessions, advisors were expected to be better prepared to engage students in discussions on the logic of the curriculum, the meaning and purpose of a college education and to reflect upon the importance of their educational choices. Specifically, the anticipated outcome was that advisors would talk more frequently with students about the purpose of a liberal arts education, degree requirements outside their major, the skills they are learning in their courses, and how courses and academic disciplines relate to one another.

**Planning the FaculTea Program**

The FaculTea professional development program series for academic advisors was created to facilitate advisor interaction with faculty and to encourage advisors to apply the theory of learning centered advising to their practice. Starting in May 2012, the FaculTea program series brought academic advisors and faculty together every three to five weeks to engage in discussion of current research in liberal arts and sciences and narratives to help advisors teach their students about classes outside their major, the importance of general studies and the value of a higher education.

In order to achieve these goals, much thought went into the planning of the program series. First, based on the timing of other events, as well as my knowledge of advisors’ workflow throughout the term, I identified the days that would be best to hold each program. I decided that a regularly scheduled program, held approximately one time each month, would be best. Allowing three to five weeks between each individual FaculTea session allowed participants time to prepare, without having to neglect their other job responsibilities. In planning the FaculTea program series I was careful not to
take too much time away from the regular workweek, as this would result in advisors being less likely to participate, or in their supervisors being less likely to support participation. In addition, I also wanted to ensure the program series would be provide regular and on-going opportunities for advisors to engage in professional development related to learning centered academic advising.

As part of the planning for the FaculTea program series, I met frequently with the Assistant Dean in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Office of Student and Academic Programs. She facilitated the faculty participation in the FaculTea series. Her background in academic advising, coupled with her strong network of faculty relationships made her assistance invaluable. Her enthusiasm for promoting the liberal arts and improving student understanding of their importance drove these efforts farther and more effectively than my efforts alone. Together, we generated a list of faculty members within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences whom the Dean knew to be proponents of a broad liberal arts education, as well as good speakers. In addition, we wanted to ensure that a variety of academic disciplines would be included over the program series. Faculty members who taught course for non-majors in their discipline, had served as director of undergraduate studies in their unit, or had participated on committees related to undergraduate education such as the general studies or curriculum committees, were especially sought after. Their broader knowledge of the university curriculum was an asset to the discussions the FaculTea sessions were meant to engender. The Dean contacted the faculty members via e-mail to invite them to participate. The faculty members were very willing to participate in the program. Only two declined to
participate due to conflicts between their teaching schedules and the session times; all others readily agreed to present as part of the FaculTea series.

All academic advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences were notified of the new FaculTea program series via the monthly College academic advisors
newsletter, announcements made in advisor meetings, and e-mail announcements sent two to three weeks prior to each program. In September, in order to encourage greater attendance, I started notifying advisors of upcoming programs using the “meeting invitation” feature in Microsoft Outlook. This gave me a tentative count of which advisors were planning to attend and also put the FaculTea session right onto the advisors’ calendars. As a result of this, I saw a large increase in attendance for the late September program. Unfortunately, although I continued using Outlook meeting invitations to announce each session, attendance eventually reverted to its previous levels.

For both faculty and advisors, the invitations to participate in a FaculTea session included a request to do a bit of preparation. Faculty and advisors alike were asked to either read an article or watch a video related to learning centered advising prior to each session, so they would better understand the purpose of the FaculTea program series. The materials for the common reading were selected based on their relevance to the goals of the FaculTea program and that they were written or presented in a style accessible to an audience not already familiar with the academic advising literature. Materials included: *An Alternative to the Developmental Theory of Advising* by Marc Lowenstein (1999) and *Academic Advising – A Focus on Learning* by Eric White and Janet Schulenberg (2012). Supplementary materials were chosen based on their relevance to the theory of learning.
centered advising and the outcomes of liberal learning. Materials needed to be accessible to a general audience, one not terribly familiar with academic advising. Brevity was also a factor. A complete list of program dates, attendance, articles and materials used may be found in Appendix A. Articles and links to the videos were distributed as e-mail attachments sent to each participating faculty member and as attachments to the e-mail invitation sent to the advisors’ distribution list.

The first FaculTea session was held in May 2012. The series consisted of eight sessions; the last FaculTea session for this cycle was held in November 2012. Over the course of the series, faculty members from disciplines across the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences participated. Faculty presented on their current research, their academic discipline, why that discipline is (or should be) interesting to students and why the discipline is an important part of a liberal arts education.

Once they agreed to participate, faculty members were sent a list of questions to guide their preparation for the FaculTea session. Based on the evolution of the program, questions from the participants and feedback from the individual session evaluations, the questions evolved over time to be:

- What is your discipline and what does it tell us about the world?
- How would I describe your discipline to non-scientists/social scientists/humanists?
- What is seductive about your discipline? How does one get bitten by the bug?
- What courses in your discipline are especially good for non-majors?
• What should we know about your discipline at ASU when we are advising?
• Is there evidence of your discipline in the everyday world and how can we tell?

Each FaculTea session lasted ninety minutes. Each session started with a brief summary of the article read in preparation for that program. Then, the invited faculty member spoke for 30 to 50 minutes on their research, their discipline, and their courses. For the remainder of the time, faculty and advisors engaged each other with questions and discussion. Advisors and faculty were encouraged to ask questions and engage in discussion in a seminar-style interaction designed to increase advisors’ knowledge of academic disciplines outside their own areas. All sessions were held in the Fulton Center, the building where the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Office of Student and Academic Programs is located. Tea, both iced and hot, and cookies were provided to all participants.

Research Questions

The FaculTea program model was intended to support and encourage advisors to incorporate learning centered conversations into their work with students. As a result of attending FaculTea sessions, advisors should be able to teach students about the logic of the curriculum and the meaning and purpose of higher education, as well as to reflect what they are learning through their coursework. Results from the first cycle of action research suggested that the FaculTea program did have an influence on advisor’s practice.
As part of the second cycle, in addition to measuring advisors’ responses to the FaculTea program, the study also measured student reactions to learning centered academic advising. The three components of research question one examine the effects the FaculTea program model has on advisor learning and practice. Research question two focuses on learning centered advising as a whole. Research question three asks how students experience learning as a result of academic advising. My three research questions for the second cycle of action research focused on the FaculTea model were shaped by the intended learning outcomes of the program, the findings from cycle one, and the supporting scholarship.

- Research Question 1: To what extent does the FaculTea model support advisor learning and professional development? What aspects of the FaculTea professional development model are most effective in supporting advisor learning? To what extent does the FaculTea model support the application of learning centered advising?

- Research Question 2: To what extent do academic advisors apply learning centered advising practices to their work with students?

- Research Question 3: How do students experience learning centered advising?
Chapter 4

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which the FaculTea model supported advisor learning and professional development, as well as the extent to which academic advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences applied the theory of learning centered advising. In addition, this research examined how students experience learning centered academic advising. To answer these questions, a mixed-methods research design was used; both quantitative and qualitative data were collected via a combination of five of separate methods:

- a pre-test/post-test questionnaire,
- individual evaluations of each FaculTea session,
- semi-structured interviews with academic advisors,
- observations of student advising appointments, and
- semi-structured interviews with students.

This chapter first provides an in-depth look at the multiple data collection methods used for this study. Also included is a description of the methods used to analyze the various data sources. The chapter concludes with a few words about efforts taken to ensure the reliability and validity of the study.

Mixing Methods

The mixing of methods was done with forethought and purpose. The primary goal of mixing methods was to examine different facets of the same complex phenomenon – the application of the theory of learning centered advising to practice. Labeled “complementarity” by Greene (2007), mixing methods for the purpose of constructing a
deeper, more complex, and nuanced understanding of the social world is a common reason for mixing methods in research and evaluation. Mixing methods also provided insight into how the FaculTea program series affected advising at different levels, both as a whole in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, as well as how it affected individual advisors.

Each method was of equal importance in fulfilling this purpose, as each addressed a different aspect of the research questions. I used the pre-test/post-test questionnaires to gain a better sense of whether the FaculTea program model affected learning, as well as how learning centered advising was, or was not, practiced across all units in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The pre-test provided quantitative data only. The post-test provided primarily quantitative data, but four open-ended response items provided valuable qualitative data. Individual session evaluations gave a sense of how much advisors learned at each FaculTea session and which aspects of the program supported, or did not support, advisor learning. These, too, provided both quantitative and qualitative data. The interviews provided deeper insight into advisors’ experiences with the FaculTea program, and with applying the theory of learning centered advising to their daily practice. Advisors also commented on students’ reactions to learning centered advising. Observations of student advising appointments revealed the extent to which advisors apply learning centered advising to their work with students. Interviews with students provided insight into their experiences with learning centered advising. Interviews and observations provided qualitative data only. All data sources, both quantitative and qualitative, were weighted equally.

Academic Advisor Questionnaires
The questionnaires measured advisors’ knowledge and application of learning centered advising. They were administered to the entire population of academic advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences in a repeated measures design. The questionnaire was developed specifically for this study. In addition to demographic information, the questionnaire consisted of 21 items measuring how frequently advisors discuss learning centered advising topics with students and three items measuring knowledge of different theories of academic advising. Examples of both the pre-test and the post-test may be found in Appendix B.

The 21 items measuring frequency of learning centered advising interactions measured three constructs of learning centered advising: the meaning and purpose of higher education, logic of the curriculum, and student self-reflection. These three constructs of learning centered advising emerged through close reading, analysis, and synthesis of the learning centered advising literature. Seven items measured each of the three constructs, for a total of 21 items designed to measure the frequency of learning centered advising discussions.

The seven items that measured the meaning and purpose of higher education were developed based on the Essential Learning Outcomes identified as part of the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ Liberal Education and America’s Promise initiative. The items measured how frequently advisors talk to students about the skills they are developing through their college experience and how their educations are preparing them for life in a complex and diverse society (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2011).
The items for the logic of the curriculum construct and the self-reflection construct were developed based on the learning centered advising literature. The works of Lowenstein (1999, 2000, 2011) and Reynolds (2010) were most beneficial, as these authors suggest a variety of topics or questions advisors who wish to focus on student learning might include in their work with students. The logic of the curriculum construct items assess how frequently advisors talk to students about the purpose of general education requirements and how courses relate to one another. The student self-reflection construct items measure how frequently advisors question students about what they hope to learn in the courses they choose and how their educational choices will help them meet their goals.

These 21 items measured the extent to which academic advisors report discussing learning centered advising topics with students. Included in these 21 items is a sub-set of five items which measured the learning outcomes of the FaculTea program. These five items are the same as those used during cycle one to measure the effects of FaculTea attendance on advisors’ practice. Thus, the questionnaires measure both the frequency of all learning centered advising discussions, as well as a sub-score measuring the frequency of learning centered advising discussions that were related to content presented as part of the FaculTea program. In addition, three separate items asked advisors to rate their familiarity with different theories/approaches to academic advising. These 24 items appeared on both the pre- and post-test questionnaires.

To pilot-test the questionnaire, these 24 items were administered to a small sample of nine academic advisors outside the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Using SPSS 20, a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of reliability ensured that the items used for
each of the three constructs on the questionnaire, as well as the questionnaire as a whole are, in fact, measuring an underlying construct. Two of the constructs that were designed to measure how frequently advisors discuss topics related to teaching students about the purpose of higher education and how frequently they discuss topics related to teaching students about the logic of the curriculum had high reliability scores, at .84 and .86, respectively. The third construct, designed to measure how frequently advisors engage students in self-reflection had a lower reliability score (at .79), but still well above the .70 that defines the low-end of ‘acceptable’ within the social sciences (DeVellis, 1991). The instrument as a whole proved very reliable, with a coefficient of reliability of .93 for the entire survey instrument.

The pre-test was administered prior to the first FaculTea session. All academic advisors who work in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences were asked to complete the survey during the April CLAS academic advisors meeting, which I chaired. Twelve advisors were absent from the meeting. For these advisors, I delivered a copy of the questionnaire to their offices that same week. To maintain advisors’ anonymity, advisors returned their surveys via campus mail or delivery to my office mail box. Out of 61 total surveys distributed, 57 were returned.

In order to match the pre- and post-tests by respondent, advisors were asked to mark their questionnaires with the first two letters of their mother’s name and the last four digits of their phone number. This way, completed pre-tests could be matched with completed post-tests months later, without the names of the participants being tied to their responses. Anonymity is important; although the advisors in the College do not report to me, because I work in the College Dean’s office overseeing professional
development, all want to demonstrate that they are fulfilling the College’s expectations for advisors. Anonymous responses helped to ensure the trustworthiness of participant’s responses.

After the final FaculTea session, the post-test questionnaires were completed during the CLAS advisor meeting. Thirty-seven advisors attended the advisor meeting, and 37 surveys were returned. Twenty advisors did not attend a meeting. Those who did not attend had a post-test and envelope hand-delivered to their offices during the week following the meeting. Each also received an e-mail with directions on how to complete and return the post-test to me in person or via campus mail. A total of 55 surveys were returned.

