



# **Decennial Core Curriculum Review Committee**

**Report of the Academic Advising Focus Group**

**July 2015**

*The members of the Core Curriculum Committee Focus Group on Academic Advising dedicate this report to the memory of Cathy Pieronek, for her longstanding commitment to excellence in advising. She made substantial contributions to the content of this report and to our discussions. Her expertise and compassion are sorely missed.*

## **Executive Summary**

The Academic Advising Focus Group of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was given the following charge to be carried out during the 2014-2015 academic year: “The Advising Focus Group will consider current advising structures -- within First Year of Studies and the colleges -- and how those might better assist students as they engage the Core Curriculum, discern their courses of study, and achieve the goals of their undergraduate programs.”

This report begins with a description of the current state of academic advising at Notre Dame, including the views of advisors themselves and of select groups of students, many of whom are acting in peer-advising roles. The remainder of the report is an attempt to consolidate and synthesize the input received from advisors and students, as well as prior surveys of Notre Dame students. It also includes a benchmarking analysis of advising at peer institutions.

Finally, we put forth a vision of how academic advising at Notre Dame might better meet the current and future needs of our undergraduate students by making the following recommendations:

1. that academic advising at the University become more deliberately integrated, incorporating more input from prospective major departments from the very beginning,
2. that a much stronger emphasis and effort be focused on achieving proper placement for each student in the introductory courses required for their choice of major as well as for Core requirements,
3. that the University undertake a review of the current advising structure, with the goal of providing means of increased collaboration and communication across all aspects of advising ensuring that students’ various needs can be met across their entire career at Notre Dame.
4. that the University establish a standard set of advising attributes that meet the student needs and can be implemented by the colleges and departments to suit their specific requirements.

Further elaboration of these recommendations and examples of what policies might be implemented in order to achieve them are presented in the final section.

The focus group met in plenary sessions several times during the academic year: December 3, 2014; January 28, February 9, February 25, April 1, and April 15, 2015. Two of these meetings included undergraduate representatives from the STEM Ambassadors and the First Year of Studies Peer Advisors.

Members included: Chair Michael Hildreth, Professor, Physics (CCRC Member); Fr. James Foster, C.S.C, Assistant Dean, College of Science and Director, Center for Health Advising; Daniel Graff, Director of Undergraduate Studies in History; Holly Martin, Associate Dean, First Year of Studies Advising; Collin Meissner, Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Advising, College of Arts and Letters; Cathy Pieronek, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Engineering; John Stamper, Associate Dean, School of Architecture (CCRC Member); D. Katherine Spiess, Associate Professor, Finance (CCRC Member); Michelle Whaley, Assistant Chair, Biology (CCRC Member). We would like to acknowledge Peter Kilpatrick, Dean, College of Engineering, for his help in the preparation of the final version of this report.

## **1. Academic Advising at Notre Dame**

The Focus Group's first goal was to obtain an overview of the current state of academic advising at Notre Dame. In this section, we present a summary of the different advising structures found in the First Year of Studies and the different Colleges. A synopsis of the salient features can be found in Table 1.

### **1.1 First Year of Studies**

First Year of Studies (FYS) provides incoming students with dedicated advising during their first year of college to facilitate a successful transition from outstanding high school students to successful Notre Dame students and to facilitate students' ability to change their intended college/major during the first year without undue difficulty. These twin goals are more important than ever now that Notre Dame is becoming less homogenous in its student body (attracting more highly talented students who do not all have the same educational background, or, potentially, other advantages enjoyed by wealthier students). These goals are also important because of the increasing need for assisting incoming students who are making the transition to college with the added burden of learning or psychological challenges. Recent restrictive changes in the Federal Loan systems pose additional challenges for students navigating the expense of college (i.e. students who fall behind because of a dropped course or a change in intended major—or any other reason—can no longer get Federal aid for more than eight semesters of coursework).

Every incoming student is assigned a full-time advisor in FYS to assist the student through the first year. There are 17 full-time advisors (special professional faculty) each with approximately 150 assigned students. Students are assigned by their intended college/major and/or special designation (Hesburgh-Yusko scholar, undeclared student, Engineering intent, Architecture intent, etc.). For example, presently Jennifer Fox advises the women engineering intents and works closely with Engineering. Holly Martin and James Creech advise students in and work closely with the Glynn Family Honors and the Hesburgh-Yusko programs. Although advisors have areas of advising specialty, they have to be prepared to work with students as they (sometimes drastically) change their intents. FYS is currently working to formalize a college liaison program that would link all of the advisors to specific college programs and/or departments to increase communication and

collaboration. During the first year, FYS advisors guide the students through the basics of scheduling and the transition to college. When students need more specialized/advanced advising (or have a definite major in mind and are interested in doing so) they are referred to the undergraduate director or advisor in the intended college or program for additional advising. By the end of March the first-year students must (at least) declare a college, at which point the students begin (if they are not already doing so) working with their college/major advisor. Every college and school handles the advising intersection with First Year of Studies slightly differently.

FYS advisors must have an M.A. or a Ph.D. and college-level experience teaching or advising. New advisors meet regularly with the Assistant to the Dean (a senior advisor) to learn the advising challenges, policies, and administrative details that make up the rhythm of the first year. These meetings may be very frequent (almost daily during the initial period after hiring) to as needed (at least once a month during the first year). New advisors are also assigned an experienced advisor to mentor them during their first year as an advisor and beyond. All FYS advisors meet twice a month to discuss advising issues and to meet with representatives of the various colleges and University programs. Advisors are expected to (in consultation with the Dean) form and complete professional development goals each year. These goals vary a great deal but include national conference participation and/or leadership, publications, university committee work, leadership in major FYS initiatives, and the like.

The basic structure of FYS contact with incoming students is as follows:

1. Assistant Dean Dawson collects information from the colleges and departments on all of the programs and courses that will be open to first-year students in the fall and sends the information to the students in June.
2. Students submit course requests during the summer, and advisors build the fall schedule (ensuring that students have the courses, labs, and tutorials needed for their intended programs as well as other courses requested by the students).
3. Advisors conduct a group advising meeting during Orientation to help students through the procedures and challenges that occur during the first week of classes.
4. Advisors meet with each student at least once before fall mid-semester break to discuss transition issues, and academic plans and opportunities.
5. Just after fall break advisors conduct group advising meetings to instruct students on how to use the on-line registration system (class search, GPS, etc.) to register themselves for spring classes. Advisors also meet with students to assist in making special requests for upper-level courses not routinely open to first year students and to make referrals to departmental advisors as needed.
6. Advisors conduct one-to-one meetings with each student at least once before spring mid-semester break. During this meeting students formally declare or reaffirm their college choice. If they have not already done so, students are instructed on how to contact undergraduate and program directors and other advisors for advising and to declare majors.

