I. Introduction: Charge, Membership and Process

In fall 2009 the Provost and Faculty Senate President jointly charged a task force chaired by Susie Brubaker-Cole, Associate Provost for Academic Success and Engagement (Academic Affairs), and Kim McAlexander, Head Advisor and Faculty Senate Executive Committee member (HHS), to “create an executable plan for improving first-year student advising,” including the following components:

- Specific outcomes for first-year student advising
- Recommendations for structural and other enhancements to advising, including consideration of how advising should interface with an “early warning” system for students in difficulty
- Recommendations for a degree audit system (by December 15, 2009).”

The co-chairs solicited membership nominations from the deans of all colleges that award undergraduate degrees, as well as representatives from Student Affairs, Academic Affairs and Ecampus from leaders in those units. Final Task Force membership included: Louie Bottaro (CLA), Rick DeBellis (Ecampus), Cary Green (CAS), Kate Halischak (Academics for Student Athletes and Faculty Senate Executive Committee), Nicole Kent (Pharmacy), Kerry Kincanon (UESP), Rebekah Lancelin (Honors College), Mary Ann Matzke (COS), Brett McFarlane (COE), Gene Newburgh (COEd), Kate Peterson (Enrollment Management), Brenda Sallee (COB and chair of the Academic Advising Council), Clay Torset (COF), Kris Winter (New Student Programs and Family Outreach).

The Task Force submitted its recommendation for the purchase of a degree audit system on December 15, 2009 (see Appendix A), and the Registrar’s Office is currently overseeing implementation of the DegreeWorks system, scheduled to be operational for full campus use by fall 2011.

The Task Force divided the work of the remaining charge into three member groupings. Brett McFarlane and Rick DeBellis co-chaired the subcommittee on Technology, Tools and Resources; see Appendix B for this group’s recommendations on advising developments relating to the DegreeWorks system. Kerry Kincanon and Mary Ann Matzke co-chaired a subcommittee on advising at orientation sessions. The recommendations appear in Appendix C and include improvements to pre-START advising and three viable models for improved advising structures for START, one of which should be implemented based on the outcome of the overall structural changes to first-year advising. Finally Gene Newburgh chaired a subcommittee charged with researching advising structure models for the purpose of informing the deliberations of the plenary committee.

The plenary committee dedicated its agenda to defining a set of fundamental student outcomes for first-year advising (see Appendix D) and determining optimal structures and practices for delivery of first-year advising in order to attain these (section III, below). National research on advising system effectiveness does not identify a single best system but rather emphasizes that successful advising systems at a given set of campuses are designed to respond to the particular structures, academic cultures, student needs, and desired outcomes within those distinctive institutions. The Task Force
identified the following characteristics of a first-year advising system that would be most conducive to fulfilling students’ needs at OSU:

- Advising will be developmental, proactive, and intrusive.
- Advising will promote the overarching learning goals for undergraduate education (including the Bacc Core and the major) and guide students toward productive, engaging educational pathways.
- Advisors will have broad knowledge of majors and disciplines to aid undecided students in exploring potential programs of study.
- Advisors will have deep knowledge of majors within a disciplinary area to guide declared students through programs of study.
- Advisors will have comprehensive, consistent knowledge of university requirements, rules, regulations, processes, and resources.
- Students will be able to establish an advising relationship with the same advisor for an extended period of time.
- Advising will address the diverse needs of the full range of students from self-starters and high-achievers to at-risk students.
- Advising structures and advising processes will be consistent across campus during the first year so as to reduce students’ confusion about how to access resources and information.

II. Delivery Models for First-Year Advising

The Task Force considered some 20 advising models in the context of the first-year advising outcomes. While the Task Force was not able to reach consensus on a single, optimal campus-wide structure for first-year advising, two models emerged as holding most promise for delivering the outcomes. The large majority of members favored the **centralized by college** advising model. In this model, a central advising office exists in each college and serves as a one-stop shop for academic information. All first-year students within a college are advised within the central advising office, and ideally the maximum advisor to student ratio is 1:300. First-year advisors are housed in a common, central office, and:

- Possess deep knowledge of majors within the college, the Bacc Core curriculum, and university rules, requirements, regulations and support resources
- Are connected to student organizations, clubs, and engagement opportunities such as research, service learning, and overseas study within majors and the college
- Are professional faculty or instructors. (Professiorial faculty in departments can serve as mentors to students who have declared a major.)
- Report to a college head advisor.