**Individual Session Evaluations**

The individual session evaluation forms (Appendix C) were distributed at each FaculTea session; all advisors in attendance at the program were asked to complete the session evaluation. Designed as a pre-test/post-test measure of each session, they were distributed before each presentation began. Attendees were asked to complete Part A prior to the start of the presentation; part B was completed after the conclusion of the session, but before leaving. Evaluations were collected as participants left the room. Evaluations were anonymous in order to increase the trustworthiness of the responses.

The evaluations were designed to measure how much and just what advisors learned as a result of attending any given FaculTea session. Advisors responded with specific things they learned, and also gave an indication of whether they intended to apply what they learned to their practice. Evaluations also asked for feedback on what aspects of the session helped advisors learn, and what aspects could be improved. In
addition, the individual session evaluations provided evidence of how advisors responded to each individual session, in contrast to the pre-/post-test surveys which measured change over the entire program series.

**Academic Advisor Interviews**

The one-on-one, semi-structured interviews with CLAS academic advisors were an opportunity for advisors to give more in-depth feedback regarding the FaculTea program series, the FaculTea model, and the learning centered content of their work with students. Interview questions addressed how advisors experienced the program series and how advisors understand their role in teaching students about the mission and purpose of higher education, the logic of the curriculum, and self-reflection.

Restrictions on time and resources prevented interviewing all advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Instead, a purposive sample of four advisors was invited to participate in the interview portion of the project. These advisors were asked to participate in a semi-structured interview lasting 20 to 45 minutes. The purposive sample of four advisors was selected from the sub-set of advisors who attended at least four of the seven FaculTea sessions held between April and mid-October, when the student advising appointment observations began. Thirteen academic advisors attended four or more FaculTea sessions between April and mid-October. Nine additional advisors attended 3 of the seven programs.

Because student characteristics, and therefore academic advising interactions, can vary across the academic disciplines, advisors were to be selected to represent the different liberal arts and sciences areas: natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. However, of the 13 advisors who attended five or more FaculTea sessions, only one
worked for a natural science unit. My request to include this academic advisor in the qualitative sample was declined by the advisor’s supervisor due to high volume of student traffic and the physical layout of the advising office in that academic unit. The advisor in question shares a small office with a colleague; physically there is very little room for an additional person to sit in on an advising session. Thus, this advisor was not able to participate in the study. Moreover, the only other advisors from natural science units who attended three or more FaculTea sessions were from this same academic unit and faced the same difficulties. No advisors from other natural science units attended more than two sessions. Due to this, the qualitative sample consisted of two advisors from humanities units and two from social sciences units. None of the four work in the same academic unit. Gathering the experiences and perceptions of advisors who attended multiple FaculTea sessions uncovered how the program and learning centered advising work under the best possible conditions.

Interviews took place near the end of the research timeframe, in November. Advisors were asked 13 prepared questions (Appendix D). Additional information was gathered through follow-up questions related to the research questions and to the advisors’ original answers. All interviews were audio-taped using a handheld digital voice recorder and transcribed by a commercial transcription service.

**Observations of Student Advising Appointments**

The same four advisors who participated in the semi-structured interviews were also observed while they conducted academic advising appointments with students. The observations occurred prior to the advisor interviews. I arranged in advance with each advisor which student appointments I would observe. Because I wished to observe how
advisors incorporate learning centered advising topics into their discussions with students under the best possible conditions, my first preference was to observe appointments with students at all academic levels who were changing their majors into the advisor’s academic unit or appointments with students who have junior standing (55-86 credit hours completed) and were coming for their “junior advising check-in” appointment. My perception was that these two types of appointments would allow advisors the most opportunities to discuss learning centered topics with students. As the end of the timeline for observations drew near, one of the advisors in the sample had had only one of these types of appointments on her schedule. To complete the observations, and in keeping with the intention to see advisors applying learning-centered advising under the most ideal circumstances, I asked the advisor in what other category of student appointment she felt best able to take a learning centered approach. She selected appointments with new transfer students.

In the end, I observed 15 student appointments over 9.5 hours. Eleven of the appointments were 30 minutes long; four of the appointments were 60 minutes. Seven of the appointments were for junior advising check-in, six were for students changing majors, and two were with new transfer students. Five of the appointments were telephone advising appointments. The remaining appointments were one-on-one, face-to-face meetings in the advisor’s office. Four of the appointments were with students in online degree programs. The remaining appointments were with students in ‘on-ground’ degree programs.

I consulted with each advisor regarding the appointments on his/her schedule to confirm days and times of upcoming change of major and junior advising check-in
appointments. One day prior to each appointment, I contacted the student by telephone or e-mail or both, reminding them of the appointment, and explaining the purpose of the proposed observation. If I spoke with the student during this phone call, I also got the student’s preliminary consent to sit in on the appointment. I informed each student of my role in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the purpose of my observation. Students were given the option to refuse my presence during their appointment. No student refused to participate in the observation.

As the advisor greeted each student prior to the start of the appointment, she would confirm the student had given his/her permission to have an observer sit in on the appointment. The signed consent letter was collected at that time if the appointment was a face to face meeting. Students participating in telephone appointments were given the option to e-mail or fax the completed consent form. Appointments were not recorded as recording was more likely to influence the content of the advising session than simple observation. Thus, I took written field notes on the content of the advisor/student interactions throughout the appointment (Appendix E). My participation during the appointments was as an observer only. My presence was not for training purposes. While my intent was to provide no advice to the students or guidance to the advisor, on two occasions advisors directly asked if I had or could confirm information related to a student’s concerns. In those cases, I did provide the information requested.

**Student Interviews**

Data on students’ experiences of learning centered advising was gathered using interviews with students. A purposive sample of six students was invited to participate in the interview process. All were current ASU students. All were enrolled in ‘on-ground’
degree programs. With this information about the participants in mind, this next section describes the student interview data collection methods in more detail.

The one-on-one, semi-structured interviews with students were an opportunity for students to give in-depth feedback regarding their experiences with learning centered academic advising. Interview questions addressed what students talked about with their advisor during their most recent advising appointment, what they learned from that appointment, and their learning expectations for academic advising.

At the end of the advising appointment observation, I asked students if they would be willing to participate in a 10 – 15 minute follow-up interview regarding the appointment they just experienced. Five interviews took place in person immediately after the advising appointment. The remaining one took place via telephone the day after the advising appointment. Because the advisors participating in the observation process represented different academic units, the students had majors in various social science and humanities areas. In addition, one was changing his major from a different college into Liberal Arts and Sciences. By gathering the experiences and perceptions of students who, in my perception, had a positive, learning centered advising experience, my goal was to uncover how students experience learning centered advising under the best possible conditions.

Students were asked eight to ten prepared questions (Appendix F). Additional information was gathered through follow-up questions related to the research questions and to the students’ answers to the original questions. All in person interviews were audio-taped using a handheld digital voice recorder. The telephone interview was
recorded via Skype. All interviews were transcribed by a commercial transcription service.

**Data Collection Timeline**

I gave careful consideration to the timing of each data collection method. The pre-test was conducted in April prior to the first FaculTea session. Individual session evaluations were conducted at each session. The student advising appointment observations took place during the latter half of October. Once the observations began, I started scheduling and conducting the student interviews. The interviews with each academic advisor took place in early November, after the final FaculTea session and after the observations of that advisor’s appointments were completed. The post tests were administered in mid-November, two weeks after the FaculTea program was complete.

Spacing the data collection methods this way allowed me to take a snapshot of students’ experiences with learning centered advising and also to hear advisors’ perceptions of how the FaculTea program influenced their practice. Analyses began on these data as soon as they were collected, so that information generated from them could be used to influence the delivery or content of FaculTea sessions held later in the program series. In turn, information gathered through student advising appointment observations influenced the content of the student interviews. The post-test questionnaire was not influenced by the other data sets. Adjusting interview questions based on data already gathered allowed me to more accurately address my research questions. Such an evolution over the course of the data collection process is common practice in qualitative research (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). These sequential data collection methods began in
April 2012 and were completed by December 2012. Thus, the timing of each data collection method was purposeful, as well.

**Quantitative Data Analysis**

Quantitative data from the pre- and post-test advising approaches questionnaire and the individual session evaluation forms were entered and analyzed using SPSS 20 statistical software. Fifty-seven pretests were collected. Fifty-five post tests were collected. From these resulted 46 pre- and post-tests matched by participant. The discrepancies are due to attrition and new hires in the advising population and mis-coding of questionnaires by some participants. The 46 individual advisors who attended the FaculTea sessions completed a total of 140 individual session evaluations over the course of the program.

**Pre- and post-test questionnaire analysis.** The pre-tests and post-tests were matched by respondent to measure change over time. Matching the pre-test and post-test responses by participant was useful, as it accounts for some of the variability in the data set. This allows the use of a more robust statistical procedure (Coladarci, Cobb, Minium & Clarke, 2011). Preliminary analyses were conducted shortly after pre-test data is collected. T-tests and other analyses were conducted after post-tests are completed.

Mean scores of FaculTea outcomes and of learning centered advising were computed for each participant. The 21 items that made up the learning centered advising scale were part of both the pre-test and the post-test. These 21 items include the five items comprising the FaculTea outcome measure. Means were computed for each participant for both the pre-test and the post-test. Post-test means for learning centered advising for various sub-groups of advisors were compared.
I conducted frequencies on all the data in an effort to identify interesting relationships. I also conducted $t$-tests for dependent means on the FaculTea outcome scores in order to measure change in frequency of advising behaviors. In addition, $t$-tests for dependent means were calculated on the pre- and post-test measures of familiarity with learning centered advising. These tests were done for three groups, based on the number of FaculTea sessions attended.

**Individual session evaluations analysis.** Analyses of these data were on-going throughout the FaculTea program series. Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted on this data set. Quantitative data were collected from the closed-ended questions. First, frequencies were computed on the number of advisors who reported an increase, a decrease, or no change in their knowledge as a result of the program. Next, the frequency was calculated on whether advisors would use the information learned when they worked with students.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

The qualitative data set had multiple components. It consisted of open-ended questions from the post-test questionnaires and from the individual session evaluations. Also, fifteen student advising appointments were observed in the course of this study, for a total of 570 minutes of observations. Analysis of the field notes from the observations of student advising appointments began immediately after the first observation. In addition, each of the four advisors participating in the qualitative portion of this study was interviewed individually. Interviews lasted less than 30 minutes apiece; a total of 93 minutes of advisor interviews were recorded. Finally, six students participated in interviews of 15 minutes or shorter; total student interview time was 66 minutes.
Analyses of the qualitative data were done using MAXQDA 11, a qualitative data analysis software program.

**Questionnaire and session evaluation analysis.** While the closed-ended questions were analyzed quantitatively, the open-ended short-answer questions from the post-test questionnaires and the individual session evaluations were subject to qualitative analyses. The responses to these open-ended questions were short phrases. Thus, the unit of analysis, the level of syntax at which the qualitative data were reviewed, was the phrase level. I read over the listed responses, using an open coding process (Corbin & Strauss, 2008), looking for categories that were common across more than one program. For the purposes of this analysis, *categories* were defined as ideas, perceptions or points of view that appeared repeatedly throughout the data set and that were related to the research questions. In the case of the individual program evaluations, I looked for categories that were common across evaluations for more than one program. I began the coding process, looking for categories within these data, shortly after the fifth FaculTea session.

Throughout the process, and as additional data were gathered, I repeatedly returned to the raw data from the questionnaires and session evaluations. No categories were predetermined. Each was constructed inductively based on my repeated readings of the data. Throughout the process, I remained open to alternate groupings. The coding process continued until no more patterns could be identified that were relevant to the current research questions.

**Interview analysis.** All academic advisor and student interviews were recorded on a digital voice recorder and transcribed by a commercial transcription service. Only
qualitative analyses were performed on the interview data. Analyses began as soon as the first interview was completed and were on-going. As I read over the photocopied transcripts in the order that the interviews were conducted, I used an open coding process, pulling out key sentences and phrases that related to my literature review and to my research questions (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). I coded the data and made memos identifying similarities in content among the interviews, noting patterns that I perceived. These memos lead to the first set of themes, and assisted me in making sense of the participant’s experiences (Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Throughout this process, I returned repeatedly to the transcripts of the interviews, comparing the raw data to the initial categories. As themes were connected, I constructed fewer, yet broader and more descriptive, groupings referred to as categories in an effort to understand what the advisors and students were sharing. Categories were not predetermined, but were constructed inductively based on my repeated readings of the interviews. Although data corresponding to the different research questions were concentrated in specific parts of the interview, I remained open to all responses related to each research question. I actively sought alternate groupings of the data. The coding process continued until no more patterns could be identified that were relevant to the current research questions. With these codes in hand, I returned to the original interview transcripts and identified sentences and phrases throughout the documents that seemed to fit each category.