7. There are (very) frequent additional meetings throughout the year with students at either the student's request or the advisor's request to discuss questions and/or to address difficulties.

FYS offers a number of non-advising support services as well, including the Learning Resource Center which provides tutoring, collaborative learning groups, help sessions and private tutoring as needed; the Academic Excellence Program which provides study skills classes and individual instruction; and the Academic Coaching Program which provides academic coaching for students needing additional assistance due to various factors. FYS also helps students build their first advising ePortfolio for reflection on academic goals and progress and archiving their best works to date. The University Counseling Center works with FYS to provide a counselor for "Let's Talk" walk-in sessions in First Year of Studies on Thursdays. The First Year Librarian, Leslie Morgan, keeps regular hours in First Year of Studies, and the Career Center provides a counselor for walk-in sessions in First Year of Studies on a regular basis in the spring. With the support of the Office of the Provost, FYS organizes a biennial national conference for advisors that is focused on advising students at highly selective institutions and programs: *The National Conference on Advising Highly Talented Undergraduates*. The conference was held in 2010, 2012, and 2014, and is scheduled to be held again in 2016.

## **1.2 The School of Architecture**

Student advising in the School of Architecture is the responsibility of Assistant Dean Fr. Richard Bullene. Father Bullene meets with first-year students as a group in the spring semester of their first year to advise them on the required courses for the second year. Those students with substantial AP credits generally meet with Fr. Bullene individually in order to plan their course of study in the most efficient way.

During their second year spring semester, Fr. Bullene advises the students on the required courses in the Rome Studies Program. He assigns students to classes and studio sections for both semesters based on distributing men and women and strong and weak students in terms of their GPA.

Fr. Bullene likewise assigns students to studio sections for the fall semester of the fourth year, and informs them of the required courses they need to take during the fourth year. He also discusses with them the School's concentrations – Furniture, Preservation, Enterprise, and the Building Arts – each of which requires four specific courses to be taken in the fourth and fifth years.

For the spring semester studio sections of the fourth year and both semesters of the fifth year, students are given the opportunity to request the professor they want to work with by submitting first, second and third choices. Typically, they will be assigned to their first or second choice. Fr. Bullene also requires individual meetings with all fourth- and fifth-year students to be sure they are on track for graduation.

### 1.3 The College of Arts & Letters

The College of Arts & Letters has developed a two-tiered advising structure. Specific advice pertaining to their choice of major is provided by the Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) in their major (or minor) department, or by other Departmental Advisors. Students receive general academic, curricular, collegiate and professional advising from the Assistant Deans in the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

Within their departments, students receive advising from their DUS and are often assigned a faculty advisor within their major. The DUS provides discipline-specific advice to students regarding such topics as:

- major/minor specific curricular requirements
- suggested path to completion of a major
- course sequencing and prerequisites
- research opportunities within a major
- approval of Study Abroad applications
- graduate and professional school
- thesis guidance
- transfer course pre-approval

All Arts & Letters students are also assigned to an Assistant Dean in an alphabetical cohort, ensuring consistency in advising throughout their undergraduate career. Each of the five Assistant Deans in the office is responsible for approximately 440 students. In addition to general curricular advising the Assistant Deans are responsible for pre-professional advising for Law and Medical School preparation (Ava Preacher for Law and Vicki Toumayan for Pre-Med and related studies, including Neuroscience and Behavior, and for general curricular management through the TUSC program (Ava Preacher). Ideally, each student meets with his or her undergraduate advising dean once per semester for a routine, 20-30 minute “state of degree” conversation. Depending on need or scale of issue, additional meetings may be as frequent as once weekly throughout the semester. The Assistant Deans advise students regarding:

- College and University requirements
- Possible paths to completion of undergraduate degree
- General collegiate advising
- Exploring research opportunities
- Career opportunities (in conjunction with Career Center advising)
- Scholarship, fellowship, internship opportunities
- Study abroad and its relation to undergraduate formation
- Special situations (course and major drop, withdrawal from university, leave of absence, overload requests, part-time approval, academic difficulties, mental and medical health...)
- Help students connect with resources as appropriate (Care Team, Counseling Center, UCC, etc.)
- Transfer course pre-approval
- Post-graduate plans and ambitions
- Parental concerns

Beyond the functional and clerical aspects of advising, the advising deans in Arts and Letters also attempt to:

- Help students understand the purpose and trajectory of their degree
- Help students see interconnections among diverse courses
- Help students see interconnections between their studies and future life aspirations
- Assess the skills, competencies, and dispositions that a student is attempting to cultivate, and help make recommendations regarding program selections (majors, minors) and course selections based on these interests/goals

The Assistant Dean's advising responsibilities also include liaising between various College and University units on behalf of faculty and students.

#### **1.4 Mendoza College of Business**

Mendoza College of Business (MCoB) is unique in that all advising is centralized in one office with five "professional" advisors who are not special professional faculty (or, if they have that title, are not currently teaching). These advisors are the first point of contact for all student related issues. Departmental advising is not structured and, as a general rule, students receive very little advising from departments other than a few instructional emails each semester. Assistant Department Chairs are the main point of contact and handle requests for upper level courses.

The five MCoB advisors each oversees the needs of approximately 400 students. Meetings with advisors are not mandatory except for Study Abroad approval or if the student is on academic probation. Many of the typical transactional advisor-student interactions have been automated in order to allow more time for meaningful advising sessions. Typical topics raised in an advising meeting are:

- schedule changes
- major selection
- study abroad interests and options
- plan of study adjustments to accommodate a second major or minor
- exam conflicts
- personal issues impacting academics
- mid-term deficiencies.

#### **1.5 The College of Engineering**

The College of Engineering maintains a Department-based advising structure, with the Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, Mr. Michael Ryan, and others in the Dean's office serving in supporting roles for students with more acute needs or those cases requiring interactions with other University resources.

In all cases except for the Department of Electrical Engineering (EE), students are assigned a member of the tenured & tenure-track (T&TT) faculty as an advisor, who handles most of the advising issues. When unique advising issues are presented, the departmental Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) is available to provide an additional advising and counseling to the student. In EE, the DUS serves as the “official” advisor for all students, while T&TT faculty serve as assigned/designated “mentors.”