A college can also decide to have its advisors specialize in one major or a subset of majors depending on the size and diversity of academic programs within the college.

The college head advisor has strong ties to college deans and department chairs. The head advisor also works with a campus-wide advising consortium on matters of training, professional development, technology, assessment, strategic planning, policy and process.

For advising in the upper-class years, the Task Force foresees three possible scenarios to be determined according to college structures and culture: 1) Students continue to be advised in the college central office. 2) Students are advised by faculty in departments. 3) Students are advised in a “split model” with an assigned advisor in a department and continued access to the central advising office services.
Advantages of the Centralized-by-College Model

- Provides easily identifiable, consistent location for students to seek information, particularly for students migrating from one major or college to another
- Honors the strong college culture of OSU and maintains uniqueness of individual college's academic culture
- Facilitates communication and professional development among advisors within a college by virtue of physical proximity, cohesive advising staff, and central reporting lines
- Ensures first-year students receive guidance from professional staff most familiar with student developmental needs and institutional requirements, policies, procedures and resources
- Facilitates communication and referrals for students in difficulty identified through the planned early warning system
- Allows faculty time to be spent on mentoring, undergraduate research, orientation courses, learning communities, and other activities that better utilize faculty expertise and support student persistence.

Disadvantages of the Centralized-by-College Model

- Students may need to transition to a different advisor for upper-class years, thus disrupting the advising relationship established in the first year
- Creates potential additional challenge and responsibility for coordinating with departments on matters of individual placement and academic standing (such as AP credit and transfer credits that are not directly articulated)
- Centralized office is one step removed from the academic life of departments, faculty and the curriculum
- May require additional personnel and space resources for colleges not currently utilizing this model

While the majority of the Task Force members favor the centralized-by-college model, several members do not feel that imposing a single advising system onto all colleges would serve students well given the breadth and diversity of OSU’s disciplines and academic cultures. This group views the model currently practiced in their colleges – the split (or decentralized) model – as most appropriate for their colleges. In this model, all students are assigned to a departmental professional advisor or instructor with advising as a formal part of the position description. Tenure track faculty advisors could be assigned as mentors for the upper-class years.

Each college has a central advising and administrative office with professional staff reporting to a head advisor who has a strong direct report to deans and department chairs. This office supports the department advisors by providing resources and training. The center would serve prospective students as well as current students who need transfer course evaluation or degree audit info, AR interpretation, petitions, etc.

The head advisor works with a campus-wide advising consortium on matters of training, professional development, assessment, strategic planning, and policy and process. All advisors have a broad knowledge of majors within the college, and each advisor specializes in a particular major or subset of majors. Advisors are connected to student organizations, clubs, and the curriculum.
The center is responsible for a particular subset of students (e.g., those who are undecided on a major within the College, those on academic probation, and pre-majors preparing for a professional program). When students have satisfied certain criteria, such as declaring a major or completing prerequisites for admission to a professional program, they are reassigned to advisors in the school or department that offer their major.

Advantages of the Split Model
- Locates advising in the realm where student academic engagement happens – the academic department – and fosters a sense of belonging to the academic community
- Facilitates long term connections between students and faculty in the department
- Connects advisors and advising to departmental curricula, research, internships, and professional/career networks
- Through the central head advising office, provides back up advising for students and consistent advising for undecided, migrating, and reinstated students
- Makes efficient use of currently available resources in colleges currently using this model
- Accommodates any of the proposed Orientation Models in the majority report

Disadvantages of the Split Model
- Student must learn to navigate to the advisor located in each department
- Consistent assessment and evaluation may be more difficult when advisors report to department chairs
- Communication among advisors in large units and across the college may be less efficient

III. Other Opportunities to Enhance Advising

The Task Force also explored means for improving first-year advising through mechanisms that are not necessarily dependent on changes in advising program structure:

- Determine procedures and practices to ensure smooth, well-informed student migration from one major to another: no student should fall through the cracks.
- Implement a regular, campus-wide advisor training and professional development program.
- Train and orient advisors on the practices and procedures of the Early Alert Referral Process developed under the auspices of the UCSEE.
- Foster a deeper campus culture of major exploration so that students make well-informed choices that include consideration of small majors and majors not often known by recent high-school graduates.
- Create strong centralized advising oversight within each college with purview over all class years, including centralized reporting, evaluation and accountability.
- Require a PIN every term for first-year students.
- Formalize a central university administrative role with responsibility for coordinating advising campus-wide.
- Implement regular campus-wide assessment of advising.
- Equalize advisor pay across units.
- Increase usage of peers and graduate students in appropriate informational advising roles.

IV. Final Recommendations For Advising Enhancements and Implementation Plan
Given the constraints OSU faces in the current climate of budget reductions and ongoing organizational realignments, the implementation process for the First Year Advising Task Force enhancements should provide for both **flexibility** for colleges to determine effective, realistic enhancements and **accountability** to ensure attainment of the outcomes defined by the Task Force. To this end we recommend constituting an implementation team, reporting to the provost, that will consult with each college on the creation of a local enhancement plan for first-year advising. The plan will draw up on the full suite of Task Force recommendations and will focus on identifying “levers” that each college would activate no later than fall 2011 to enhance particular aspects of advising. Levers for enhancing first-year advising include:

- **Structure of advising system/mode of delivery**
  - University-wide structure that is consistent across colleges
  - Structural changes internal to colleges

- **Personnel**
  - Professorial versus professional advisors
  - Graduate students and peers

- **Training and professional development**

- **Technology**
  - DegreeWorks
  - Web sites
  - Online interactive tools and degree maps
  - Registration PINs

- **Content of advising/advising topics or “syllabus”**
  - Developmental versus prescriptive approaches
  - Orientation content in advising
  - Academic Success content in advising
  - Proactive interventions for students in difficulty

- **Programming/workshops/orientations**
  - Student success workshops
  - Major exploration workshops
  - Links with orientation courses
  - Academic sessions of START/CONNECT

- **Others as agreed upon by the college and implementation team**

Each college plan will also include a timeline and plan for assessment and reporting of results based on the Task Forces learning outcomes for first-year advising. We expect that at least one college will be ready to transition to the centralized-by-college model recommended by the majority of Task Force members, and that assessment of the new model will drive future decisions on structural changes in other colleges. Other colleges could move forward to the centralized model at a later date as assessment information indicates and resources permit.

The implementation team should be led by the associate provost for academic success and engagement and ideally will include representation from the Academic Advising Council, the Council of Head Advisors, the Undergraduate Education Council and departmental advisors. Meetings with individual colleges should start no later than fall quarter 2010. In addition to implementation oversight, the University should formally assign the associate provost the title of director of advising and, with it, responsibility for ongoing coordination of academic advising efforts from a campus-wide perspective. This assignment would not include any change in advising reporting lines.
Appendix A: DegreeWorks Report  

December 4, 2009  

To: Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President  

From: Susie Brubaker-Cole and Kim McAlexander, Co-Chairs of the First-Year Advising Task Force  

CC: Rebecca Warner, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs  
    Kent Kuo, University Registrar  
    Jim Day, Enrollment Management  
    Catherine Williams, Enterprise Computing  
    First-Year Advising Task Force Members  

Re: Task Force Recommendations for a Degree Audit System  

We are pleased to convey the unanimous decision of the First-Year Advising Task Force to recommend the purchase of the Sungard SCT DegreeWorks degree audit system to provide critical support and enhancements to OSU’s advising, student progress auditing, degree clearance, and course access planning enterprises. On November 30, 2009, the Task Force participated in an online DegreeWorks demonstration facilitated by Kent Kuo and led by a DegreeWorks representative; several Task Force members had also attended a similar demonstration earlier in the quarter. The Task Force concluded that the following DegreeWorks attributes render this system uniquely qualified to meet our campus’ needs:  