**Appointment observation analysis.** Because one of the intents of these observations is to determine the extent to which advisors apply the theory of learning centered academic advising to their practice, analysis of the field notes began with the
constructs of learning centered advising identified during the literature review. Prior to
the first interview, as recommended by Creswell (2009), I created a codebook to aid
analysis (Appendix G). Each code was defined based upon behaviors, actions, topics, and
questions suggested by the writings of Lowenstein (1999, 2000, 2005, 2011), Reynolds
(2010), Hemwall and Trachte (1999, 2003, 2005), and others. The code book consisted of
17 topics these authors suggested as part of a learning centered advising interaction.
These 17 topics were grouped into three categories, also based on the literature. The three
categories were: meaning and purpose of higher education, logic of the curriculum, and
student self-reflection. Coding proceeded deductively from the list of 17 topics that
comprised the three categories of effective learning centered advising as suggested by the
literature.

As I read over the field notes as they were collected, I started the coding process
using the codebook, specifically seeking occasions when advisors engaged in learning
centered advising. I also pulled out key sentences and phrases that related to my literature
review, research questions, and other aspects of academic advising. After this initial
review, I re-analyzed the data, keeping the initial codes in mind, but also seeking greater
understanding of the whole interaction between student and advisor. During this process,
new codes emerged of teaching the rules and educational opportunities, problem solving,
and degree information. These codes naturally grouped into three additional categories.

**Mixed Methods Analysis Across Data Sources**

Once all data sources were analyzed independently, I began to compare themes
and codes across qualitative sources and to relate those findings to the quantitative
findings. To conduct these analyses, I returned to the original transcriptions of the
interviews, the original field notes from the observations and to the statistical findings. As suggested by the data, I ran additional statistical analyses at this time. An overview of how each data source contributed to answering each research question is included in Appendix H. By comparing data, codes and themes across all data sets, I developed a set of warranted assertions that responded to my research questions. In addition, I looked for and considered any contrasting findings, as well as any themes that arise outside the boundaries of my current research questions. While the focus of this research has always been clear, I strove to keep an open mind regarding what the participants told me regarding their experiences with the FaculTea program series, the FaculTea model, and learning centered advising.

**Reliability, Validity, and Generalizability**

As suggested by Greene (2007), the quality of method in this mixed method study will be judged by the traditions and criteria of each individual data collection method. For the quantitative methods, the pre-test/post-test questionnaires and portions of the individual program evaluations, I took steps to ensure validity by pilot-testing the instruments on small samples of academic advisors outside my potential participant pool. From the pilot-testing, I received feedback on each question.

For qualitative methods – the interviews, observations, field notes, and open-ended questions on the individual program evaluations – different standards of reliability and validity are used. Qualitative validity, sometimes referred to as trustworthiness, was enhanced by several methods. First, the use of multiple data sources to build warranted assertions provides increased reliability over the use of just a single data source. In addition, in reporting my findings, I have been sure to include discrepant information.
This is to ensure that all views are represented and consumers of this research can be assured the data were not manipulated to provide a particular outcome.

Generalizability was not a primary goal of this research. As an action research study employing primarily qualitative methods, suggesting that any findings might apply beyond the context of the professional academic advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Arizona State would be beyond the scope of this study. Nonetheless, the scholarly basis and the research methods are sound; findings from this study will be useful to other advisors and administrators at institutions with similar characteristics as a starting point for improving professional development and/or incorporating learning centered academic advising into their specific contexts.
Chapter 5

RESULTS

Data collected via the questionnaires, individual session evaluations, observations, and one-on-one interviews with advisors and with students provided answers to the three research questions addressed in this study. The student and advisor interviews address research question three, how students experience learning centered advising. Research question two asks to what extent advisors apply learning centered advising practices to their work with students. Quantitative data from the questionnaires, coupled with qualitative data from appointment observations and advisor interviews, answer this question. Research question one has three distinct parts, all of which address the effectiveness of the FaculTea program model. However, each part of research question one is addressed by different aspects of the questionnaires, individual session evaluations, and advisor interviews. Thus, initial analyses were done separately.

Results Related to Research Question 1a

Data from the pre- and post-test questionnaires, individual session evaluations, and the academic advisor interviews provided responses to research question 1a: To what extent does the FaculTea model support advisor learning and professional development? The results from both the quantitative and qualitative data sources support the conclusion that the model did support learning and professional development among the academic advisors in the College.

Pre- and post-test questionnaire results. A comparison of the responses on the advising approaches questions from the pre- and post-test questionnaires suggests that the FaculTea program model supports advisor learning and professional development.
However, the extent to which it does so is related to the number of programs attended. To measure the effect the FaculTea program had on advisor learning, advisors responded to a sub-set of five items which measured learning outcomes of the FaculTea program. Advisors indicated how frequently in the past three months they had discussed these topics with students. Advisors responded on a 10-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 10 (almost always).

These five items, noted in Chapter 1, were also measured during cycle one to determine if the FaculTea program led to a change in advisor’s discussions with students. As shown in Table 1, advisors who attended zero programs or just one or two programs showed statistically no change in how frequently they discussed these topics with students. In contrast, advisors who attended three or more programs showed a statistically significant increase in frequency of these discussions, $t = -2.11$, $p = .05$. These results demonstrate that advisors who attend three or more FaculTea sessions engage more frequently in discussions with students related to the topics covered in FaculTea sessions.

The questionnaire data also showed an increase over time in advisors’ familiarity with the theory of learning centered academic advising. On both the pre- and post-test, advisors rated their familiarity on a four-point Likert scale. Responses were scored 1 (I have never heard of this approach to advising); 2 (I have heard of this approach, but do not know much about it); 3 (I am familiar with this approach to advising); and 4 (I am familiar with this approach to advising and apply it to my work as needed). Mean scores on the pre- and post-tests revealed an increased familiarity with learning centered advising regardless of attendance at FaculTea sessions. As reported in Table 2, the increase for those who attended three or more programs was not statistically significant $t$
= 1.43, \( p = .17 \). For those who attended one or two programs, there was no increase in familiarity with learning centered advising. In contrast, the increase in familiarity with learning centered advising for advisors who did not attend any FaculTea sessions was significant, \( t = -3.01, \ p = .01 \). While the sample size of those who attended no FaculTea programs was small, only 14 advisors in the set of matched pre- and post-tests, these results suggest that the focus on learning centered advising spread beyond those who attended FaculTea sessions.

**Individual session evaluation results.** Qualitative data were collected via open-ended questions on the individual session evaluation forms and the advisor interviews. The individual session evaluation forms asked advisors to share two things they had learned from the day’s program. To determine to what extent the FaculTea program model supported advisor learning and professional development, the evaluation form asked advisors to indicate two things they learned at the program that day. Of the 140 individual session evaluation forms submitted across the eight FaculTea sessions, this question was left blank on only eight occasions.

Upon analysis, advisors’ responses to this question fell into two distinct categories: *advising context* and *curriculum*. Responses related to advising context referred to approaches to education, information about the academic departments or the faculty members themselves. For example, advisors learned:

- “More on (this professor’s) background; that he tells undergrads that they should not yet be specializing.”
- “How the global health program evolved.”
- “Ideas are sexy!”
Responses related to curriculum referenced how courses and disciplines connect and what is learned from them. Examples of learning about the curriculum included:

- “The idea of drawing conceptual pictures as a way of describing philosophy.”
- “The significance of geography in current events and society.”
- “Ways nature could kill you.”
- “Influence of liberal arts on health issues – history, social justice, cultural studies, etc.”

The number and quality of the responses clearly demonstrates that the majority of advisors who attended each program were learning.

**Advisor interview results.** During the advisor interviews, participants reflected on how participation in the FaculTea program influenced their advising. To illustrate how the FaculTea program model supports advisor learning and professional development, four academic advisors explained how they thought their advising had changed as a result of participating in the FaculTea sessions. During the initial analysis, themes of academic information, general studies, advising depth, and applications were constructed. These themes were categorized into two larger themes: excitement and information.

Responses that shared how FaculTea sessions increased advisors’ knowledge of courses, the curriculum, advising, or the world in general were coded as information. Some of the responses that fit the information category were:

- “There’s been a lot of value, even if I don’t necessarily get (my) specific question answered, I know somebody now in that department, I’ve heard some of the lingo.”
• “Whenever you have a specific example about something, I think it’s way more powerful than just an idea. That’s really helpful, and that’s what the FaculTeas I think are especially good at providing.”

• “…It’s changed in that the way of particular courses, or if they’re mentioning exploring that area, I have just a little more background.”

• “I’m not sure the style of advising has changed so much as some of the depth to it. What I mean by that specifically is just that it made it a lot easier to explain what the areas on a general studies section might be, or what a science and society class might be about from a particular area.”

Advisors also felt that the FaculTea program model increased their engagement with advising, as well as their ability to excite their students about academics. Examples of responses that fell into this category include:

• “I told them about some of the things that he presented. He talked about (the university’s) involvement with the National Weather Service. I didn’t realize it was that connected there and some of the poster boards that he had, giving them some of those details. Then they’re kind of excited, ’oh boy, this class they might touch on some of those subjects or those topics.’”

• “Having that chance to learn is part of the reason why I’m in the job that I’m in. By making a more enthusiastic advisor, you get more enthusiastic advising, which hopefully will engage the students.”

• “It just energizes me, first of all. I’m more excited when I go back to advise my students.”
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• “It’s providing ways to get them excited about it (general studies) through examples that someone on the faculty has provided.”
• “I really enjoy it, and it has improved the way I work with students a ton.”

**Warranted Assertions for Research Question 1a.** The results described above, and summarized in Table 3, support the warranted assertion that, the FaculTea program model did provide learning and professional development for advisors. Advisors who did attend FaculTea sessions reported on specific topics learned. The comparison of the pre- and post-test advising approaches questions showed that the frequency of discussions related to the intended outcomes of the FaculTea programs rose significantly over that time for advisors who attended three or more sessions. In addition, the questionnaire administered both prior to and at the completion of the program series also revealed gains in knowledge of learning centered advising over the seven months. Although the gains were modest, they suggest that the benefits of the FaculTea program diffused among all advisors, even those who did not attend any programs.

**Results Related to Research Question 1b**

Qualitative data from the post-test questionnaires and individual session evaluation forms provided responses to research question 1b: what aspects of the FaculTea professional development model are most effective in supporting advisor learning?

**Post-test Questionnaire results.** Advisors responded to three open-ended questions related to research question 1b. The 46 advisors who attended at least one FaculTea session answered the first two questions: 1) “what aspects of the FaculTea
program series (e.g. articles, videos, faculty presenters, discussion, topics) were particularly useful in supporting your learning and professional development?” And 2) “what needs to be improved to make the FaculTea program series a better learning and professional development experience for you?” Fourteen out of the fifteen advisors who did not attend any FaculTea sessions answered the third question: “what led to your decision not to attend?”

Advisors reported that faculty, discussion, and the supporting materials were most helpful to their learning. The faculty presenters were the most frequently mentioned, with thirty-two advisors specifically mentioning the faculty as the aspect of the FaculTea model that most supported their learning. Comments reflective of the value of faculty presentations include, “When instructors describe what a non-major in that program will take away from the classes they offer.” and, “All of the faculty presenters I saw were very engaging and enthusiastic about their fields. Enthusiasm begets learning as long as the learner’s mind is open to it.” Ten advisors indicated that the discussion aspect of the sessions supported their learning. For example, the “casual set-up” left “room for Q & A and discussion,” and “It was very helpful to engage in discussions and Q & A sessions with faculty from other departments as well as colleagues.” Six advisors mentioned the supporting materials – the articles and videos assigned for each program. One commented, “I enjoyed the pre-FaculTea materials. They all encourage new ways of thinking with little time commitment.”

When asked what aspects of the FaculTea program should be improved to better support their learning, the most common responses centered on the theme of keeping the faculty and the discussion needed to have a clearer focus on advising needs. Fourteen
advisors gave responses similar to this one: “It is a good experience. There is a bit of a disconnect with what may have been discussed in the Teas and what we are supposed to take away to assist with advising.” Another said the sessions could better support learning “If the faculty could more directly address what we can tell our students.” Twelve respondents gave no suggestions for improvement. These either left the question blank, indicated “no suggestions” or “n/a”. A few responded with positive comments, such as “They are very helpful. Thanks!” Six advisors specifically mentioned issues related to time. Some advisors were too busy in their offices to attend as frequently as they would have liked, such as this advisor: “I have not been able to attend all FaculTeas because of scheduling – I have a lot of appointments.” Some had other conflicts: “Have them from 2-4 instead of 3-5; I had carpooling issues.”

Indeed, workload and problems related to time were the most common reason given by advisors who did not attend any FaculTea sessions. When asked why they did not attend, nine advisors cited reasons related to workload. For example, “busy with other advising tasks, meetings, students or extra duty activities.” Others mentioned having to make trade-offs with colleagues to keep a busy office running smoothly, “remained in office to staff phones, e-mails, and student inquires so that the rest of the advisors could participate.” Five advisors stated issues with time, but did not specifically mention workload, such as in this example: “Although I very much wanted to attend, I am part time and was not able to make the late day schedule.” In addition to these two main categories of responses, one advisor indicated that in addition to her other work tasks taking precedence, she did not attend any FaculTea sessions because she doubted she
would be able to use the information in her work: “not enough time in student appointments to get into depth about the topics.”