Depending on the size of the department, individual faculty advisors may be responsible for 10-20 students. Although course requirements in the College of Engineering are well understood, an advisor will help a student:

- navigate a non-standard path through the curriculum (due to, for example, a late transfer into Engineering, a degree program change within Engineering, academic issues such as failed classes, or crafting a program to facilitate study abroad or a particular internship experience)
- discern a coherent set of electives to develop a competency in a particular sub-specialty
- secure a professional internship
- find a faculty member to oversee a research experience.

## **1.6 The College of Science**

In addition to the five Departments in the College of Science, there are three other large programs in the college whose students are not majors in one of the five departments: Science Pre-professional Studies, Science-Business, and Neuroscience. Altogether, approximately 500 students graduate each year with degrees in Science.

The advising structure in the College is very decentralized. At the College level, the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies provides the primary point of contact for “students of concern”, meaning those in academic trouble or those students who have personal or psychological difficulties. Separate advising is provided in the Dean’s Office for transfer students to help them find their way when they first arrive. Most discussions with other colleges to work out dual-degree programs are conducted through this office as well. Separate, college-wide advising also exists for International Studies. This advice is provided by a part-time Associate Dean, a full-time Assistant Dean, and 20% of an advisor who also works with the Pre-Professional program.

Each department has set its own internal advising structure to offer specific advice to its majors. While these are broadly similar, there are differences among the departments as to the points of contact for different advising questions. Often, the DUS serves as a point contact for administrative issues, such as course registration overrides, and monitoring student progress. The DUS is most often the person who interacts with First Year of Studies (FYS), and with the Career Center and International Studies. Most of the departments have a group or committee of faculty who serve as advisors for the students in terms of course choices, career discussions, graduate school choices, etc. Because the courses of study in the college are both extremely specialized and yet quite diverse, discipline-specific advising is concentrated in the Departments where faculty have the necessary expertise.



## 1.7 Center for Health Sciences

The Center for Health Sciences Advising is available to assist all Notre Dame students from early in their undergraduate years with their vocational discernment and professional preparation for the application process to medical and dental schools. It also serves as a resource for students who are discerning any of the allied health professions, including physical therapy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, public health, etc.

The pre-health advising staff includes Fr. James Foster, C.S.C., MD, Assistant Dean and Director; Kathleen J.S. Kolberg, PhD., Assistant Dean, College of Science; and, Susan Gursky, PhD., Sophomore advisor. They work closely with undergraduate advisors across departments and disciplines who regularly advise pre-health students, including Vicki Toumayan, the Assistant Dean in the College of Arts and Letters, working with Pre-Health students. All are members of the National Association of Advisors for the Health Professions, a national organization of health professions advisors with the purpose of educating advisers in this field and keeping them up-to-date with changing requirements and expectations. In addition to yearly conferences, the organization sponsors a number of advising resources, including a quarterly journal and health professions listserv.

Formal pre-health programming begins during Freshman Orientation weekend. The Health Sciences advising staff works closely with First Year advisors, meeting with them once per year to discuss any significant changes on the pre-health advising front. Advisors are also available to meet with individual first-year students who have particular questions about their preparation and planning for the future. Contact with students continues toward the end of first year, when advisors offer assistance in discernment for those considering the health professions, and through sophomore year with various exercises that help the students reflect on their preparation and aspirations.

The advising in the junior year is extensive. In addition to preparatory advising meetings in the fall, students enroll in a 1-credit "Preparation for the Health Professions" course that outlines the details of the process for applying to medical schools and various aspects of different health career paths. Intensive contact with the Career Center and the Writing Center includes mock interviews and reviews of students' application materials. Finally, the Center for Health Sciences collects the recommendation letters for the students and prepares a cover letter for the student's application packet.

Significant resources are currently engaged to support alumni who have waited at least a year to apply to medical school. Approximately half of the applicants supported by the Center in recent years have come from this pool of former students.

Table 1. Overview of Advising in the Colleges/Programs

<b>Academic Unit</b>	<b>Central Team</b>	<b>DUS Role</b>	<b>Individual Faculty</b>
Architecture	Assistant Dean is the single point of contact		Limited contact
Arts & Letters	5 Associate Deans, meet with student once per semester; Broader-view, liaisons with other units. Pre-Prof. Special cases.	Points of contact, academic progress, course of study, etc.	Often yes, assigned to each student
Engineering	Small central staff, special cases, liaisons.	Points of contact, provide advising for unique issues	Yes, assigned to each student
First Year of Studies	17 full-time advisors; deans and senior advisors act as liaisons to other academic and non-academic units	Points of contact for information and assistance for deans and advisors. Most contact with students during the second semester after declaring the college and/or major.	Generally after the major is declared but can be earlier depending on the norms of department
Mendoza College of Business	Assistant Dean and 5 full-time advisors; handles almost all advising	Assistant Chairs; requests for upper division courses and career-specific advice	Little contact
Science	2.2 people, special cases only, plus Pre-professional. Broader view, liaisons with other units	Points of contact, some advising. Larger majors have “professional” advising	Mostly yes, assigned to each student
Pre-Professional (Science and A&L)	Science: Center for Health Sciences Advising: 3 people; One Associate Dean in A&L with pre-health focus	N/A. Close contact between DUS of relevant departments and advising staff	N/A

## 1.8 Additional Advising Issues

An observation, that was raised specifically by Arts & Letters but is common to all units is that the assistant deans are spending an increasing amount of time working through *special needs* advising, particularly in relation to students who present themselves with accommodation needs (mental health, medical disability, academic challenge). The rate of increase in terms of time spent on this type of advising is exponential and occupies on average 20% of the deans' time, with an increase to absorbing 90% of their time towards the end of each semester as student crises build. This points to the need for effective linkages between advising units, the University Health Services, the University Counseling Center, Student Affairs, and other support providers.

## 2. Students' views of Advising

This section presents an overview of student opinions and desires with respect to academic advising at all levels. First, data from exit surveys, collected as students have left their first year or upon graduation from Engineering and Business, are presented. Second, the main points from several student focus group meetings are summarized. It is worth noting that we have no data on the opinions of the effectiveness of advising as viewed by post graduates, nor do we have department-by-department or program-by-program breakdowns of student views. Nevertheless, the data presented and the opinions gathered from groups of students seem to be correlated, giving some confidence that the overall attitudes observed paint a representative picture of the student perspective of advising.

