

Student Survey of Advising
Comparison of Years 2009, 2011, & 2014

John Briggs, Ed.D.

Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics

San Jose State University

May 2014

Contents

Executive Summary	i
Key Findings	i
Introduction	1
Background	1
Students Getting the Course They Need	1
General Education Advising	2
Overall View of General Education Advising	2
Alternate Sources of GE Advice	3
Usefulness of GE Advisor Advice	5
Student’s Relationship to GE Advisor	7
Major-Related Advising	9
Overall View of Advising Within the Major	9
Alternate Sources of Major-Related Advice	10
Usefulness of Major-Related Advisor Advice	11
Student’s Relationship to Major-Related Advisor	13
Miscellaneous Questions	15
Preparation for Advising Session	15
The Advising Hub:	15
Appendix	17

Executive Summary

The Advising Effectiveness Taskforce was created by the Advising Council to develop protocols to assess academic advising on campus. Included in that process is the need to learn how students are currently using the academic advising resources on campus, and how they evaluate the effectiveness of the advice they receive. To that end the Advising Council administered three surveys to gather information about student opinion about advising at SJSU.

This report summarizes the findings of the Survey of Undergraduate Academic Advising administered in spring 2009, and the Student Survey of Advising administered in spring 2011 and spring 2014. Data from all three surveys was merged and compared. Only questions common to all three surveys were analyzed in this report.

Key Findings

- Students report that they are less likely to get the courses they need in their major in 2014 than in 2011.

General Education (GE) Advising

- On average, students are not satisfied with the General Education (GE) advising at SJSU.
- On average, students visit their GE advisor once a semester.
- A significant percentage of GE advisors are faculty or staff in the students major
- Students who do not visit their GE advisor are using multiple sources of information to determine their academic path
- From 2011 to 2014 students felt the usefulness of GE advisor advice had improved in clarifying life and career goals, obtaining information about internships, and improving study habits.
- Students give their GE advisor an overall good rating, however, when asked about specific areas of advising, they rate their GE advisor poorly.

Major-Related Advising

- On average, students are satisfied with the major-related advising at SJSU.
- On average students visit their major-related advisor 1 to 2 times a semester.
- In 2009 about one-half of major-related advisors were faculty or staff from the students' department, by 2014 about two-thirds were.
- From 2009 to 2014 students significantly increased their use of the Advising Hub and peer mentoring for information about their major.
- For all years in the survey students rated the advice given by their major-related advisor as better than the advice by their GE advisor.
- For the most part students rated their major-related advisor highly saying they were helpful, effective, and treated them with respect. This relationship has also significantly improved throughout the years.

Preparation for Advising Session & Advising Hub

- Student use of the Unofficial Transcript has increased from 2009 to 2014.
- Students have increased their use of the Advising Hub from 2009 to 2014. Although satisfaction has not improved during this time period, students remain somewhat satisfied.

Introduction

Background

San Jose State University established an Advising Council to survey the state of academic advising and recommend improvements to academic advising, especially among undergraduate students. In fall 2008, Advising Council members and the Office of Institutional Research developed a student survey on academic advising. The survey looked at both general education (GE) advising and major advising. It explored how frequently students consulted advisors, which advisors they visited, the topics covered during advising sessions, the characteristics of their advisors, and their overall satisfaction with advising.

The survey was originally distributed to undergraduate students in spring 2009. The survey was then modified slightly and given in spring 2011. A third iteration of the survey was given in spring 2014. The purpose of this paper is to compare the responses to survey questions over time and to see if the Advising Council and San Jose State University (SJSU) should be aware of any trends.

Students Getting the Course They Need

In 2011 and 2014 students were asked if they got either the GE course they needed or the major courses they needed (Table 1). There is a trend between 2011 and 2014 that students are not getting the classes they want whether GE or major related. This is especially true of classes in their major which declined from 82.0% to 79.5%. This difference was significant.

These numbers reflect the current state of affairs at SJSU. Because of budgetary constraints the number of courses and the number of sections offered has declined. This means that students may not have the choices of classes they once had and are not getting the courses they need. This trend could also affect the answers we get from students. Students who do not get the courses they need may feel that it is the fault of their advisors, rather than externalities that neither the advisor nor SJSU can control.