**Individual session evaluation results.** In addition to the overall program evaluation, participants were also asked to evaluate each FaculTea session. Two open-ended questions (similar to the overall program evaluation questions reported earlier), collected at the end of each session, asked participants to identify one aspect of the session that (1) “was helpful and contributed to your learning” and (2) “should be changed to better support your learning.” Advisors were also invited to provide any other comments they wished to share about the program. Similar to the results from the post-test questionnaires, on the session evaluations advisors mentioned the faculty presenter and the discussion among attendees as helpful and contributing to their learning. Several also mentioned bigger picture concepts as helpful to their learning. However, the most frequently mentioned aspect was information about the discipline or courses.

Most session evaluations included descriptions, stories, or information about the featured discipline or courses within that discipline. For instance after a session on statistics, one advisor cited as most helpful “bringing math into a conceptual (WORDS!) format for a math-avoider like myself.” Another presentation elicited this “most helpful” aspect, “It was interesting to learn how to speak to students about philosophy, especially how it is a lens to other disciplines.” Sixty-one responses to this question fit the category of discipline/course.

Thirty-eight respondents identified information about or the opportunity to connect with the faculty presenter as the most helpful aspect of the program. Some comments reflected on the content the faculty member provided, such as: “Wonderful
speaker. Enjoyed what she said about history making good citizens; also history being both humanities and social science.” Others commented on how the faculty presented the information, for example: “I loved hearing the stories. My students can certainly connect to narrative.” These results mirror the findings from the post-test questionnaires, which also revealed that the faculty presenters were an important aspect for supporting advisors’ learning.

Also mirroring the findings from the post-test questionnaires, responses to the individual session evaluations showed discussion among attendees to be a helpful aspect of the program that supported learning. On the individual session evaluations, discussion with the faculty members and colleagues was mentioned 15 times as contributing to learning. For example, one advisor commented that the “candid discussions with a faculty member” helped her learning. Another found “there was useful discussion on the benefits of taking a history course for students.”

Ten advisors responded with aspects related to the big picture. For instance, one advisor found helpful “the larger discussion of how global health relates to liberal arts and undergrad education.” Another mentioned the “idea of encouraging students to learn adaptability, (and the) importance of broad liberal arts education.”

The individual session evaluation forms also gave advisors an opportunity to suggest aspects of the FaculTea session that could be improved to support their learning. The 24 responses submitted over the course of the eight FaculTea sessions echoed those from the post-test questionnaires, with nearly all related to the focus of the presentation. One advisor suggested the moderator “rein in questions that might be ‘off topic’ from
An answer to that question would be: “Why is my discipline important.”

**Warranted Assertions for Research Question 1b.** The data collected from post-test questionnaires and from the individual session evaluations, summarized in Table 4, revealed which aspects of the FaculTea program model were helpful to advisors, and what aspects they would improve. Those who did not attend explained what kept them away. These data support the assertions that the faculty presentations and discussion with colleagues were the aspects of the program most helpful in supporting advisor learning. It is the information they glean from these about the academic disciplines and specific courses that help them the most. In contrast, advisors suggested that helping the faculty to focus their remarks would be a change for the better. Advisors who did not attend indicated that their heavy workload prevented their participation. Thus, responses from the advisors support the assertion that the design of the FaculTea program model is sound; while there are small things to improve, overall the program is considered to be helpful and of high quality.

**Results Related to Research Question 1c**

One quantitative measure and two qualitative data sets were used to address research question 1c: To what extent does the FaculTea program model support the application of learning centered advising? The post-test questionnaires administered after all eight FaculTea sessions were completed provided quantitative and qualitative data. The interviews with academic advisors also provided responses to this question.

**Post-test questionnaire results.** On the post-test advisors reported how often they used information learned through FaculTea sessions when they advise students.
Respondents rated themselves on a Likert scale with answers ranging from 1 (never), up to 10 (almost always). As demonstrated in Figure 1, on average, advisors who attended even just a few FaculTea sessions reported using the information at least occasionally. The more FaculTea sessions an advisor attended, the more likely she was to use information from FaculTea sessions when working with students.

The post-test questionnaire asked that all advisors who attended at least one FaculTea session provide an example of how they had used information from the program when working with students. Of the 46 advisors who reported attending at least one session, 44 responded to this open-ended question. These qualitative responses fell into four initial categories: course relationships, academic content, matching interests, and better recommendations.

Many advisors used information from the FaculTea sessions to describe course relationships, the connections between courses students were required to take. For example, one advisor mentioned she used what she had learned for “Explaining the rationale for our statistics requirement and why statistics are important and useful in academic and personal applications.” Others use the information from FaculTea sessions to explain the academic content of courses or disciplines, to better teach students what the discipline has to offer them. One advisor gave a specific example, “History – in high school memorize events; in college, one analyzes ‘why’ an event occurred, events surrounding the main event, and did it really need to happen.” Discussing connections across the disciplines, as well as the skills and knowledge they gain from their courses, helps students understand the logic of the curriculum, as described by Lowenstein (2000).
Advisors also use information from FaculTea sessions to tailor their advice to each student’s interests. These responses were categorized as matching interests. For example, “When I advise students in transition, I use the information to help them choose disciplines that match with their skills and get them closer to their goals.” Other advisors mentioned that they use what they learned at FaculTea sessions to make better recommendations to students, suggesting specific courses or faculty members. For example, one attendee noted, “I often recommend geography courses as natural sciences to students after discussing them with the faculty.” Another shared, “based on (the professor’s) obvious love of and enthusiasm for her particular branch of history, I encourage new students interested in U.S. history to take at least one class with her.” These types of recommendations support students in getting the most out of their courses and their education as a whole – another goal of learning centered advising.

**Advisor interview results.** Four advisors were interviewed to determine the extent to which they thought the FaculTea program supported advisors in being able to include learning centered advising topics when they meet with students. Advisors shared various examples of how the program had supported their ability to discuss the meaning and purpose of higher education, the logic of the curriculum, and, to a lesser degree, to support student self-reflection. Advisors also shared ideas on how the program could better support the application of learning centered advising.

**Meaning and purpose of higher education.** When asked to what extent she talked with students about topics related to the meaning and purpose of higher education, one advisor replied, “I try to do that more and more now, and it’s probably as a direct result
of this program, the FaculTeas, and especially those helpful articles and videos that you send.” Another on the meaning and purpose of learning:

    I see things like FaculTeas being good for the advisors, but even with advisors, and much more so with the students, you never know what’s going to flip the switch, light the spark, whatever cliché you want to use, to where they really get excited about not just meeting the requirements, getting the degrees, so they can find a job where they can earn the money and retire comfortably and die. For some people it is that and they are all about the money. I’ve had plenty of kids that come in that say that up front… (but) there are so many other students that are engaged.

    Logic of the curriculum. The FaculTea program model also supports advising on the logic of the curriculum. For example, discussing connections between classes, “…I love the geography one that we had. That was already one of the courses that we usually highlight as a recommended science course for (our) majors, in particular just because of the nice tie in between (our major) and physical geography. Now, after that, I felt like I had more talking points or some things to tell them.” Another advisor shared how she advised one of her new students to consider taking physical geography to fill his lab science requirement. The student was a humanities major, as well as a rock climber and member of the Outdoor club. “We’re talking about how that class would be perfect for him just as an individual in his life. Also, then how to connect it to the narrative thing, so with movies and telling stories and things like that.” In this example, the advisor connects the lab science course not only with the student’s personal interests, but also makes the
connection between geography and what he is learning about narrative in his major coursework.

*Supporting student self-reflection.* Knowledge from FaculTea sessions helped advisors support student self-reflection. Examples include the following quotes. “if I can explain what a course is like and what a subject material is like in a general way, that really helps the students making the decision, because they might not have ever been exposed to physical geography before.”

Overall, the advisors interviewed indicated that attending FaculTea sessions did support the application of learning centered advising in their work with students. Of the four advisors interviewed, the one newest to the profession commented that, “…most of the topics are very relevant and have been beneficial for me as a new advisor. I feel like I’m still learning a lot of that, so it’s been the perfect complement to everything.” But she could not always see the connection, with day to day advising. She suggested some improvements: “maybe even a summarized, ‘okay there’s these three things that we need to get answered as a result of this conversation.” Although there was room for improvements, the data clearly show that advisors felt the FaculTea program was useful in supporting their application of learning centered advising.

**Warranted Assertions for Research Question 1c.** The qualitative data from the post-test questionnaires and from the advisor interviews support the assertion that the FaculTea program increases the application of learning centered advising, as outlined in Table 5. On the questionnaire, advisors reported using information they learned from FaculTea sessions with students, providing examples that fit the definition of learning centered advising. Those interviewed provided more in-depth examples of how
knowledge gained from FaculTea sessions makes them more likely to have learning centered conversations with students.

**Warranted Assertions for Research Question 1**

The data collected support a warranted assertion that the FaculTea program model as implemented in this study, supports academic advisor learning overall and that it specifically supports advisors in incorporating learning centered advising into their work with students. Some advisors felt the sessions would benefit from more focused presentations. Others were not able attend at all due to workload or time conflicts. Yet, responses from the advisors who attended support the assertion that the FaculTea program model effectively fulfills its intended purposes. Indeed, when asked how the FaculTea program had influenced her advising, one advisor shared the new perspective she brings to her advising, a perspective entirely consistent with the normative theory of learning centered advising. She said, “I bring more passion and energy to all the requirements of a degree, just versus looking at the major classes and having the requirements as a ‘check, we’ve done that, we need to get this in’.” Advising in this way, with a focus on the connections within the curriculum and education as a whole, as opposed to a set of requirements to be checked off a list, is the core of learning centered advising.

**Results Related to Research Question 2**

While research question 1 evaluated the effectiveness of the FaculTea program model, research question 2 seeks to answer a broader question: To what extent do academic advisors apply learning centered advising practices to their work with students? Quantitative data from the pre- and post-test questionnaires and qualitative data from
advising appointment observations and interviews with academic advisors answered this question.

Pre- and post-test questionnaire results. On the questionnaires, advisors self-reported how frequently they engaged students in discussions on 21 different learning centered advising topics. Advisors responded on a ten-point Likert scale, from 1 (never) to 10 (almost always). Here, the average scores on both the pre-test and the post-test hovered near seven ($\bar{X}_{pre} = 6.98$, $SD = 1.33$, $n = 57$) ($\bar{X}_{post} = 7.15$, $SD = 1.30$, $n = 55$). Scores on the pre-test ranged from 4.19 to 9.38. On the post-test the range was 4.38 to 9.24. These scores indicate that advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences were discussing learning centered topics with students with some regularity. Even those reporting scores at the low end of the range apply some learning centered advising topics at least occasionally. Advisors with scores at the high end of the range almost always incorporate a number of learning centered advising topics.

Additional statistical analyses indicated that within this population of advisors, the frequency of learning centered advising varied only slightly among different sub-groups – with one notable exception. Number of years of advising experience made a significant difference in the reported frequency of learning centered advising. A Welch’s adjusted F was conducted to compare frequency of learning centered advising between advisors who have zero to five years of experience ($\bar{X}_{post} = 6.60$, $SD = 1.37$, $n = 23$), and those who have six years or more of experience ($\bar{X}_{post} = 7.57$, $SD = 1.25$, $n = 23$). The results showed that, in this population, more experienced advisors reported higher levels of learning centered advising, $F(1, 43.60) = 6.32$, $p = .02$). This finding suggests that
students are more likely to experience learning centered advising when they meet with more experienced academic advisors.

**Advising appointment observation results.** The observations of academic advising appointments revealed that advisors do apply learning centered advising practices to their work with students. However, analyzing the whole of the academic advising appointments revealed how advisors balance different advising approaches, even within individual appointments. Field notes from the observations were coded according to the 17 topics that comprised the three major categories of learning centered advising: logic of the curriculum, the meaning and purpose of higher education, and self-reflection. During this analysis, three additional categories emerged, basic advising, enhanced advising, and miscellaneous.

Advisors do discuss learning centered advising topics with many students. However, on the whole, appointments focused on basic and enhanced advising tasks. As described in Table 6, Basic advising tasks included problem solving and giving degree information. Enhanced advising included topics such as teaching students about the rules of the university, and suggesting educational opportunities beyond degree requirements. Because academic advising appointments are interactions, both the student and the advisor contribute to the content and outcomes of the meeting.

**Basic advising.** When students came for their advising appointments, most were seeking guidance in planning for the upcoming semester. Others had specific issues or problems with which they needed assistance. Thus, advisors sought to meet their students’ most immediate needs. In every case, the advisor spent a portion of the appointment reviewing degree information with the student. Together, they reviewed the
degree audit report, noting what requirements were complete and which were yet to be met in order to assure graduation. In addition, some students arrived at their appointments with additional concerns. For instance, one student sought her advisor’s council when she was told her scholarship would not cover her tuition if she took a prestigious full-time internship. In this case, the advisor spent the appointment getting accurate information from the scholarship office and helping the student plan for alternative coursework.