### 2.1 Survey Data

Three of the colleges, First Year of Studies, Engineering, and Business, provided results from previous student surveys regarding advising. First Year of Studies provided internal student survey data on a wide range of advising-related issues for annual surveys of first year students conducted from 2009-2015 (see Appendix 1 for complete results). The College of Engineering provided both results of internal Notre Dame assessments and the advising-related portion of the EBI Exit Assessments of graduating seniors conducted from 2004-2014 (Appendix 2). Mendoza College of Business provided the advising-related portion of the EBI Exit Assessments of graduating seniors from 2005-2013 (Appendix 3). An overview of the results is presented here; more detailed analysis can be found in the appendices.

#### *First Year of Studies Survey:*

In 2007 the First Year of Studies worked with the Office of Strategic Planning & Institutional Research to develop a survey that would address students' impression of 1) their progress toward First Year of Studies' learning goals; 2) First Year of Studies' support services, such as tutoring and peer advising, and 3) advising. The survey is administered by the OSPIR toward the end of the students' first year and results are given to the dean and

individual advisors shortly after the end of the academic year. The results for individual advisors and program directors are discussed with them in their annual review meeting with the dean to acknowledge strengths and discuss plans for improvements. The survey is one of several methods used to both assist in continually improving First Year of Studies' practices and services and to assist individual advisors in continually improving their own practice of advising.

Approximately 80% of first-year students complete the survey each year, and the survey includes a large number of detailed questions. The results have been good, and, equally important, there has been consistent improvement in most areas from year to year. This year (2014-2015) in answer to the summary question, "Overall, my First Year Advisor is . . ." "83% responded either "Excellent" or "Very Good." 56% responded "Excellent," 27% "Very Good," 12% "Good," 4% "Fair," and 1% "Ineffective" as compared with their response to the same question in 2008-2009 in which 78% responded either "Excellent" or "Very Good." 48% responded "Excellent," 30% "Very Good," 14% "Good," 5% "Fair," and 3% "Ineffective."

More detailed questioning revealed that the overall student perception of FYS advising is generally positive. Almost 60% of students rate surveyed in the last five years rate their FYS advisor as "excellent". Similar rates of satisfaction are present when asked if the FYS advisor "met my needs". One result that does stand out is the perceived degree to which the FYS advisor helped the students to develop academic planning skills, where the rate of "excellent" responses is lower. Nonetheless, as of 2015, 81% agreed or strongly agreed that their FYS advisor has help them develop academic planning skills. 32% strongly agreed, 49% agreed, 16% were neutral, 3% disagreed, and 0% strongly disagreed that their FYS advisor helped them develop academic planning skills. Details are provided in Appendix 1.

#### *College of Engineering Survey:*

As a reminder, the College of Engineering maintains a Department-based advising structure, where the majority of students are assigned a member of the faculty as their primary advisor. The Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs and others in the Dean's office serve in supporting roles for students with more acute needs or those cases requiring interactions with other University resources.

The data from the College of Engineering include results from three different surveys that shed light on student perceptions of the advising experience. The first, given to graduating seniors in 2010, is limited to a table of queries where students are asked to indicate what is important in the interactions with their advisors. The students are also asked to estimate what the importance of these topics should be to the departments and the college. By and large, the results show a general alignment between what the students thought was important for advising and what they thought the priorities should be for their individual advisors and the departments in Engineering.

The second set of engineering survey results examine students' perception of the their FYS and Department advising experiences. One of the objectives of this survey was to see if the

students perceived a lack of encouragement from FYS to study engineering. Results were broken down by gender and ethnicity. Several notable features emerge from this data. From 2000-2012, the fraction of female engineering graduates who felt that FYS had “strongly encouraged” them to study engineering was a full 6 percentage points lower than their male colleagues (34% vs. 40%). In the 2013 and 2014 surveys, the rate of encouragement for female students basically reached parity with that for male students, due to ongoing efforts and collaboration between FYS and Engineering. The overall rate for students feeling that they were encouraged towards engineering also rose across the board.

The third set of Engineering data are from an annual survey of graduating seniors conducted by Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) that asks the same questions of graduates from many different institutions, facilitating extramural comparisons. The results imply that most students are satisfied with the academic portions of the advising experience. Historical data from 2000-2013 show Notre Dame engineering student satisfaction with their advising experience typically in the bottom quartile compared with peer institutions, with gradual and steady improvement starting in 2006. No one factor has been identified as being responsible for this improvement in student satisfaction, but clearly this is a good trend.

#### *Mendoza College of Business Survey:*

As a reminder of the advising structure, Mendoza College of Business (MCoB) advising is centralized in one office with five “professional” advisors who are not professional specialist faculty who advisors are the first point of contact for all student related issues

Mendoza College of Business has participated in the EBI Undergraduate Business Exit Assessment since 2005. The survey includes four questions related to advising, as well as a composite factor based on those four questions. In the EBI reports, Mendoza’s results are compared to a “Select 6” benchmarking group, the “Carnegie Class,” and “All Institutions.”

In the most recent report (2013), 95.5% of Mendoza students responded. The survey questions pertaining to advising ask the students to rate their advisor(s) on four dimension: (1) Availability; (2) Knowledge of requirements; (3) Helpfulness of recommendations; and (4) Advisor’s interest in students’ progress. On a 0% to 100% performance scale, Mendoza advisors ranged from 80% to 89% on these four dimensions. In each case, the mean rating for Mendoza advisors was statistically higher than the mean for each of the three comparison groups. For the composite “Advisor” factor, Mendoza’s performance rating was 86%, higher than any of the “Select 6” institutions and second among the sixteen Carnegie Class institutions.

The ratings that exiting students have given their Mendoza advisors have also increased significantly over time, with the performance rating on the composite “Advisor” factor gradually increasing from 71.1% in 2005 to 85.9% in 2013.

## *Survey Summary*

We note that the latest detailed data presented are from different years (2013 vs 2014), and the EBI questionnaires ask different questions, with the Engineering version more narrowly focused on advisor knowledge. However, there is at least one potential conclusion that can be drawn from a comparison of the MCoB results to those from the College of Engineering: entrusting student advising to the good will of individual faculty members with little training in advising or counseling techniques may lead to lower student satisfaction. Clearly, some advisors make contact with their students and provide useful advice. Others may not necessarily perform up to the expected level.

In general, all of these surveys indicate a level of student satisfaction with their advising experience, be it FYS or in the departments, as mostly good, but not outstanding.