- Superior, built-in academic planning tools that will allow students to map complete educational plans and will enable administrators to accurately project course access needs across quarters and academic years (similar planning tools would be available only at additional expense in other systems on the market)  
- Seamless integration with OSU’s existing transfer articulation system, thus reducing implementation time and expense and eliminating data translation requirements  
- Intuitive user-interface design that will create ease of access for students, faculty, advisors, and administrators  
- Built-in note-taking functions that will allow advisors and student services agents to track interactions across offices, creating a more holistic, consistent approach to working with students  
- Flexibility to sustain diverse degree requirement and degree audit needs, including those of the Graduate School, ROTC, Athletics, Ecampus, and pre-enrollment transfer institutions  
- User-friendly customization options that will allow advisors to design the online degree audit views.  

The Task Force also recommends purchasing this system at the “full” engagement level. When investing in a system of this scope and impact, we should seek to maximize the investment pay-offs up
front, rather than seek to cobble together lesser-quality solutions to campus needs and thus risk substandard mid- to long-range results. Finally, we recommend providing adequate implementation staff levels in the Office of the Registrar, including a project manager and programmer, so as to avoid interruptions in the office’s regular campus services and functions.

We are confident that the DegreeWorks system has the capacity, flexibility, and functionality to fundamentally transform how we serve our students. Thank you for your support of this critical tool for supporting our campus’ student success goals.
Appendix B: Technology Subcommittee Report

Members: Susie Brubaker-Cole, Brett McFarlane, Rick DeBellis, Brenda Sallee, Eric Stoller

Our Charge
To identify and make recommendations for technology, tools, and resources needed to support the recommendations of the 1st advising task force. Given the significant scope of this charge, the subgroup chose to narrow our focus to three 1st year advising outcomes most relevant to our charge:
- Students will know where and how to access accurate information about educational goals and progress.
- Students will be empowered to utilize support services to accommodate their individual needs in meeting the challenges and expectations of university study.
- Students will communicate regularly with their advisors to monitor and evaluate educational goals and progress.

Initial Priorities

1. Prepare for and maximize functionality, utilization, and usability of Degree Works software package.
2. Improve how we communicate important advising and academic information to our student population and other important stakeholders on and off-campus.
3. Prepare recommendations for further study.

Priority 1: Prepare for and maximize functionality, utilization, and usability of Degree Works (DWorks) software package.

RECOMMENDATIONS (responsibility for task noted in parenthesis):

- Identify DWorks user experience expert with strong communication skills to guide students, faculty, and staff. (Registrar’s Office)
- Create standardized note taking practices with common standards prior to DWorks implementation (what will we use the notes for, what will they contain, what creative content can be added?) (AAC)
- Appoint ongoing DWorks User Implementation Team (UIT) responsible for consulting with other campuses using fully utilized DWorks system to inform best practice, speed bumps, creative usage, effective training, etc. Focus would not be on technical implementation but on fully preparing the advising and student communities on campus. (UIT – User Implementation Team)
- Consult with other campuses using fully utilized DWorks system to see what creative ideas are being utilized outside of the basic functionality of DWorks. This would include exploring specific target population interventions within DWorks. (UIT)
- Utilize report and consultant recommendations to prepare training/implementation/marketing plan for Oregon State DWorks rollout. (UIT, University Advancement, NSPFO)
- Plan implementation and publicity to prospective OSU students in community college system and other academic partners. (Enrollment Management)
Priority 2: Improve how we communicate important advising and academic information to our student population and other important stakeholders on and off-campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS (responsibility for task noted in parenthesis):

- Revise “current students” website to provide easy access to accurate, commonly used information and web-based self-advising about options, opportunities, and requirements. Repurpose content utilizing multiple communication platforms. (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, University Advancement)
- Create parallel “advisors” website with appropriate information and links for faculty, professional, and peer advisors across campus. (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs)
- Online student services becomes “My OSU” and eventually transitions to a portal platform for all current students, faculty, and off-campus stakeholders (alumni, employers, etc.) (Registrar’s Office)
- Utilize search engine optimization for content related to advising for current and prospective students. (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, University Advancement)
- Find a better way to present the BAC CORE to students in our written and presentation materials across campus. (Academic Affairs)

Priority 3: Prepare recommendations for further study.