While the purpose of academic advising is much more than recommending classes and solving problems, giving accurate information to help students meet their degree requirements and graduate is still the most fundamental expectation of the advising role.

**Enhanced advising.** Enhanced advising took two main forms in the advising appointments observed: educational opportunities and teaching the rules. Advisors engaged in teaching students about the rules when they took additional time in the appointment to explain how certain policies or procedures worked. One advisor, for instance, taught each student that the three levels of degree requirements – university, college, and major – were analogous to federal, state, and local taxes. Another advisor took time to teach one of her students about the nuanced rules related to being in an all-online degree program versus taking on-line classes while remaining in an on-ground degree program.

Advisors also moved beyond basic advising when they suggested students consider educational opportunities beyond the basic requirements. One advisor discussed internship opportunities with each of her students. Other advisors suggested students consider pursuing minors or certificates related to their interests, in addition to their
majors. Study abroad was also a topic of conversation in some of the observed appointments.

**Learning centered advising.** While learning centered topics were not the focus of any of the observed appointments, advisors found ways to insert them at different points within the larger conversations. Conversations on the logic of the curriculum and occasions for student self-reflection occurred in most student appointments. Discussions related to the meaning and purpose of higher education were less frequent.

Advisors had various opportunities to discuss the logic of the curriculum with students. One advisor provided a learning centered explanation for the purpose of the university science requirement, pointing out that all citizens need to know something about science, so that if someone ever tries to ‘throw a bunch of bunk’ at them, they will know enough about science to question what they are hearing. Other advisors taught students about connections between their courses. In one appointment, the advisor discussed with the student how courses in English, British, and Korean literature could all work together to broaden her understanding of linguistics, narrative, and culture. Others discussed the skills students were learning in courses within and outside their major, such as how statistics is used in polling and how the university literacy requirement increases students’ writing and research skills.

Advisors also guided students towards reflections on their academic life. Most advisors did this by asking questions, engaging students in a critical thinking process prior to making a decision. Asking students about their academic goals helped students to reflect on the types of experience needed to achieve those goals. For example, advisors asked students to reflect on what they hoped to learn while at the university. Questions
such as, “how did you happen to select this university, and where are you headed?” and “how would a bachelor’s degree be helpful to you?” helped new students in online degree programs to engage in the advising process, rather than passively expect course recommendations. Students meet with advisors to get information, but also for guidance on making decisions. Advisors will not decide for them, but guide them through the thought process to make up their own minds.

Advisors also related the purpose and meaning of higher education during advising appointments. For example, when advising a new transfer student, one advisor shared that the student was earning a degree through the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Because of this, the advisor explained, the student was gaining tools beyond one narrow major, learning skills not just for her first job, but for many different types of jobs. The advisor emphasized ways the student’s education would prepare her for real-life challenges. In another appointment, a student wondered if her degree would be useful for a career in marketing. The advisor discussed the intellectual and practical skills the student was developing through her college experience: history, cultural knowledge, writing, critical thinking, research skills. The trick, the advisor said, was to learn how to sell the skills.

**Missed opportunities.** Worthy of note were a few occasions where advisors might have addressed a student's question or issue in a more learning centered way. For example, one student declared he was having difficulty “getting past math,” and wanted information on withdrawing from the class. The advisor provided good information on deadlines, course sequencing, and other possible ramifications of withdrawing from the course, which was what the student was seeking. The advisor helped the student solve the
problem, but missed an opportunity to walk the student through this difficult situation, to have him reflect on his situation and his options. In another appointment, a student expressed interest in pursuing a political science minor along with his major. The advisor encouraged the student, letting him know that this combination worked well together because the minor courses could also count as related field classes for the major. While this is all true and good, the advisor missed an opportunity to talk about how the major and the minor disciplines would look at the same issue or topic in different ways, and how the skills from each discipline would complement the other.

**Advisor interview results.** When asked about how they incorporate learning centered advising content into their work with students, advisors described not only what they say to students, but also in which situations and with which students the topics are most likely to arise. Comments related to advising content, advisors shared how they discuss learning centered content during advising appointments. Descriptions of the advising context describe what situations support or hinder advisors’ ability to have learning centered conversations with students. Advisors also shared how they adjust their advising depending on the student with whom they are working. Each of these three categories, outlined in Table 7, incorporates several themes.

When describing what they say to students, advisors touched on three main themes. The first was connections between courses and academic disciplines. In these stories, advisors shared how they teach students about how the ideas they learn in different courses relate to each other, an aspect of the logic of the curriculum. One advisor, for instance, shared how she made connections for her freshmen when they complained about the university lab science requirement: “since it’s a (media studies)
class, I (told them), ‘well, let’s think about James Cameron, and all the stuff he does and his movies, how they are based on science. Or look at television shows like The Big Bang Theory. You think the people who write and work on that show need to know a little bit about science? Of course they do.”

The second theme within advising content was the importance of subjects, or teaching students why learning certain topics is important. One advisor shared that “about 90 percent of them grumble about the (second) language requirement, but they never get off the hook, not with me… I really talk about the importance of language, and language is tied to a culture. If you’re going be a global citizen it’s so important to make an effort to at least try to understand a little bit of someone else’s language. Language and food and literature and how that’s all tied together.”

The third theme was discovery. Here, advisors incorporate learning centered advising topics when they encourage students to discover new academic interests or ideas. One advisor described how she suggests courses to students based upon the interests and goals they share with her, “sometimes they say they have no idea, and we will pull up the… course titles in the schedule of classes to kind of get them thinking about (their options).” She explained that she uses these techniques, putting her “passion into it (because I) want my students to get excited about their education.” Another shared the importance of talking to her students about the possibilities, because making those discoveries on their own can be difficult: “they just aren’t sure what they are going to love. There is so much choice here. They come from high school and (now) there are five million gazillion classes (to choose from).” Thus, the interviews provided another glimpse of the content of learning centered advising in practice.
In the interviews, advisors also spoke about the advising context, and how it influences the extent to which they apply learning centered advising in their work. Within this category, the themes of time and success classes were predominant. Some of the advisors interviewed teach courses on first-year student success, in addition to providing one-on-one advising. These advisors shared stories of how they incorporate learning centered topics into their classrooms. For example, one related that “in (class) we’re always talking about internships and careers, but then also taking a step back and saying there is more than (that) – this college education does not equal job. There are more reasons for you to be here: to be a good citizen, to learn about those things.” This same advisor shared that teaching a success course helps her teach her students about learning centered topics because, “you’ve got a captive audience there.” She went on to identify the second theme, time, by saying that “time is the biggest issue for me.” All four advisors shared that a tight schedule of appointments and a high volume of student interactions limited the amount of time they could devote to learning centered advisement. One commented that “it would be fun to actually look at the classes and say ‘what do you think of this.’ Sometimes I do. Sometimes you can, but you don’t always have that luxury of the time that it takes.” Another commented that, to include more learning centered advising, it would help to have “more time to be with the student… (For example) if we have a line of walk-ins out there, we might be less likely to go into some of these topics unless they are brought up directly by the student.” In these ways, the advising context influences the extent to which advisors apply learning centered practices in their work.
The third category that influences the extent to which advisors apply learning centered advising is the student. Three themes emerged to describe how attributes of the student affect the advising appointment. First, the *presenting issue* makes a difference; the extent of learning centered advising is influenced by the issue that prompted the student to seek advising. For example, during certain times of year, “it seems like the only ones you see are the ones that are in trouble. Then you are just triaging that rather than getting into the bigger discussions.” So, the amount of learning centered advising “depends on the type of advising appointment.” One advisor shared that she often discusses learning centered topics with students who are thinking of leaving the university. She shared this situation: “we ended up talking about how (his college education) could impact him, regardless of what he chooses to do, (and) what he could gain, because he was feeling – not necessarily just that he was not prepared for (college), but that (he was) never going to use this (information)… he was not seeing beyond (a specific job in his father’s business).”

Second, the *relationship* between the advisor and student can also influence the extent to which learning centered advising is included in an advising session. One advisor uses learning centered topics to build relationships with her students, by “shar(ing) examples of how, now that I’m in the ‘real world,’ as an adult with a degree, different topics that come up that my husband and I discuss, and how I wish I’d had more classes (on) that, so I could critically think through some of those … issues or situations that we are faced with in real life or the working world.” Another advisor observed that learning centered topics were more likely to arise with students who already knew them. She cited the importance of “making those strong connections with students early on so they are
coming back and having those conversations.” Rather than only coming for advising when they had problems, students would return to see their advisors “so they can ask meaningful questions.”

Third, advisors noted that the student’s developmental level also affects the extent to which they include learning centered topics into advising sessions. One advisor shared that he has learning centered discussions with “the best of students and the worst of students.” He went on to describe how, with students on the low end of the developmental scale, he has discussions that answer their questions about why certain courses are required. In contrast, with students on the higher end of the scale, he helps students who reflect on their interests and goals and to seek meaningful academic opportunities to fulfill them. Another advisor identified students in online degree programs as at a specific developmental level: “they are returning to finish a degree, which is a goal they have. So you try to bring it back to that – ‘okay, yes, I know you… need to finish this degree as soon as possible. Let’s make it meaningful… while you are here.” Thus, the student’s readiness to engage in and benefit from learning centered advising conversations can also influence advisors’ practice.

Warranted Assertions for Research Question 2

The results described above suggest that, within the context being studied, advisors are applying learning centered advising practices to their work with students to a moderate extent. As outlined in Table 8, the data came from the questionnaires, observations of academic advising appointments, and the advisor interviews. The extent to which they practice learning centered advising overall is influenced by the time available, as well as the need to cover basic advising topics. The extent to which advisors
apply learning centered practices with any given student is influenced by the student’s presenting issue, the relationship that exists between the student and the advisor, and the student’s developmental level. While advisors did miss some opportunities to engage in learning centered advising conversations with students, this was usually the result of the limited time available for the appointment, and the amount of basic and enhanced advising the student’s presenting issue entailed.

**Results Related to Research Question 3**

Qualitative data from the interviews with academic advisors and with students answered research question 3: How do students experience learning centered advising?

**Advisor interview results.** During the interviews, advisors shared how their students respond to learning centered advising discussions. Upon analysis, advisors’ descriptions fell into two categories. The first category was students who *get it*, who are receptive or even excited to engage in discussions about learning centered topics. The second category is students who respond with an *eye roll*. These students are resistant to engaging in learning centered discussions.

Students who get it respond to learning centered advising by learning and engaging in discussion with their advisors. Advisors relayed the following experiences:

- “…most of them are very pleased to hear (about the logic of the curriculum) because rather than just saying you have X, Y, and Z to complete, they … know that there is a reason. There is a thought process behind it.”
• “…they’re usually receptive to… seeing that they have room to work in things that might go along with their goals, even if it’s outside the major. They usually like that.”

• “…you do have some students that are excited about that possibility… They (say), ‘I never thought about the fact that I could take a class in another area that might still pertain to what I’m doing.”

• “The ones that are already keyed into it, and are looking for more meaning and looking for certain classes to really help them learn, they get it. I mean, they are already there. They’re just wanting more guidance in finding the right fit.”

In contrast, many students respond to their advisors with an eye roll, resistant to engaging in learning centered discussions. Advisors provided these examples:

• “The ones that are on the other end of the spectrum, that are all about, ‘Do I have to take this? I hate science.’ That’s a harder one… you can get an eye roll even sometimes when you feel like you’ve made the perfect argument.”

• “You will hear them say, ‘yeah, yeah, yeah. I know, I know.’ That’s more the response I get, to be honest.”

• “Sometimes they have a blank look on their face – ‘oh, wait. I’m supposed to be doing this? You’re not just going to tell me what to do?”

• “Sometimes there is resistance, and that’s not fun, but it’s part of that tough love. Just like a parent, you… still encourage them…”
Although students’ immediate responses were sometimes less than encouraging, the advisors believed that repeated exposure to learning centered topics would eventually lead to understanding:

- “Some of them (respond with) ‘eh.’ So you have to keep pounding the message home, with some of them.”
- “Even with kids, introducing them to new foods, they say you have to introduce them so many times before they will try it… I may not think I’m getting anywhere, but hopefully I’m chipping away at that and it will help (the student) understand.”
- “… you hope they got some food for thought.”
- “You can make the perfect argument, you can lay it all out, but if they’re not responsive to it, it’s not going to happen… You have to do the best you can with … providing good information. It may penetrate now, it may penetrate later, it may not penetrate at all, but you can’t control that portion.”

Clearly, advisors see different responses from their students when they initiate learning centered discussions during appointments. While some students are receptive, others are resistant. Yet, knowing that students learn at different rates, advisors continue to present learning centered topics, with hope that the ideas will one day take hold.