### **2.2 Student Focus Groups**

As mentioned above, the Advising Focus Group met with several groups of students over the course of the semester, approximately 30 students in all. Most, if not all, of the students have had a generally positive experience with the current advising structure. During the discussions, however, several themes emerged on how advising could be improved, at least from a student's perspective. These are outlined below.

*First-Year course selection:* A significant area of student concern and frustration was the selection of courses for their first year at Notre Dame. Many engineering and science intents felt that the course options based on a proposed major results in an overly narrow or inflexible range of potential first year courses, especially in math and science. Students also found it daunting having to choose courses without a real idea of how they might fit into a prospective major, the overall sequence of University requirements, or how they might facilitate or hinder a study-abroad program.

*Placement:* Although a great many students place directly into Calculus III, advanced language courses, and out of the Writing and Rhetoric course due to AP, SAT II and departmental examination placement results, some students identified placement as a problem, one which is most acute in the selection of the correct mathematics, language, and writing courses. This is, of course, directly related to issues of first year course selection, but has a more direct impact on the most advanced students who would benefit from enrolling directly in higher-level courses. While a sincere effort to place all students appropriately has been made, several students in the focus groups reported difficulties in this area.

*Discernment:* A number of students felt that they were unprepared to select a course of study by the end of their first year or a major at the end of their sophomore year. They suggested that comprehensive descriptions of different majors, including a means of matching skills, aptitudes, and interests to prospective paths, be made available in some centrally accessible place. A web portal or some other interactive interface might be one

possible way of providing this service. The information presented there would include a description of the courses required for a given major and might also give students some perspective on future career options for a given choice. It was noted that Career Services already has such a portal, but its focus is on career choices rather than choosing majors.

*FYS/Department advising transition:* The majority of students were satisfied with their first year advising and the transition from First Year of Studies to the advisor(s) in their choice of major. The one issue that arose was that students would have liked more input from their prospective major advisors *earlier*, during their first year. For students who already are sure of a path of study, many felt that they would benefit from domain-specific expertise in answering such questions as the best strategies to use AP credits, which classes to select to keep study-abroad options open, etc. Several students also expressed a wish for more active engagement with pre-professional advising during the first year. (students' fault in this/or both cases?)

*Upperclass Advising:* Most students were more or less satisfied with the level and activity of advising in the departments and colleges, although the experience can be quite varied given the diverse advising structures that they encounter depending on their major and their college. Some very specific deficiencies were mentioned, such as problems with faculty advisors in some engineering departments, or the lack of information/guidance for engineering and science internships. Students (in science and engineering) expressed an interest for more contact with their advisors, specifically for career advice. A particular issue that arose is the question of why there seemed to be some sort of "stigma" attached to upperclassmen asking for advice. Whether they feel disconnected from their advisors or they are embarrassed that they don't know the answers, it was felt that upper class students are reluctant to seek out advising in formal settings. Upperclass peer-advising groups may be one solution to this problem.

*Lack of Monitoring Tools:* Students felt that the current Graduation Progress System (GPS) for tracking their requirements, etc., was poorly advertised and often contained errors. They expressed a clear desire for better tools to chart their academic course through the University. If a more flexible Core Curriculum were to be introduced, this would become even more important.

To summarize, taken as a whole many students were satisfied with the overall level of advising provided by First Year of Studies and their college or department. There is a clear desire, however, for a more integrated advising structure so that students can get advice on prospective courses of study and begin with a "four year vision" as soon as possible.

### **3. Peer Institutions**

As part of our discussions, the Focus Group examined a survey of advising structures and practices of 24 other institutions. Many of these were small Catholic colleges, but the list also included Harvard, Dartmouth, Boston College, and the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. A wide diversity of advising structures were represented, with the version

developed at Notre Dame not standing out as particularly unusual. One thing that appears to be fairly common is early contact between students and faculty advisors, but this is by no means universal. Many of the institutions surveyed also had extensive summer orientation programs for incoming students, but this also did not represent a wide majority of the programs, especially those at peer institutions. The survey compendium is included as an appendix to this report.

#### **4. Advising Recommendations**

Whether or not substantial changes are forthcoming to the Core Curriculum, the Focus Group on Advising has arrived at several broad recommendations to improve the overall advising experience for our students. As the diversity and academic sophistication of the student body has increased, the demand for a more holistic and integrated approach to advising has become much stronger. If more freedom is introduced into the selection of both the sequence and substance of the Core Curriculum, the changes we suggest will be all but mandatory in order to offer appropriate guidance to our students throughout their undergraduate years.

While overall student satisfaction with their individual advising experiences is generally quite favorable, the themes that emerged during the group's deliberations and its meetings with students suggest a number of ways that advising can be substantially improved for many students. The conclusions are summarized in the following four recommendations:

The Focus Group on Advising recommends

1. that academic advising at the University become more deliberately integrated, incorporating more input from prospective major departments from the very beginning,
2. that a much stronger emphasis and effort be focused on achieving proper placement for each student in the introductory courses required for their choice of major as well as for Core requirements,
3. that the University undertake a review of the current advising structure, with the goal of providing means of increased collaboration and communication across all aspects of advising ensuring that students' various needs can be met across their entire career at Notre Dame.
4. that the University establish a standard set of advising attributes that meet the student needs and can be implemented by the colleges and departments to suit their specific requirements.

In the following paragraphs, we expand upon the recommendations, proposing some possible policies and solutions that may improve the overall situation.



## 1. Advising Integration

Throughout our examination of the current advising structure, it became more and more apparent that there could be a dramatic improvement in advising if the advising structure was integrated in order to provide each student with a “four year vision” from the outset of their studies at Notre Dame.

University-wide integrated advising would begin with closer collaboration between the First Year of Studies and the University’s other advising entities (colleges, schools, departments, and programs) regarding pre-enrollment information and advising for incoming students. Students need assistance with the complexities concerning how to register for their initial courses so as to leave open options for the various majors they are interested in pursuing, and they need advanced information on how those various majors and programs are likely to unfold over their entire time at the University and into their future careers. The First Year of Studies is expert at the former; the various colleges, schools, programs, and departments are expert at the latter.