RECOMMENDATIONS (responsibility for task noted in parenthesis):

- Explore options for demystifying advising referrals/student migration in our complex structures across campus. (AAC)
- Explore how can we better utilize social media tools and alternate communication modes to further personalize the advisor/student relationship (AAC)
- Explore how can we further utilize technology to create virtual appointments/meetings/workshops (AAC)
- Explore options for an online advising appointment scheduling system (AAC)

Other recommendations.

During our discussion time, several suggestions to other subgroups and subcommittees across campus were identified and compiled:

- Themed BAC CORE tracks based upon student interest areas (BAC Core Committee)
- Adopt advising syllabus across campus with key metrics (AAC)
- Not allow ONID forwarding off-campus (Academic Affairs, IT)
Appendix C: Orientation Subcommittee Report

First Year Advising Task Force –Orientation Subgroup Final Report
Members: Mary Ann Matzke (Co-Chair), Kerry Kincanon (Co-Chair)
Louie Bottaro, Kris Winter, Kate Peterson, Kim McAlexander, Brett McFarlane

Our Charge
To consider and discuss Advising at Orientation and to produce a summary written document for consideration by the larger task force that addresses two priorities:
1. Define outcomes of Advising at Orientation for students/advisors
2. Provide recommendations and options for Advising at Orientation structure

Priority 1: Define outcomes of Advising at Orientation for students/advisors
Here are the outcomes of Advising at Orientation as well as the “milepost” (Pre-START, START, CONNECT, 1st Term) where each outcome is potentially initiated, addressed, reinforced, or achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the first term, the student will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify unique expectations of OSU’s learning environment</td>
<td>CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify key resources and strategies for success at OSU</td>
<td>CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know where to find OSU academic regulations, policies and procedures</td>
<td>START, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register for classes using the Student On-Line Registration System and establish an ONID e-mail account</td>
<td>START and Pre-START respectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize OSU on-line tools: Catalog &amp; Schedule of Classes &amp; Student Online Services &amp; Degree Audit System</td>
<td>Pre-START, START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the Baccalaureate Core curriculum’s role and relevance as a part of the OSU degree requirements.</td>
<td>Pre-START, START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify where their academic advisor’s office is located and know how and when to contact him/her post-orientation</td>
<td>START, CONNECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain knowledge of university terminology.</td>
<td>Pre-START, START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand curricular requirements surrounding their major or educational area of interest</td>
<td>START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify opportunities that exist outside the classroom (clubs, internships, research, study abroad) that can enhance your OSU experience</td>
<td>START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For undecided students, have an initial strategy for exploring interests and areas of study</td>
<td>START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For declared students, have a preliminary plan of study for subsequent quarters.</td>
<td>START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisor Delivery Outcomes</th>
<th>Milepost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the end of the student’s first term, the advisor will have:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met their advisee at least once.</td>
<td>START, CONNECT, 1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imparted a sense of personal connection between advisor and advisee</td>
<td>1st Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained expectations for advising roles and communication practices.</td>
<td>START</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presented advising/orientation information in a way that students can understand. | START, CONNECT, 1st Term  
---|---  
Helped the student to make appropriate course selection based on placement scores, prior educational experience, and student interests/abilities | START  
---|---  
Discussed basic academic success strategies and resources according to the individual student’s strengths and background | 1st Term  
---|---  
Introduced OSU co-curricular activities that can supplement classroom learning | Pre-START, START, CONNECT, 1st Term  
---|---  
Helped the student initiate a process for designing and developing his/her educational plan | Pre-START, START, CONNECT, 1st Term  
---|---  
Explained the Baccalaureate Core curriculum’s role and relevance as a part of the OSU degree requirements | Pre-START, START, CONNECT, 1st Term  
---|---

**Priority 2: Provide recommendations and options for Advising at Orientation**

Our primary focus in evaluating this priority was considering Pre-START and START, but we do offer thoughts on CONNECT and the 1st Term as well.