**Student interview results.** After their advising appointments, six students were asked to give their thoughts on the definition of learning centered advising, as well as to share how they responded to specific learning centered topics that arose during their appointments. Some students recognized these discussions as sources of learning, and
appreciated the conversations. These comments, categorized as *appreciate*, demonstrated that some students do grasp the learning centered concepts introduced by their advisors, such as the meaning and purpose of higher education. For example, one student shared that her advisor “has shown me how college is a preparation for life. It’s not a set amount of requirements you have to get over in order to move on. It’s something that’ going to help me build myself and have a foundation (for) the rest of my life.” Another recognized and appreciated his advisor’s discussion of the purpose of the science requirement. He commented, “My main problem with science is I can never really get how to relate it to my world. There he explained how it related, and how it affected the real world…That I liked. I understood that.” These examples came from a sophomore and a junior who reported meeting frequently with their advisors.

Other students, when asked about learning centered advising, did not recognize the conversation as learning centered, yet showed signs that learning was occurring. These comments were categorized as *affecting*, as the advising was influencing students even if they were not fully aware of it. One student, for example, when asked how he responded to a learning centered discussion that had occurred in the previous day’s appointment, answered at first, “pretty much I was just looking at how fast I want to graduate.” But as he continued his response, he revealed the self-reflection behind that initial answer: “I don’t want to rush things, and then I have too much on my plate and I can’t finish. My thought process was just trying to take it slow, that’s what I need to do. Most likely I will take some extra classes in the summer; even though I don’t want to, I may need to.” This particular comment came from a student who met frequently with his
advisor. He was a full time student and worked a full time job, as well. He showed signs of reflecting but was more focused on the outcome of his education than on the process.

Some student comments, however, showed no evidence of recognition or learning. Comments such as these were categorized as *nothing yet*. They demonstrate a lack of self-reflection and an unwillingness to engage. Nothing yet comments are exemplified by this exchange:

**Interviewer:** ...That kind of conversation, how do you respond to that?

**Student:** where I want to go in the future?

**Interviewer:** To have that conversation. Having someone ask you (about your interests and goals), does it make you uncomfortable, or you like it, or you wish someone would just tell you (what to do)?

**Student:** Yeah, I don’t really know what I want to do; I kind of have an idea, but it’s not 100% yet.

**Interviewer:** So, having those conversations with an advisor, would that be helpful to you?

**Student:** Yeah, I think it would be helpful.

This example came from a new first-year student whose previous experience with advising came from a single meeting with an advisor in another school.

These three categories represent a range of student responses to learning centered academic advising. Clearly, not all students respond to learning centered advising in the same way.

**Warranted Assertions for Research Question 3**
As revealed by the interviews with academic advisors and students, it is clear that students have mixed responses to learning centered advising. The data, as outlined in Table 9, further suggest that the differences among students stem from, as several advisors suggested, the student’s developmental level. Students who get it value learning centered interactions and recognize what they learn from their advisors. Others are being challenged and supported to learn, but are not yet aware of what they are gaining from advising. These students show signs of self-reflection. Still other students respond with outright resistance, unwilling or unable to engage in self-reflection. These students, perhaps so intent on receiving a degree, miss their opportunity to earn an education.
Chapter 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study examined the FaculTea program model for advisor professional development, the application of learning centered academic advising, and how students respond to learning centered advising interactions. Using a mixed methods approach, data collected from five sources supported warranted assertions that

- the FaculTea program model is effective in supporting advisor learning and increasing the frequency of learning centered advising practices,
- advisors apply learning centered practices to their work with students to the extent they are able, given the advising context and the student, and
- student responses to learning centered advising conversations vary based on each student’s developmental level.

Discussion

In addition, this work contributes to closing a gap in the academic advising literature regarding how advisor professional development can support the practice of learning centered academic advising. Moreover, the findings suggest ways learning centered advising may be implemented in contexts other than small institutions and advisors other than faculty. And, although this study does not address the specific student outcomes of learning centered academic advising, it does have implications for future research on this topic. This section now expands on the results of the study. It discusses implications for professional development for academic advisors, the practice of advising, and implications for students. Limitations of the study and areas for additional research are also identified.
Academic Advisor Professional Development. When searching for ideas on providing professional development for academic advisors, training coordinators have many resources to which they may turn. A review of NACADA’s online clearinghouse, the New Advisor Guidebook (Folsom & Chamberlain, 2007) or training and professional development monograph (Givans Voller, Miller, and Neste, 2010) will yield many options for delivering professional development. Yet many of the models within the advisor professional development marketplace have not been subject to the same rigorous assessment as the FaculTea program model.

This study demonstrates the effectiveness of the FaculTea program model in increasing knowledge and frequency of learning centered academic advising. Previous literature on learning centered advising has provided suggestions that advisors might incorporate into their work with students (Reynolds, 2010), and advanced its status as the purpose of academic advising (Lowenstein, 2010, 2011). Now, training coordinators have a mechanism to prepare advisors to fulfill that purpose. Given that not all advisors come to the field with a broad education in liberal arts or an appreciation for the same, if they are to fulfill the learning centered purpose of academic advising, they will need the knowledge and support to do so. The FaculTea program model meets that need.

FaculTea program model. Designed to conform to the best practices of academic advisor training and professional development, the FaculTea model successfully supported advisors’ learning about the academic disciplines and about the theory of learning centered academic advising. At each session, advisors shared what they learned about the liberal arts curriculum, necessary knowledge for providing learning centered advising (Lowenstein, 2011). The program also exposed advisors to different theories of
advising, as recommended by Lowenstein (2011). Through the various aspects of the program, including the common readings and videos, the program successfully increased advisors knowledge of advising theory. Advisors identified meeting with the faculty members to be the aspect of the program that most contributed to this finding. This supports Folsom’s (2008) suggestion that advisors meet with faculty members to learn more about the liberal arts curriculum. The demonstrated increase in learning centered advising among advisors who attended three or more sessions supports Folsom et al.’s (2010) guideline that effective professional development is on-going, rather than a single event.

Moreover, the results show that the FaculTea program model does support improvements in all three components of academic advisor knowledge: informational, relational and conceptual. Advisors indicated they learned information about the disciplines and specific courses within them. They also gained knowledge of faculty members as individuals, laying the groundwork for new professional relationships. In addition, advisors reported increases in conceptual knowledge of theories and philosophies that form the foundation of advising practice. Clearly, the results of this study demonstrate that the FaculTea program model, designed with the best practices of advisor professional development in mind, is effective in supporting advisor learning and increasing advisors’ knowledge and application of learning centered advising.

**Pragmatic advantages.** The FaculTea model is effective, and it is also practical. First, the cost to provide the program is very low. The only costs incurred in mounting the program as described in this study were for the refreshments – cookies, tea, and paper products. Articles and videos for the common reading portion of the program are easily
found online. Faculty members were more than willing to participate. While this study suggests that faculty may benefit from more extensive preparation than was described here, very little other planning is required. It should be noted, however, that the program benefits if facilitated by an experienced academic advisor who is knowledgeable about the theory of learning centered advising and the goals of liberal learning. Overall, the FaculTea model is simple to emulate.

Furthermore, the model can be modified to account for different needs and contexts. Advisors working with exploratory or undecided students would gain knowledge to support their students’ decision making processes. Smaller institutions might open the program not only to advisors, but also to students, with the program functioning as both a professional development and a student engagement event. Faculty advisors, too, might enjoy and benefit from the FaculTea model, as it takes an academic approach to advising, promoting learning and connections across the disciplines. Some institutions might choose to present small panels of faculty from the same or different disciplines, to compare and contrast their offerings and how their courses each contribute to students’ understanding of the world. Some sessions might exclude a presenter, to instead focus entirely on discussion of the common reading or role playing how advisors might share learning centered information with students.

**Diffusion of knowledge.** Interestingly, the results of this study suggest that the effects of the FaculTea program extend even to advisors who did not attend any sessions. Comparisons of the pre- and post-tests revealed that even advisors who did not attend a single FaculTea session showed gains in knowledge of the theory of learning centered advising. In fact, they showed greater gains in knowledge than advisors who attended one
or two sessions. These data indicate a diffusion effect that led even advisors who did not attend the program to increase their knowledge of learning centered advising and to reflect and revise their conversations with students.

The cause is unclear. All advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences received invitations to the FaculTea sessions. Perhaps advisors read the attached common reading materials but were later unable to attend the session. Or maybe this group gained knowledge from their colleagues, comments made at advising staff meetings, or simply showed maturation over the course of the study. Regardless, the culture of learning centered advising spread beyond the program itself. In this case, effects on learning centered practice could not be measured by program attendance alone.

Whatever its cause, this finding suggests that learning can diffuse beyond those who attend professional development sessions. Thus, low attendance, on its own, should not prevent the implementation and continuation of advisor professional development programs. Changes in culture often begin slowly, and diffusion can take time. If even a few advisors attend, their knowledge and experience can spread (Rogers, 2003), leading to improved advising for students in all areas. This diffusion effect suggests that offering ongoing professional development is worthwhile, even if not all advisors are able to attend. This phenomenon warrants further study.

**Additional future research.** Also worthy of additional study is how faculty members experience the FaculTea program. For example, were there any effects on relationships between advisors and faculty members? Research from the medical field (Zaigier, 2010), suggests that a common reading program can break down status barriers in the workplace. Perhaps the FaculTea program has similar effects? Such knowledge
would be of use when planning future professional development programs and could underscore the benefits of bringing faculty and professional advisors together.

Of additional interest is how faculty members’ views of advising or advisors were affected by participating in a FaculTea session. Those who participated appeared to truly enjoy talking about their research, discipline, and curriculum with the advisors. Afterwards, several faculty members confided in the Assistant Dean that they had learned a great deal from the advisors, including how students view the courses and programs in their discipline. One faculty member, for example, left with a plan to request title changes to several courses, to make them more appealing to students. Although this evidence is anecdotal, future research on the FaculTea program model should take a closer look at what faculty expected from the program, and what they experienced.

Clearly, the FaculTea program model was not only successful in fulfilling its stated goals, but also served as a source of increased awareness of learning centered advising across the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. While additional questions about the extent of its influence remain, the FaculTea program model has proved its efficacy and has been adopted as an on-going professional development program for advisors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Academic advising practice. In addition to its implication for advisor professional development, the results of this study also shed light on the practice of academic advising itself. The literature on learning centered advising originated from faculty advisors at relatively small institutions (Hemwall & Trachte, 1999, 2003; Reynolds, 2010); in contrast this study examined learning centered advising as enacted with professional advisors at a large state school. Results demonstrate that this population
does apply learning centered academic advising practices to their work with students. Although advisors get affective benefits from engaging in learning centered advising, the extent to which these practices are applied, however, are dependent upon the advising context and the experience level of the academic advisor.

**Contexts for learning centered advising.** Professional development programs can increase the frequency of learning centered advising. Yet, opportunities to engage in these discussions with students can vary greatly across advising contexts. The institutional mission, administrative pressures, student load, and student characteristics can all influence an advisor’s ability to initiate learning centered conversations. Since finding the time to fit these topics in to student appointment can be a challenge, advisors use other means for delivering this information to students.

**Time.** Time is an issue. For these professional advisors with student appointments scheduled in thirty-minute increments back-to-back throughout the day, learning centered advising conversations often take a back seat to solving student problems and reviewing degree requirements. While advisors in the College appreciate the importance of their role in teaching students about the whole of their education and how to experience the most learning from their courses, institutional expectations, as well as the expectations of many students, compel them to make basic advising a priority.

**Utilizing existing structures.** Since time is at a premium during advising appointments, advisors utilize alternative structures to deliver learning centered advising. For example, several advisors noted that they cover such topics as part of the first-year success seminar courses they teach. These courses, required for all first-time freshman students at this university, are an appropriate forum for teaching students about the logic
of the curriculum, the meaning and purpose of higher education, and engage them in self-reflection. Class sessions provide more time for engagement and discussion, and the classroom format allows advisors to formally assess students’ understanding of the information. In addition, seeing academic advisors in the classroom affirms for students the advisor’s role as teacher. Students would benefit if learning centered topics and assignments would be incorporated into all sections of the first-year success seminar courses.

Lowenstein’s (2011) idea of requiring similar courses for students at all academic levels, while perhaps an ideal, is unlikely to take hold at larger schools. Yet, certainly learning centered topics could be incorporated into selected junior- and senior-level courses. Alternately, such topics might be integrated into group advising sessions. With some creative thinking, professional advisors at larger institutions can utilize existing structures to provide students with the benefits of learning centered advising.

**Value of experienced advisors.** Finding ways to deliver learning centered advising to students can be challenging, perhaps this helps explain why experienced advisors more frequently incorporated learning centered topics into their work with students. Based on the data, this may be due to experienced advisors’ more extensive knowledge of basic and enhanced advising information. Secure in their knowledge of policies, procedures, and graduation requirements, they have the mental energy to engage students in personalized learning centered conversations. Too, experienced advisors, over time, may have gained more knowledge of the theories, knowledge, and ideas within the disciplines – information they then share with students in the form of learning centered
advising conversations. Additional research will be needed to determine why this might be true.