The present system of advising should be improved **by creating greater integration between First Year of Studies and the other advising entities** so as to facilitate easier access to departmental/program advising during the pre-college summer and throughout the first year. This increased integration of upper-division advising and the First Year of Studies advising should also result in a more consistently smooth hand-off between advising entities in the spring when first-year students must have officially declared (at least) their upper-division college and build their sophomore schedule with their upper division advisors. Access to upper division advisors before and during their first year will enable students to develop a much more detailed vision of how their course of studies could evolve over the four years. Options that are opened by Advanced Placement credit can, for example, be discussed in the context of how best to approach a student’s choice of major: would it be advantageous for the student to advance more quickly or would it be more appropriate to investigate more broadly, following some of the courses that are part of the Core Curriculum? How might the student plan for Study Abroad, given their potential choice of major and the associated requirements? Students from disadvantaged backgrounds may also benefit from specific advice on how to navigate the first few required courses for a given major while ensuring that they simultaneously acquire sound fundamental skills in those subjects that will serve as the basis for their future study. A potential low-impact first step in this direction would be to **expand the time allotted to the Advisor/Student discussions during Freshman Welcome Weekend in order to allow representatives of departments and programs to participate**, with the expectation that some more complicated student situations may require subsequent follow-up. The new Webinars created by FYS advising are also a great addition, since they will allow detailed and sustained student access before the start of classes. Continued opportunities for integrated engagement would need to be cultivated throughout the students’ first year. A greater role for the Career Center can also be envisioned in this context. One item that was suggested in this regard is a **new discernment “portal”**, similar to what exists in the Career Center for suggesting career paths, but instead containing descriptive information about potential matches between skills, interests, and a

major course of study. A central resource where students can explore the spectrum of possible majors and programs in a guided way may prove to be a valuable asset in discerning their path through their undergraduate careers.

Greater student/faculty (as opposed to student/advisor) departmental mentoring opportunities could be improved by routinely **making more “majors” courses available to first-year students**, particularly in the College of Arts and Letters. This is also relevant for appropriate student placement, as detailed in the following paragraph.

## 2. Importance of placement

While the majority of students seem to be successfully enrolled in courses of the appropriate level, there continues to be a number of students who end up in the wrong course sequence given their backgrounds and changing aspirations. For example, appropriate mathematics placement, either at the high or low end, continues to be a problem for some students. Placement difficulties are exacerbated in many instances by the fact that Advanced Placement scores do not necessarily correlate with mastery of the subject material. For the students affected by these issues, improper placement can result in the need to drop a course, delaying their progress, or the loss of an opportunity to take a more advanced course that would accelerate their entry into their major. Discerning courses of study for students with unusual plans is also an area of difficulty. An integrated advising structure with direct input from departments and programs should ameliorate these sorts of issues, since the “special cases” can be dealt with more easily. There is no reason that *all* students cannot be placed in an appropriate course of study.

Depending on the recommendations of the Core Curriculum Review, other mechanisms for placement may become necessary. If the diversity of introductory writing courses is expanded, for example, the administration of a writing placement test may be the only way to accurately discern the appropriate course for a given student. The development and upkeep of such placement instruments will need to take place as a collaboration between the instructors of the departments or programs involved and First Year of Studies.

## 3. Four-Year Advising and University-wide Advising Integration

The deliberate integration of advising needs to continue not only throughout the student's first year, but throughout their entire career at the University. Real integration of advising is complex because it needs to include not only the obvious academic realm of the professional advisors: the deans in each college, school, and program, and the departmental advisors, but it also involves the integration of the expertise of the Notre Dame International Studies, the Center for Social Concerns, Center for Undergraduate Scholarly Engagement, the Kellogg Institute, the Career Center, Academic Advising for Student Athletes, and the like. In addition, even after the first year many students need expert assistance in achieving and sustaining college-level academics and college life. The students' academic progress is in no small way dependent on their physical and mental health, and students with various difficulties in these areas are entering colleges and universities across the country in increasing numbers. Although the professional advisors

and the designated deans in the colleges and schools work most closely with those who support the students in transition and those who struggle, a University-wide integrated advising system also demands that advisors at all levels be knowledgeable about, and at times work closely with, those support systems that fall under the umbrella of Office of Community Standards: Multicultural Student Programs and Services, University Health Services, University Counseling Center, Disabilities Services, the Care Team, and others. In addition, the relatively new restrictions and rules concerning federal financial aid as well as the increasing socioeconomic diversity of our student-body also demand advising that is well integrated with the expertise of the Office of Financial Aid. Even beyond their first year, many students need referrals to the Writing Center and other academic tutoring and support services. There is a great deal of support and excellent advising open to students, but integrating it is, and will continue to be, both hugely important and a challenge.

Although the advising structures in place already do a remarkable job of juggling the complex and continuously changing landscape of academic hurdles and opportunities as well as of health, diversity, and financial pressures, a more deliberately integrated approach, **possibly via a University-wide advising council**, might supplement the liaison efforts already in place between the many advising and support entities. This body would convene periodic meetings of all of the advising groups across campus in order to share information, best practices, and discuss common problems. This advising council might also help to facilitate on-going university-wide advisor training and yearly assessment practices that would include departmental faculty as well as professional advisors. The newly developed system of online notes may also go some way in helping advisors from across the campus work together for the good of the student. **The focus group recommends that the University convene a study group to examine ways to coordinate and/or consolidate the current advising structures to improve the level of communication and consistency of advising across all academic units.**

#### 4. Quality/Consistency of Advising

In addition to greater integration of advising across campus, the consistency of advising is an area of some concern. Some advisors receive training and continuing professional development. Others are pressed into service with nothing more than a course catalogue. In some colleges and departments, advising is easily accessed and highly supportive. In other colleges and departments, advising is minimal and/or students are unsure whom to contact for advising. **Expectations concerning advising practices need to be established and means of assessing advising need to be put into place for both professional and departmental advisors** to ensure all students are receiving good, if not excellent, advising during the entirety of their time at the University. Some colleges and schools will need to make few if any adjustments; others may need to do much more. **The focus group recommends that the University convene a study group to examine ways to establish a consistent level of quality of advising across all academic units.**

## Appendix 1: First Year Studies Advising Survey Results (2009-2015)

Here, detailed results from the FYS end-of-year surveys described in the main report are presented. As can be seen from the number of responses, the survey base is the majority of students completing their first year.

The overall results (Tables A1-1 and A1-2) show a consistent student response as represented by the mean value of the survey ratings, but with a statistically significant shift from the number of students rating their experience as “Very Good” to that of an “Excellent” rating. Table A1-3 shows a trend of increasing student satisfaction with the amount of contact with their academic advisor. (Auxiliary data is required to tell whether the amount of contact increased, decreased, or remained constant during this period.)