**Recommendation: The Pedagogy of Advising at Orientation**

We recommend that Advising at Orientation has a coherent curriculum (complete with a syllabus) that delineates the when, where, who, why, and how of learning expectations and outcomes.

**Recommendation: Pre-START**

We suggest identifying a finite amount of “bite sized” content to be delivered to students as part of a Pre-START orientation. Examples could include:

An online welcome via video/multimedia piece that:
- Briefly introduces the concept of the bacc core, its relevance and rationale
- Provides a short tour of the online catalog and schedule of classes
- Facilitates ONID signup
- Initiates the Math Placement test

A Pre-START checklist (perhaps linked to Admissions’ existing checklist) that:
- Prompts students to send in standardized test scores and final high school transcript
- Provides a template for creating an accurate list of AP scores earned, AP classes taken senior year, and any college level transferable coursework

**Recommendation: START**

---

1 OSU’s New Student Programs and Family Outreach office is engaging in an orientation review process this summer. This process will utilize outside consultants, as well as the Student Voice Orientation Benchmarking Survey. The purpose of the review is to take a comprehensive look at orientation programs to see if, in their current state, they are meeting the needs of new students and OSU constituents. We acknowledge that the results of this review could influence future programmatic decisions surrounding Advising at Orientation.
The structure of Advising at START should either mirror or be congruent with the delivery model we adopt for First Year Advising as a whole. The majority opinion of the First Year Advising Task Force points toward the *College Centralized Model* and the minority opinion points toward a *Split Model*. We identified four START models\(^2\) that work with the *College Centralized Model* (See Table 1 at the end of this document for full definitions as well as strengths and weaknesses of each model).

1. *College Standardized Model*
2. *The Orientation Advising Team Model*
3. *The Hybrid Approach*
4. *Online Orientation*

**Recommendation: CONNECT & Fall Term First Year Orientation classes**

We recognize that an Advising at Orientation pedagogy should dictate that practice at these two sites would:

- Reinforce information and terminology presented during Pre-START and/or START – *examples:* confirmation of ONID signup and usage, CONNECT week interaction with primary advisor.
- Provide opportunities for more specificity of information as students encounter new experiences (living on campus, being in OSU classes) that give them greater context for understanding that information. – *examples:* a convocation segment dedicated to exemplifying the bacc core as an integral part of an OSU degree, a workshop on getting the most out of large lecture classes.
- Provide opportunities to introduce new information and terminology – *example:* how to use Degree Works to initiate an educational plan for the remainder of the first year and beyond.