Regardless of the reason, this finding reinforces the value of experience in academic advising, as well as the importance of academic advisor retention. Experienced advisors, as a group, provide more learning centered advising. If learning centered advising maximizes the benefits students reap from their academic experiences, then retaining advisors within the field becomes crucial to students’ learning. While there is no standard to determine when an advisor becomes experienced (M. A. Miller, personal communication, March 1, 2013), institutions committed to student learning will want to examine how they develop and support their academic advisors.

**Affective benefits.** One aspect of supporting academic advisors is professional development. Miller (personal communication, March 4, 2013) notes that, unfortunately, experienced advisors can become jaded when it comes to professional development. However, in her experience, experienced advisors tend to respond more positively when they can participate. Thus, a program such as FaculTea, where advisors participate in readings and discussion with faculty members may be useful in keeping experienced advisors happy.

Indeed, the results of this study suggest that participating in the FaculTea program and providing learning centered advising to students were satisfying to advisors at all levels of experience. For example, many indicated that having conversations with students on learning centered topics makes their work more rewarding, reminding them of why they originally chose to pursue to become an academic advisor. Many mentioned how they sought to encourage and excite their students about courses and ideas. For
example, one advisor shared that she “…tr(ies) to put passion into (my advising) and want my students to get excited about their educations, too.” In addition, advisors encouraged students to consider classes that they themselves would enjoy. Anecdotally, at the end of more than one FaculTea session, advisors commented that they would now like to register for a class in the discipline presented that day.

On their session evaluations and questionnaires, they also shared how they enjoyed connecting with colleagues. Positive learning experiences such as these are important for academic advisors, and for students. As one advisor commented, “By making a more enthusiastic advisor, you get more enthusiastic advising, which… will engage the students.” Clearly, the FaculTea program sparks advisors’ interests, causing them to be more energized and passionate about their work, which ultimately benefits students.

**Students.** Just how much students benefit depends on the individual. Student responses to learning centered advising varied based upon their level of development. Some students recognized and appreciated talking with their advisors about the purpose of their requirements and how courses outside their major would enhance their overall education. Such responses were more common among students who had been at the university for at least one year, and who had sought academic advising on multiple prior occasions. Students who reported fewer encounters with academic advisors were more likely to be unaware or even resistant to what they were learning from their academic advisors. These students had less exposure to learning centered ideas and conversations. Determining the causal relationship between students’ exposure to advising and their
response to learning centered discussions, while beyond the scope of this study, is an intriguing question for further research.

Measuring student learning from academic advising is challenging, as it is difficult to measure the non-formal and informal learning that results from these interactions. First, the learning may not manifest itself until weeks, months, or even years later. As one advisor said, some students will get it later, some may never get it. Like parents and educators of all sorts, academic advisors plant seeds that may not bear fruit for many years. Second, students learn from what advisors tell them, but they also learn what advisors do. For example, when asked what she had learned from her advising appointment, one student, who had sought help with questions about her scholarship, replied, “I learned that…networking is good, because if you know someone that knows someone, it might help you out. He mentioned he knew someone in financial aid and that might help me in my situation, so, that is definitely a plus to remember, to just network with people.” Thus, while this study did not establish or measure specific student learning outcomes for advising, the results did begin to establish how students experience learning centered advising.

Future research should take the next steps to define the outcomes of learning centered advising, and how best to measure them. If the goals of learning centered advising are to increase student understanding about the connections among their courses and the purpose of their education, are these goals being met? This study examined a brief snapshot of student experiences with learning centered advising. A larger study including more students would yield many more answers about how students experience these types of academic advising conversations. Thus, it remains to be seen whether
learning centered advising produces students who are more self-reflective and more knowledgeable about the logic of the curriculum and the meaning and purpose of higher education.

**Conclusion**

The theory of learning centered advising has great potential for generating new questions and understandings of academic advising. While this study has focused on learning centered behaviors, conversations, and approaches, it is important to remember that learning centered advising is more than a set of advising techniques. Learning centered advising is a normative theory, or philosophy, of academic advising. Thus, it describes the purpose of academic advising and provides an ideal vision of its practice.

As explained by Lowenstein (2007), learning centered advising:

- helps (students) order the pieces, put them together to make a coherent whole, so that a student experiences the curriculum not as a checklist of discrete, isolated pieces but instead as a unity, a composition of interrelated parts with multiple connections and relationships. The adviser helps students see how courses complement each other, lead to each other, perhaps contrast with each other.
- …the excellent adviser helps students understand the structure or logic of their entire education.

This study has moved this vision forward, demonstrating its applicability to a wider range of academic advising contexts. The FaculTea professional development program supports academic advisors in fulfilling the purpose of advising as defined above, providing both information and inspiration. Moreover, the results of this study suggest that all who advise – faculty and staff, at small institutions and large – can, with
support and experience, enhance student learning. While not all students will respond initially with understanding, the lessons may still be learned, albeit in ways that can be difficult to quantify.

Advising is teaching. This idea is not new. Indeed, it has been around since Crookston published his seminal article in 1972. Yet, the theory of learning centered advising illuminates more clearly what advisors should be teaching, in a way that distinguishes advising from other educational roles at the university (Lowenstein, 2007). While real challenges will prevent academic advisors from reaching this ideal with many, or even most, students, such higher order learning must still be the goal. The learning centered philosophy of academic advising is an ideal that is worth pursuing.

Yet, advisors are not entirely free to set the standards for their field. Unlike other professions, which have more autonomy to govern their practices and purposes, academic advisors must practice within the framework of a post-secondary educational institution. The purpose of advising is, for all practical purposes, governed by the administration of those institutions. Indeed, as administrators seek to control costs while servicing an increasing number of students, a narrow view of advising benefits the bottom line. Defining advising as a series of clerical, data entry tasks designed to march students efficiently towards graduation may be economical, but at what cost to student learning and, ultimately, to society?

Academic advising is an important source of student learning, but advisors’ ability to fulfill this role is jeopardized if institutions do not provide the time, resources, and support needed to engage in teaching and learning. To increase recognition of advisors’ role in student learning, academic advisors must do more than educate
themselves. They must work with faculty and administrators, explaining the contributions academic advising makes to student learning. Programs such as FaculTea, which brings together advisors and faculty members, can play a part. In addition, advisors must continue to define what students should be learning from advising and, moreover, develop more effective ways to assess that learning is taking place. Then, they must share this information through conference presentations, in reports to university administrators, on their advising web sites, and via popular and scholarly publications. If academic advisors are to be acknowledged as academics and educators in their own right, they must begin sharing with a wider audience the vision, the goals, the outcomes, and the purpose of what they do.
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Table 1: T-tests on pre- vs. post-test means on FaculTea Outcomes for 3 levels of attendance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FaculTea sessions attended</th>
<th>Pre-test mean(SD)</th>
<th>Post-test mean(SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended 0 n = 14</td>
<td>6.90 (2.01)</td>
<td>7.10 (1.49)</td>
<td>-.603</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended 1 or 2 n=14</td>
<td>7.16 (1.69)</td>
<td>6.83 (1.71)</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended 3 or more n=18</td>
<td>7.06 (1.41)</td>
<td>7.70 (1.18)</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant at the .05 level or lower
Table 2: T-tests on pre- vs. post-test means on Familiarity with Learning Centered Advising for 3 levels of attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FaculTea sessions attended</th>
<th>Pre-test mean (SD)</th>
<th>Post-test mean (SD)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended 0 n = 14</td>
<td>2.64 (1.22)</td>
<td>3.43 (.94)</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended 1 or 2 n=14</td>
<td>3.14 (1.03)</td>
<td>3.14 (.95)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended 3 or more n=18</td>
<td>3.33 (.97)</td>
<td>3.61 (.67)</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant at the .05 level or lower
Table 3: Summary of data related to research question 1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>FaculTea Outcome Scores</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Increase in discussions about topics related to FaculTea outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Knowledge of Learning Centered</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Increased knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Session</td>
<td>What Was Learned</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Advising content; Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>How Advising Changed</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Information; Excitement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Summary of data related to research question 1b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Aspects that contributed to learning</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Faculty; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Aspects to be improved</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Why did not attend</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Session Evaluations</td>
<td>Aspects that contributed to learning</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Discipline/Courses; Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Session Evaluations</td>
<td>Aspects to be improved</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Frequency of Use</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>At least occasionally for all who attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Examples of how advisors use information from FaculTea with students</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Course relationships, Academic content, Matching interests, Better recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Interviews</td>
<td>To what extent did FaculTea support you being able to include learning-centered topics when you met with students?</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Meaning and purpose; Logic of the curriculum; Student self-reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Centered Advising</td>
<td>Logic of the Curriculum</td>
<td>The purpose of the College or general education requirements. Benefits of taking a variety of courses outside the major. Skills students learn in the courses. How content of different courses relate to one another. How different academic disciplines approach the same topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Self-reflection</td>
<td>Various responses to a difficult academic situation. What the student hopes to learn from a course. How the courses the student has selected will help them meet their goals. A school project or academic achievement of which the student is particularly proud.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaning &amp; Purpose of Higher Education</td>
<td>Purpose of a liberal arts education. Intellectual or practical skills the student is developing through their college experience. Ways the student’s education is preparing them to engage with complex, real-life challenges. How a course the student has taken influenced their point of view on an issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Advising</td>
<td>Teaching the Rules</td>
<td>Teaching. Communication to help students learn/understand what is needed to graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Opportunities</td>
<td>Opportunities beyond degree requirements (<em>e.g.</em> study abroad, minors, internships)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Advising</td>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Addressing a student problem or issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree Information</td>
<td>Telling/reviewing what is needed to graduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Missed Opportunities</td>
<td>Situations that could have been more learning centered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Extent of learning centered advising: Advisor interview themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising Content</td>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>How content of different courses or academic disciplines relate to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of subjects</td>
<td>Importance of certain courses or academic disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td>Encouraging student to consider new ideas or new options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Context</td>
<td>Success class</td>
<td>Teaching student success courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Length of time available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presenting issue</td>
<td>What prompted the student to seek advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Nature of the relationship between the advisor and the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental level</td>
<td>Student’s level of self-knowledge, and basic advising knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: summary of data related to research question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Frequency of learning centered discussions</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>moderate frequency of learning centered discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Appointment Observations</td>
<td>Learning centered topics</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Learning centered topics are incorporated into appointments, complementing basic and enhanced advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Interviews</td>
<td>To what extent do they apply</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Extent of learning centered advising content depends upon the advising context and the student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Summary of data related to research question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor Interviews</td>
<td>To what extent do they apply</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Range from ‘get it’ to ‘eye roll’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interviews</td>
<td>Responses to learning centered experiences and to the definition</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Range from ‘appreciate’ to ‘affecting’ to ‘nothing yet’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Frequency of using information from FaculTea by number of sessions attended
APPENDIX A

FACULTEA TOPICS, ATTENDANCE, AND MATERIALS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th>Advisors Present</th>
<th>Common Reading/Viewing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PRE- AND POST-TEST ADVISOR QUESTIONNAIRES
I. Information about your background in advising and higher education will be helpful.