Of particular note are the results of Tables A1-4 through A1-8. Table A1-4 shows the student’s perception of how well their FYS advisor had helped build their academic planning skills. While the overall mean of the student response to this question is not particularly low (81% agree or strongly agree that their FYS advisor helped in improving their academic planning skills), it is striking that the number of students who strongly agreed that their advisor had helped them improve their skills in this area is notably smaller than any other category in this survey. In contrast, the results of Tables A1-5 through A1-8 suggest that the students feel that they are receiving quality advice from their advisors on relevant academic matters. Taken together, these results give the impression that the students feel that they are, in general, getting good advice on what to do, but don’t feel that they have really “taken ownership” of their academic trajectories. Perhaps this is not that surprising, given that the students in this survey are just finishing their first year.

(Source: OSPIR  
Switched to web administration in 2014)

**Table A1-1.** Student view of the overall FYS advising experience.

		First Year advising – overall experience						Mean	Valid N
		Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent				
Academic Year	2013	3%	12%	38%	47%			3.29	1669
	2014	2%	12%	35%	51%			3.35	1625
	2015	3%	12%	35%	51%			3.34	1481

**Table A1-2.** Students’ rating of their FYS Advisor.

		Overall rating of advisor					Mean	Valid N
		Ineffective	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent		
Academic Year	2009	3%	5%	14%	30%	48%	4.15	1552
	2010	1%	4%	11%	31%	53%	4.32	1791
	2011	1%	4%	11%	31%	53%	4.30	1714
	2012	1%	3%	10%	28%	57%	4.37	1527
	2013	2%	4%	13%	29%	52%	4.26	1655
	2014	1%	4%	11%	28%	56%	4.33	1618
	2015	1%	4%	12%	27%	56%	4.32	1474

**Table A1-3.** Students' view of appropriate levels of contact with their FYS advisor.

		Amount of contact with FY advisor has met my needs						Mean	Valid N
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree			
Academic Year	2009	2%	3%	11%	43%	41%	4.18	1553	
	2010	1%	2%	9%	42%	46%	4.31	1795	
	2011	-	2%	11%	42%	44%	4.29	1706	
	2012	-	2%	9%	40%	49%	4.36	1536	
	2013	-	3%	8%	42%	47%	4.32	1663	
	2014	-	2%	8%	39%	50%	4.36	1624	
	2015	-	2%	9%	39%	50%	4.36	1481	

**Table A1-4.** Students' view of whether advising had helped with planning skills

		My advisor has helped me to develop my academic planning skills						Mean	Valid N
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree			
Academic Year	2009	2%	5%	23%	45%	24%	3.84	1553	
	2010	1%	3%	18%	50%	28%	4.01	1795	
	2011	1%	4%	19%	48%	28%	3.97	1705	
	2012	1%	3%	18%	48%	30%	4.03	1525	
	2013	1%	4%	20%	50%	25%	3.93	1667	
	2014	1%	3%	16%	46%	35%	4.11	1617	
	2015	-	3%	16%	49%	32%	4.09	1474	

**Table A1-5.** Students' view of advising quality with respect to explaining overall requirements

		Advisor's explanations of university/college requirements - Satisfaction					Mean	Valid N
		Not at all	A little	Moderately	Greatly			
Academic Year	2009	1%	8%	35%	56%	3.46	1544	
	2010	1%	6%	31%	62%	3.56	1785	
	2011	1%	6%	32%	61%	3.54	1715	
	2012	-	5%	27%	67%	3.61	1532	
	2013	2%	6%	31%	61%	3.52	1661	
	2014	1%	5%	24%	69%	3.61	1617	
	2015	2%	6%	23%	69%	3.60	1473	

**Table A1-6.** Students' view of advising quality with respect to explaining courses required in the first year to enter specific majors/colleges.

		Advisor's explanations of FY courses needed for college and major - Satisfaction					Mean	Valid N
		Not at all	A little	Moderately	Greatly			
Academic Year	2009	1%	6%	33%	59%	3.50	1549	
	2010	1%	6%	29%	65%	3.57	1789	
	2011	1%	6%	28%	64%	3.56	1717	
	2012	1%	5%	27%	68%	3.61	1533	
	2013	1%	6%	30%	63%	3.54	1664	
	2014	1%	4%	21%	73%	3.67	1617	
	2015	1%	5%	23%	71%	3.63	1475	

**Table A1-7. Students' view of advising quality with respect to explaining overall academic options**

		Advisor's explanations of available academic options - Satisfaction					
		Not at all	A little	Moderately	Greatly	Mean	Valid N
Academic Year	2009	3%	11%	37%	49%	3.33	1548
	2010	2%	9%	36%	53%	3.41	1788
	2011	2%	10%	36%	52%	3.38	1715
	2012	1%	8%	35%	56%	3.46	1533
	2013	3%	10%	36%	51%	3.35	1662
	2014	2%	8%	29%	61%	3.49	1619
	2015	3%	3%	29%	61%	3.48	1476

**Table A1-8. Students' view of advising quality with respect to aiding exploration**

		Advisor's guidance in exploring a college or program - Satisfaction					
		Not at all	A little	Moderately	Greatly	Mean	Valid N
Academic Year	2009	3%	12%	39%	46%	3.28	1549
	2010	1%	8%	41%	50%	3.39	1784
	2011	2%	11%	38%	49%	3.35	1715
	2012	2%	9%	36%	52%	3.39	1531
	2013	2%	13%	38%	47%	3.30	1661
	2014	3%	10%	29%	58%	3.42	1617
	2015	3%	9%	30%	58%	3.44	1476

## **Appendix 2: College of Engineering Survey Results (2004-2015)**

The data from the College of Engineering include results from three different surveys that shed light on student perceptions of the advising experience. The first, given to graduating seniors in 2010, is limited to a table of queries where students are asked to indicate what is important in the interactions with their advisors. The students are also asked to estimate what the importance of these topics should be to the departments and the college. The results are shown in Table A2-1. Some results are not so surprising. For example, since these are students already within the College of Engineering, it would follow that “selecting a major” would not be a concern for the students. It might be surprising that the students felt that “personal problems” were not the purview of academic advisors, which begs the question where the students felt they should turn for these issues. There is a general alignment, however, between students’ perception of important advising topics and the emphasis they felt the departments and college were placing on them.