---

\(^2\) With the exception of the online orientation, all would be two day programs. Our subcommittee did not discuss substantive changes to Off-Site STARTs, START@CONNECT, or Transfer STARTs at this time.
Table 1: Advising at Orientation: Strengths and Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODELS</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College Standardized Model - START dates and capacity at current levels -- Advising is managed at the college level -- Every college has a centralized team of cross-trained advisors and uses the same delivery structure for advising students.</td>
<td>Easier to manage and consistency of advising practice better accommodates day 2 major changes; consistency in advisor training and scheduling; advisors (all on 12 month contracts) would be cross-trained and would be able to advise all majors in their college; would even out the load to accommodate heavy attendance by a particular major; would better define the parameters of the day 2 experience for student participants.</td>
<td>Students may not meet or work with their actual advisor; Student numbers and space needs vary by college, so mandating a standard delivery model may not make sense for smaller colleges; For small colleges, may actually create a less personalized experience than actually exists; cross-training for advisors within the college may require some effort and time commitment for some colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Orientation Advising Team Model– START dates increased, capacity is lowered -- A core centralized team of advisors (drawn from UESP and the colleges) manages first day academic presentations for each college and second day START advising and registration. The student’s assigned advisor follows up with an audit of registered classes and a call/e-mail if changes are necessary (like our current off-site model, except spread out over two days).</td>
<td>New Student Programs would provide more support for the registration process and centralized training for advisors. Also they could manage and run the computer labs, etc. NSP would be more aware of access and computer registration problems and have staff available to deal with the crises that develop. Smaller sessions would reduce the amount of classroom space taken up by START activities; Smaller sessions may give students more face time with an advisor; Would allow colleges to put forward advisors for the Advising Orientation Team who truly want to work STARTs and whose strength is working with new students in transition. Built-in follow up by assigned advisor would provide an added check against scheduling errors or ill-advised changes made by the student after START; This follow-up contact would be another formal point of contact between the university and the student between START and matriculation. Could spawn more intentional CONNECT week programs to get students in contact with college advisors and faculty in close proximity to the start of their actual classes in fall term. Perhaps would be the most scalable model to accommodate the increasing undergraduate population envisioned by OSU 2025.</td>
<td>Distances the students from the college and department to a degree; Will require more cross-training as advisors could be in a position where they are advising outside of their college. Would put more of the onus on departments to create CONNECT week programming to provide the college/department connection. Students may not meet their actual advisor; Small departments may feel underrepresented. May present challenges in relationship to articulation and departmental overrides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MODELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODELS</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The Hybrid Approach – For June/July, we use the College Standardized Model. In August/September, we use Orientation Advising Team Model.</td>
<td>Since access problems peak in August, using the Orientation Advising Team Model in August could better manage the crises presented by lack of access. Varying the delivery models could mitigate the human resources challenges brought about by the increasing number of START sessions we are providing to offer flexibility for our incoming students.</td>
<td>Would require two different schedules for New Student Programs. Students in August would likely not meet their actual advisor or interact much with department. Would require additional cross training for August advisors: Variability in models compromiss our goal of providing a consistent orientation and advising experience for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Online Orientation – Only used for certain populations (E-campus, Firefighters, National Guard members, etc.) -- Advisors monitor/audit registration activity and follow up with student by phone/e-mail. – Could be used to enhance/supplement any of the other three models if needed. -- Could also be used for students entering OSU during winter or spring term.</td>
<td>This model could provide flexibility for students who cannot afford to come back to campus for START or who have other extenuating circumstances; Would give us a substantive, viable alternative that we could use to accommodate students with extreme circumstances; Could be a space to develop the modules we'd like to develop for &quot;Pre-START&quot; orientation; Also includes the built-in follow up by the assigned advisor.</td>
<td>Online model cannot fully replicate the teaching and learning that happens at the on-site program; harder to achieve the personal connection that is an important part of the on-campus programs: The &quot;coming to campus&quot; component is a critical part of the process for many of our students, and we wouldn't want to trade that for the convenience of the online model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: First-Year Advising Outcomes and Initial Assessment Recommendations

The Task Force created the following seven First-Year Advising Outcomes intended to guide students in their transition to the university and their OSU advising experience. These outcomes have also served as the standard by which the Task Force evaluated potential changes to the current advising system.

1. Students will explore and identify interests, abilities and life goals, and they will pursue these through purposeful and personally relevant programs of study that are the subject of ongoing reflection and refinement.

2. Students will understand the value of pursuing both breadth and depth of study through combined coursework in the Baccalaureate Core and the major field with the goal of fostering expansive lifelong learning, successful careers, and engaged citizenship.

3. Students will understand the university expectation to be active and self-directed learners who stretch themselves regularly in order to meet high standards of performance.

4. Students will pursue a balanced and challenging educational program both in and out of the classroom, immersing themselves in and contributing personally to diverse communities of students, teachers, scholars and mentors.

5. Students will monitor and evaluate their educational goals and progress through regular communication with advisors who care about their individual needs.

6. Students will know where and how to access accurate information about educational opportunities, requirements, academic regulations, policies and procedures.

7. Students will be empowered to utilize support services to accommodate their individual needs in meeting the challenges and expectations of university study.

Progress toward attainment of the first-year advising outcomes should be regularly assessed in colleges and across campus. While design of a full assessment plan exceeds the scope of this report, the Task Force recommends the use of student exit surveys similar to those used in several colleges presently but adapted to generate comparative data across campus. This spring OSU will participate in a statewide student advising survey administered by PSU which will provide baseline data against which to measure system improvements over the coming years. Finally the Task Force recommends tracking changes in first-to-second year retention rates as a marker of advising program success.