1. Number of years of education you have completed: ________________________

2. Highest degree completed:
   Associate’s  Bachelor’s  Master’s  Juris Doctor  Doctorate

3. Academic area of your highest degree completed (Circle one):
   a. Humanities/Arts
   b. Social Sciences
   c. Physical Science/ Math
   d. Life Sciences
   e. Engineering/Technology
   f. Education
   g. Business
   h. Interdisciplinary
   i. Public Affairs/Public Policy/Law
   j. Other (please indicate): ________________________

4. Number of years you have been an academic advisor (include years here at ASU as well as at other institutions). ________________________

5. Have you taught classes at the post-secondary level (community college, college or university)?  Yes  No

II. Academic advisors use different approaches to academic advising depending upon their own experiences, the student’s needs, and the context of the meeting. Circle the response that best describes how familiar you are with each of the following approaches to academic advising:

1. Prescriptive advising
   i. I am familiar with this approach to advising and apply it to my work as needed
   ii. I am familiar with this approach to advising
   iii. I have heard of this but do not know much about it
   iv. I have never heard of this approach to advising

2. Developmental advising
   i. I am familiar with this approach to advising and apply it to my work as needed
   ii. I am familiar with this approach to advising
   iii. I have heard of this but do not know much about it
   iv. I have never heard of this approach to advising

So that I may later match these answers with your post-test, please write the first two letters of your mother’s name and the last four digits of your telephone number: ________________________
3. Learning centered advising
   i. I am familiar with this approach to advising and apply it to my
      work as needed
   ii. I am familiar with this approach to advising
   iii. I have heard of this but do not know much about it
   iv. I have never heard of this approach to advising

III. Many topics are discussed during academic advising appointments, walk-in
     meetings and group advising sessions. This section of the questionnaire asks
     about certain topics you might be discussing during advising appointments.
     First, advisors sometimes talk with students about the purpose of a college
     education. With all the students you have advised in the last six (6) months how
     frequently have you discussed the following? (circle one number)

The purpose of a liberal arts education (beyond getting a job or going to graduate
school).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intellectual skills the student is developing through their college experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practical skills the student is developing through their college experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of a college education in a democratic society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the student’s education is preparing him/her to live in an increasingly diverse
society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ways the student’s education is preparing them to engage with complex, real-life
challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How a course the student has taken influenced their thinking on an issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Advisors sometimes talk to students about why certain courses are required and the relationships between different courses. With all the students you have advised in the last six (6) months how frequently have you discussed the following? (circle one number)

Skills students are expected to learn in the courses required by their major.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never

How different academic disciplines approach the same topic.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never

The purpose of the ASU general education requirements (e.g. literacy, mathematics).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never

How the curriculum is structured to support specific learning goals.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never

The purpose of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences requirements (second language and/or science & society).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never

How the content of different courses the student is taking relate to one another.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never

Skills students learn in the courses outside their major.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never

V. Advisors sometimes engage students in reflecting upon their learning and their educational choices. With all the students you have advised in the last six (6) months how frequently have you asked students to reflect on the following? (circle one number)

What the student hopes to learn from a particular course.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Almost Always Occasionally Never
Various ways the student might respond to a difficult academic situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What the student hopes to learn while they are at ASU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their greatest academic strengths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the student has changed since they started college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the courses the student has selected will help them meet their goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student’s learning goals for the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which FaculTea sessions did you attend? (circle all that apply)

May (Political Science)  June (History)  July (Life Sciences)
August (Philosophy)    September 6 (Physical Geography & Climatology)
September 27 (Statistics)  October (Earth & Space Exploration)
November (Global Health & Anthropology)

If you did not attend any FaculTea sessions, please skip ahead to section I.
If you attended at least one session, please answer the following two questions before proceeding to section I.

How often do you use information you have learned through FaculTea when you advise your students?

10  9  8  7  6  5  4  3  2  1
Almost Always  Occasionally  Never

Please share an example:

I. Academic advisors use different approaches to academic advising depending upon their own experiences, the student’s needs, and the context of the meeting. Circle the response that best describes how familiar are you with each of the following approaches to academic advising:

1. Prescriptive advising
   i. I am familiar with this approach to advising and apply it to my work as needed
   ii. I am familiar with this approach to advising
   iii. I have heard of this but do not know much about it
   iv. I have never heard of this approach to advising

2. Developmental advising
   i. I am familiar with this approach to advising and apply it to my work as needed
   ii. I am familiar with this approach to advising
   iii. I have heard of this but do not know much about it
   iv. I have never heard of this approach to advising
3. Learning centered advising
   i. I am familiar with this approach to advising and apply it to my work as needed
   ii. I am familiar with this approach to advising
   iii. I have heard of this but do not know much about it
   iv. I have never heard of this approach to advising

II. Many topics are discussed during academic advising appointments, walk-in meetings and group advising sessions. This section of the questionnaire asks about certain topics you might be discussing during advising appointments.

First, advisors sometimes talk with students about the purpose of a college education. With all the students you have advised in the last three (3) months how frequently have you discussed the following? (circle one number)

The purpose of a liberal arts education (beyond getting a job or going to graduate school).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intellectual skills the student is developing through their college experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practical skills the student is developing through their college experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of a college education in a democratic society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the student’s education is preparing him/her to live in an increasingly diverse society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ways the student’s education is preparing them to engage with complex, real-life challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How a course the student has taken influenced their thinking on an issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Advisors sometimes talk to students about why certain courses are required and the relationships between different courses. With all the students you have advised in the last three (3) months how frequently have you discussed the following? (circle one number)

Skills students are expected to learn in the courses required by their major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How different academic disciplines approach the same topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the ASU general education requirements (e.g. literacy, mathematics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the curriculum is structured to support specific learning goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences requirements (second language and/or science & society).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How the content of different courses the student is taking relate to one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skills students learn in the courses outside their major.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Advisors sometimes engage students in reflecting upon their learning and their educational choices. With all the students you have advised in the last three (3) months how frequently have you asked students to reflect on the following? (circle one number)

What the student hopes to learn from a particular course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 (Almost Always)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Never)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Various ways the student might respond to a difficult academic situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What the student hopes to learn while they are at ASU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Their greatest academic strengths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How the student has changed since they started college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How the courses the student has selected will help them meet their goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The student’s learning goals for the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

V. Final Items: if you attended at least one FaculTea session, please answer only questions 1, 2, and 4. If you did not attend any FaculTeas sessions, please answer only questions 3 and 4.

1. **If you attended at least one FaculTea session**, what aspects of the FaculTea program series (e.g. articles, videos, faculty presenters, discussion, topics) were particularly useful in supporting your learning and professional development?

2. **If you attended at least one FaculTea session**, what needs to be improved to make the FaculTea program series a better learning and professional development experience for you?
3. **If you did not attend any FaculTea sessions,** what led to your decision not to attend?

4. **Based on the organizational structure of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences, the department/school/unit where I currently work is categorized as part of (circle one):**

   Natural Sciences/Math  Humanities  Social Sciences  Student & Academic Program
APPENDIX C

INDIVIDUAL SESSION EVALUATION FORM
Part A: Please complete these first three questions prior to the start of the program:

1. The academic discipline featured today is: _______________________________________

2. In your opinion, how much do you know about this academic discipline? (Circle one)
   Nothing           Very Little           Some/A Few Facts           A Lot/Can Answer Common Questions           Very Well Informed

Part B: Please complete these remaining questions after the program, but before you leave:

1. Was your question (above) answered? Yes No

2. Now that you have attended this program, how much do you feel you know about this academic discipline?
   Nothing           Very Little           Some/A Few Facts           A Lot/Can Answer Common Questions           Very Well Informed

3. What were 2 things you learned from today’s program?

1. Will you use this information in your work with students? Yes No
   a. If yes, how?

2. What one aspect of today’s program was helpful and contributed to your learning?

3. What one aspect of today’s program should be changed to better support your learning?

4. I welcome any additional comments, questions or suggestions:
APPENDIX D

ACADEMIC ADVISOR INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Semi-structured Interview Method: the researcher interviews selected academic advisors (approximately 30 - 45 minutes). Interviews will be conducted in person and recorded using a digital recorder. Four advisors will be selected to be interviewed as part of a purposive sample intended to include advisors across academic disciplines and experience levels. All will be selected based upon their demonstrated high level of participation and perceived engagement in the FaculTeas program. The questions on the following page will serve as the basis for each advisor interview. Follow-up questions based on their responses to these questions will also be asked. In addition, I may ask follow-up questions related to what I learn during the student interviews.
To what extent has your advising changed as a result of participating in FacuTeas?

  o  Follow-up: Please give an example.

I’d like to ask you a few questions about what students learn from you through advising and how they respond to certain topics.

Some advisors believe that one of the things students should learn from academic advising is the mission and purpose of higher education. For example, why having a college education is important, especially in a diverse and democratic society, the skills students are learning in their classes, the institutional mission, or the purpose of a liberal arts education. To what extent do you talk to your students about topics like this?

  o  How do you talk with them about that topic? Please give an example.
  o  How do students respond when you talk to them about the meaning and purpose of higher education?

Advisors also teach students about what some call the “logic of the curriculum:” why general studies are important to students, how the content of different courses relates to each other, and how the curriculum creates a logical progression of learning. To what extent do you talk to your students about topics like this?

  o  How do you talk with them about that topic? Please give an example.
  o  How do students respond when you talk to them about the meaning and purpose of higher education?

Advisors are often in a position to talk with students about the importance of the choices they are making about their education. Advisors engage students in self-reflection by having them explain how they decided on their course selections for the term, for example, or how those choices relate to their educational, personal, and/or career goals. To what extent do you talk to your students about topics like this?
○ How do you talk with them about that topic? Please give an example.
○ How do students respond when you talk to them about the meaning and purpose of higher education?

• In your opinion, to what extent does FacuTeas support advisors in being able to include these topics when they meet with students?
• What conditions would support you to better incorporate conversations like this into their interactions with students? (for example, professional development, working conditions, management, mission statement, student populations, etc.)
• Anything else you want to add?
APPENDIX E

OBSERVATION FIELD NOTE TEMPLATE
Date of the session: ________________ Location: ______________

Advisor Initials/Academic unit: __________ Start time: _________ End time: _______

Context of the appointment (student’s presenting issue(s), for example):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Field Notes</th>
<th>Reflective Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed, chronological notes about what the content of the advising appointment.)</td>
<td>Concurrent notes about the observer’s personal reactions, experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-structured Interview Method: the researcher interviews selected students (approximately 30-45 minutes). Interviews will be conducted in person and recorded using two digital tape recorders. Four - eight students will be selected to be interviewed as part of a purposive sample intended to include students across academic disciplines and experience levels. All will be over 18 years of age, and will be selected from the sub-set of students whose advising appointments I previously observed. Interviews will be conducted within 1-5 days of the student’s advising appointment. They will take place in late October/early November.

The students being interviewed will already be familiar with me from my observation of their recent advising appointment. Before beginning, students will be asked to sign a consent form indicating their agreement to have the interview recorded, transcribed and used as part of this research project. Students will understand that they may opt to terminate their participation at any time until the final document is completed.
I am doing my dissertation on academic advising, and what students learn from their advisors. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. As you recall, I sat in on your recent advising appointment with your advisor. Just to confirm, your major is: ________________? How long have you been a ___________ major?

Before you met with your advisor on the day that I observed, had you met with that same advisor previously? (follow-up questions to get a sense of their experiences with that specific advisor and advising in general)

For the first part of this interview, I’d like to ask some questions specifically about the appointment I observed. For example, when <advisor name> said <example of learning centered advising topic>, what was your response? (what did you think or feel about what s/he said?)

Now, when your advisor said <example of learning centered advising topic>, what was your response to that? (what did you think or feel about what s/he said?)

Now that it has been a few days since that appointment, looking back and reflecting upon the advising experience, what did you learn from that advising appointment?

One definition of academic advising describes it as “the way we teach students about higher education, the logic and meaning of the curriculum, and (the) significance of their educational choices.” This definition suggests that, in addition to reading your DARS or major map, academic advising teaches students about how college is helping to prepare you for life after college, why general studies courses are important, how different classes you take connect with each other, and how decisions you make now might affect you later. How does that definition fit with the advising appointment you had with <advisor name>? What is your response to that definition of academic advising?
In what ways has academic advising contributed to your academic plans and goals? (if they do not address this in their answer, follow up with: Do you plan on completing your Bachelor’s degree here at ASU?”)
APPENDIX G

CODEBOOK FOR APPOINTMENT OBSERVATIONS
I. Meaning and purpose of higher education

- The purpose of a liberal arts education
  The intellectual or practical skills the student is developing through their college experience
- The value of a college education in a democratic society
- How the student’s education is preparing him/her to live in an increasingly diverse society
- Ways the student’s education is preparing them to engage with complex, real-life challenges.
- How a course the student has taken influenced their point of view on an issue.

II. Logic of the Curriculum: why certain courses are required and the relationships between different courses.

- The purpose of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences requirements (second language and/or science & society) and/or the ASU general education requirements (e.g. literacy, mathematics).
- The benefits of taking a variety of courses outside the major.
- Skills students learn in the courses outside their major.
- How the content of different courses the student is taking relate to one another.
- How different academic disciplines approach the same topic.

III. Encouraging student self-reflection

- Various ways the student might respond to a difficult academic situation.
- What the student hopes to learn from a course or while they are at ASU
- The student’s learning goals for the semester.
- How the courses the student has selected will help them meet their goals.
- A school project or academic achievement of which the student is particularly proud.
APPENDIX H

DATA ORGANIZATION CHART
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Pre- and Post-Questionnaires</th>
<th>Session Evaluations</th>
<th>Appointment Observations</th>
<th>Student Interviews</th>
<th>Advisor Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a To what extent does the FacuTea program model support advisor learning and professional development?</td>
<td>Quantitative: 1) 5 FT outcome items 2) Change in knowledge of learning centered adv.</td>
<td>Qualitative: Two things you learned?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative: to what extent their advising had changed as a result of participating in the FacuTea sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b What aspects of the FacuTea professional development model are most effective in supporting advisor learning?</td>
<td>Quantify the qualitative: What aspects helped, which to be changed, and why not attend</td>
<td>Quantify the qualitative: what aspects were helpful, which to be changed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c To what extent does the FacuTea program model support the application of learning centered advising?</td>
<td>Quantitative: how frequently use FT info with students? Qualitative: examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative: to what extent FT supported them in including learning centered advising topics when they meet with students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To what extent do academic advisors apply learning centered advising practices to their work with students?</td>
<td>Quantitative: 21 learning centered advising items</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative: Analyze with code book based on learning centered theory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative: their answers to those questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 How do students experience learning centered advising?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative: their answers to those questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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