The second set of engineering survey results examine students’ perception of their FYS and Department advising experiences. Note that the students responding to this set of questions are those graduating with a degree in engineering, so that there may be a selection bias. A particular concern of the College of Engineering has been that of FYS encouragement (or not) of students to pursue a degree in engineering. Results were broken down by gender and ethnicity. Graduating classes from 2004 to 2012 showed fairly consistent impressions of FYS advising. The classes of 2013 and 2014, however, showed a shift to a more positive view of their FYS experience. This effect is mostly due to a greater sense among female students that FYS is providing “strong encouragement” to study engineering. These results are shown in Tables A2-2 and A2-3. Note the dramatic increase in essentially all categories for encouragement towards engineering. (The “International” student category in Table 4 is subject to large fluctuations due to the small number of students that fall into this characterization.) Recent results seem to indicate an evening of the advice given by FYS to prospective engineering students.

Results for the second component of this survey, related to Department advising, are shown in Table A2-4. Note again the increase in positive perception of advising in recent years.

The third set of Engineering data are from an annual survey of graduating seniors conducted by Educational Benchmarking, Inc. (EBI) that asks the same questions of graduates from many different institutions, facilitating extramural comparisons. The results of the 2014 survey (the questions changed after 2013) are shown in Table A2-5.

On a scale of 1-7, the majority of students chose A2-5 or A2-6, implying most students are satisfied with the academic portions of the advising experience. Of note is that students felt that academic advisors were not a good source of advice for “other” problems. This is consistent with the previous survey results. In a comparison with peer institutions, Notre Dame sits pretty much at the average in terms of student satisfaction with the advising experience. This is shown in Table A2-6.

**Table A2-1.** Results of a 2010 Exit Survey from the College of Engineering

<b>Survey Responses Class of 2010 (1-5 scale, 5 highest) 225/225 Seniors responding</b>	<b>Importance to you to discuss with an advisor</b>	<b>Your view on how important this subject is as an advising priority for your department</b>	<b>Your view on how important this subject is as an advising priority for the college</b>
Selection of major	3.2	3.7	4.0
Selection of courses	3.9	4.0	3.4
College and University requirements	3.4	3.2	3.3
Major requirements	4.0	4.2	3.5
Study abroad opportunities	3.5	3.4	3.6
Fellowship and award opportunities	3.2	3.4	3.4
Research opportunities	3.9	4.1	3.6
Summer internship opportunities	3.6	3.8	3.7
Career goals and opportunities	4.0	4.0	3.8
Post-graduate education opportunities	3.9	4.1	3.9
Personal problems	2.1	2.0	2.0
Academic problems	3.9	4.0	3.6

**Table A2-2.** Engineering Graduates' Views of FYS Advising: Encouragement Received from FYS Advisor to Pursue an Engineering degree

	<b>Classes of 2004-2012 Mean</b>	<b>Classes of 2013-2014 Mean</b>
Strong encouragement	38.1%	44.7%
Cautious encouragement	14.5%	14.6%
Discouragement	3.3%	1.5%
Did not seek FYS advice	41.6%	37.5%

**Table A2-3.** Engineering Graduates' Views of FYS Advising: Percentage Who Believe FYS Strongly Encouraged Them to Pursue Engineering, by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

	<b>Classes of 2004-2012 Mean</b>	<b>Classes of 2013-2014 Mean</b>
All	38.1%	44.7%
Women	33.7%	43.2%
Men	39.5%	45.2%
White	37.6%	44.7%
Non-White	40.8%	44.3%
International	43.7%	55.1%

**Table A2-4.** Engineering Graduates' Views of Departmental Advising

	<b>Classes of 2004-2013 Mean</b>	<b>Class of 2014</b>
Department active	19.2%	26.7%
Department available	40.4%	37.3%
Department inactive	22.4%	13.2%
Used EG Dean's Office	4.8%	7.9%
Did not seek advising	12.8%	14.9%



**Table A2-5.** Results of 2014 EBI Survey of Engineering Graduates: Student Satisfaction with Advising

	Mean (1-7 scale)	% 6 or 7
<b>Overall Advisor Satisfaction</b> (weighted average of individual questions below)	5.48	N/A
Satisfaction with the degree to which the advisor was knowledgeable about <b>course requirements for major</b>	5.72	69.5%
Satisfaction with the degree to which the advisor was knowledgeable about <b>degree requirements</b>	5.68	66.8%
Satisfaction with the degree to which the advisor was knowledgeable about <b>campus referral sources for personal, academic, or financial problems</b>	4.78	42.2%

**Table A2-6.** Results of 2014 EBI Survey of Engineering Graduates: External Benchmark Comparisons (Mean Response on 1-7 scale)

	Notre Dame	Select Six	Carnegie Class	All	ND v. Carnegie Percentile
<b>Overall Advisor Satisfaction</b>	<b>5.48</b>	<b>5.32</b>	<b>5.52</b>	<b>5.57</b>	<b>43%</b>
Major course requirements	5.72	5.46	5.63	5.71	52%
Degree requirements	5.68	5.49	5.66	5.73	48%
Campus referral sources	4.78	4.13	5.14	5.19	13%

### Appendix 3: Mendoza College of Business Survey Results (2005-2013)

**Table A3-1.** Results of 2013 EBI Survey of Business Graduates: Student Satisfaction with Advising

	Mean (1-7 scale)	% 6 or 7
<b>Overall Advisor Satisfaction</b> (weighted average of individual questions below)	6.16	N/A
Satisfaction with the advisor's <b>knowledge of requirements</b>	6.36	86.6%
Satisfaction with the advisor's <b>availability</b>	6.32	84.7%
Satisfaction with the <b>helpfulness of recommendations</b> made by the advisor	6.13	82.3%
Satisfaction with <b>advisor's interest in students' progress</b>	5.82	70.4%

**Table A3-2.** Results of 2013 EBI Survey of Business Graduates: External Benchmark Comparisons (Mean Response on 1-7 scale)

	Notre Dame	Select Six	Carnegie Class	All	ND v. Carnegie Percentile
<b>Overall Advisor Satisfaction</b>	<b>6.16</b>	<b>5.57</b>	<b>5.29</b>	<b>5.25</b>	<b>87%</b>
Knowledge of requirements	6.36	5.74	5.54	5.43	87%
Availability	6.32	5.73	5.28	5.33	99%
Helpfulness of recommendations	6.13	5.54	5.33	5.27	87%
Advisor's interest in students' progress	5.82	5.28	5.05	5.01	75%

**Figure A3-1.** Mean Overall Advisor Satisfaction from EBIT Exit Surveys (2005-2013)

