

**OIR Assessment Tool
2012 Advising Survey
10/23/2013**

Purpose of Survey: *The purpose of the UND 2012 Advising Survey is to gather information from undergraduate students regarding their academic advising experiences at the University of North Dakota.*

1. The data collected addresses information relating to what university group or situation? (i.e., from whom is the university collecting this information? Whose perceptions are we reading?)

The Advising Survey asks students about their academic advising experiences. The most recent survey was sent to a random sample of 3000 undergraduate students enrolled at UND (both on- and off-campus). An invitation to participate was sent out electronically. The response rate for the survey was 24% (727/3000).

2. How often is this tool used and analyzed? What time of year?

The survey was initially administered in 2008 and again in 2012; therefore, it appears to be on a four-year rotation. It is administered during the fall semester.

3. To whom does the assessment group believe that an analysis of this report would be beneficial? In other words, what individuals, departments, or programs need this information in order to have reliable information to ‘close the loop’ on their assessment process?

- **Academic departments (chairs, faculty advisors)**
- **Academic Dean**
- **Professional advisors**
 - **Student Success Center**
 - **Nursing**
 - **Aviation**
 - **Engineering**
 - **Business**
 - **Arts & Sciences**
 - **Education**
- **Career Services**
- **Provost’s Office**
- **Vice President for Student Affairs**
- **Student leaders (student government)**
- **Retention committees**
- **One-stop Shop (coming in the future)**

4. What UND student learning goals are assessed?

- a. Use Y, N, ? to indicate whether the instrument collects data relevant to each of the following Institutional and/or Essential Studies goals:

 N 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)

___N___ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)

___N___ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)

___N___ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)

___N___ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)

___N___ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)

___N___ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)

___N___ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

b. Additional goals

Obtain information regarding student perceptions and behaviors in order to provide feedback to departments/advisors in an effort to improve advising.

5. What are the findings/results of this tool?

a. From Question 4a above: For the goals with a Y or ?, describe the relevant findings/results from this survey:

b. Other findings/results of note for faculty or in reference to student learning

6. Does this tool measure student learning or behaviors associated with student learning? If it measures student learning, does it do so directly or indirectly?

This survey does not measure student learning; it is an evaluation which measures customer satisfaction, perception, and behaviors vs. learning.

7. Does this tool empower individuals or the university to better understand and assess student learning at the university? If so, how?

The tool is not a measure of student learning, but it does provide insight into the perceptions of undergraduate students related to academic advising. The information is invaluable as departments and professional advisors move forward in their training and expansion of advising services. When results and improvements are observed, this should empower students to recognize that their opinions and feedback make a difference.

8. Are there recommendations for changes (e.g., additional or better tools, different means of analysis, etc.) that might improve the university’s ability to use this information?

A 24% response rate is very good for an electronic survey. The report is easy to read and understand. There was a good use of graphics in the report. One area of improvement would be to try and get more data from students who are taking courses primarily online. While there was an increase (10% in 2012 compared to 4% in 2008), it seems particularly important to try and get the perspectives of the online students given the increases in online courses.

Also, the survey, on page 10, indicated the possibility of including an “importance” scale to confirm how important some the advising aspects are, and which aspects students would like advisors to focus on. It is agreed that such a scale would provide valuable information as advisors are trained and decisions are made as to how to best use limited advising time.

Students can choose to receive what they consider as advising from many different sources. In order to clarify and make the data collected from this survey more relevant and transparent, it is recommended to include demographic questions which collect the following information:

- Major
- Where do you go for your advising? (Select all that apply.)
 - Faculty advisor
 - Professional advisor (Business, Nursing, Engineering, Education, Arts & Sciences, Aviation, Student Success Center)
 - Professor
 - Other office(s) on campus (Indicate office(s)_____)
 - Other _____

9. What value does the committee place on this tool for helping to achieve the university’s assessment plan?

The survey provides useful data regarding undergraduate advising at UND. Data from the survey further enhances the complete assessment plan.

10. Review Summary (one or two sentences).

This report summarizes the perceptions of 727 undergraduate students regarding academic advising at UND during the Fall 2012 semester. There is vital information on students’ perception and the benefits of the program, as well as what needs to be improved.

11. What might faculty want to know about this survey? *(Please provide one to two paragraphs describing some findings from this survey. These paragraphs will be forwarded to academic departments as a means of keeping them informed about the existence of information that might be useful to them.)*

- **92% of respondents know who their advisors are; 54% meet with their advisor once a semester, 17% meet twice a semester, and 21% marked an “other” response which they filled in comments such as “whenever I need guidance,” “rarely,” and “don’t have one.”**
- **Fewer students were very satisfied/ satisfied with their overall academic advising experience in 2012 compared to 2008 (62% in 2012; 74% in 2008). However, when asked if they would recommend their advisor to another student, 64% of the students reported they would compared to 62% in 2008.**
- **While rating their advisors, 69% of students rated their advisors as excellent/ good of having the ability to listen and understand their concerns, 60% of the advisors prepare for their advising sessions, with 68% honoring their office hours, and 70% answering their emails.**
- **Discussion of career opportunities tended to be at the bottom of the list when rating**

their advisor. Only 57% of the respondents rate their advisor as excellent or good in this area.

12. What results about this survey would students find interesting? *(Please provide a few sentences or bullet points of highlights, written in student-friendly language. This will be posted on the assessment website and distributed to students via other means as well.)*

Most students rated the advising process as positive. Over half (62%) of students indicated that they were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their academic advising experience at UND. The main area for improvement noted by students was discussing career choices.

13. Should review of this instrument be continued as part of the UAC review cycle? If so, how frequently?

Yes; the current schedule appears to be working.

Submitted by: Brett Johnson, Kevin Buettner, Shari Nelson
Date of Submission: 10/23/2013

Form revised: 9/25/13