Table 1.
Students Getting the Course They Needed

	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	t-test (F) ²
I was able to register for the GE classes I needed.	85.0%	84.4%	.500
I was able to register for the classes in my major that I needed	82.0%	79.5%	7.733*

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

General Education Advising

The survey is divided into two parts asking nearly identical questions: General Education (GE) advising and Major-related advising. This part focuses on GE advising.

Overall View of General Education Advising

There is an upward trend in the satisfaction with students' GE advisor (Table 2). However, this trend is not significant. Also, students are still, on average, moderately dissatisfied with their GE advisor.

Table 2.
Satisfaction with GE Advising

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	ANOVA (F) ²
How satisfied have you been with GE advising overall at SJSU?	2.85	2.86	2.91	1.131

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Very dissatisfied; 2 = Moderately dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat satisfied; 4 = Very Satisfied (Note: This analysis excluded "Don't Know"=5)

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Table 3 summarizes the number of times students who answered the survey saw their GE advisor in the last year. The average number of times is slightly over once a year. This number is trending upward, but is not a significant trend. Looking at the frequencies (Appendix: Table A), we find that there is a decline from 35.3% to 32.0% in the percentage of students that have not seen their advisor in the last year.

Table 3.
Number of Visits to GE Advisor

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	ANOVA (F) ²
During the past year how often did you meet with an advisor about GE?	2.11	2.15	2.16	0.916

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = None; 2 = Once; 3 = Twice; 4 = Three times; 5 = More than three times

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Table 4 summarizes the types of advisor from which students sought GE advice. There was a big decline in students who use advisors from Academic Advising and Retention Services (AARS). In 2009 36.2% of students used AARS for GE advising, by 2014 only 18.0% used AARS. This decline was offset by an increase in GE advising by faculty and peers. In 2009 27.5% got their GE advice from advisors in their major, this increased to 36.6% in 2014. Faculty advisors from other major or college increased from 0.9% to 4.2% and peer or mentor advising increased from 4.3% to 7.0%

Table 4.
Best Description of Primary Advisor for GE

	2009	2011	2014
Faculty advisor in my major	27.5%	37.2%	36.6%
Advisor from college-based advising center (e.g., BSAC, COSAC, or Engineering Student Success Center)	24.2%	17.7%	22.7%
Advisor from Academic Advising and Retention Services (located at 10th Street Garage)	36.2%	20.8%	18.0%
Other	5.1%	10.8%	7.1%
Peer mentor/advisor	4.3%	6.6%	7.0%
Staff member in my major	1.8%	4.1%	4.3%
Faculty advisor from other major/college	0.9%	2.7%	4.2%

Alternate Sources of GE Advice

In 2009, students who indicated they had not visited with an advisor were asked their sources of GE information. In 2011 and 2014 all students were asked which sources of GE information they used. In all three years students could check all sources that they used.

In order to get a complete understanding of the responses to these questions two types of analysis were prepared. The first analysis compares only those students who have not visited an advisor in the last year (Table 5). It was found that from 2009 to 2014 students are increasing their use of multiple sources of information about GE. Some sources have shown significant increases such as Schedule of Classes, friends, the Advising Hub, and peer mentor. Other sources have remained virtually unchanged such as the SJSU Catalog and other SJSU students.

The second analysis compares sources of GE information for all students (Appendix: Table B). Because of the restrictions in the survey method, 2009 did not ask all students this question, so only 2011 and 2014 data is shown. The table shows that for all students their primary sources of GE information is either staying the same or significantly declining (e.g. SJSU Catalog, Advising Hub and family members). The only source of information that has increased significantly is peer mentoring.

What these two analyses suggest is that while more students are using advisors, those that do not use advisors are becoming more sophisticated in gathering information by using multiple sources of information. Also, those that are using advisors are not using as many other sources of information. This suggests students are more satisfied with GE information from their advisor and do not feel the need to check other sources.

Table 5.
 Primary Sources of Information about GE for Students Who Had Not Visited an Advisor in the
 Past Year

	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	2014 (%)	2009-14 ANOVA (F) ¹
SJSU Catalog	72.2%	71.1%	66.1%	1.744
SJSU Schedule of Classes	50.1%	58.5%	52.2%	3.015*
Other SJSU students	30.5%	34.1%	35.9%	1.425
Friend	20.0%	26.6%	30.5%	6.208**
Other	14.1%	5.7%	6.8%	10.472***
Other areas on SJSU website	13.7%	25.5%	17.6%	9.962***
Advising Hub on SJSU website	9.3%	16.6%	11.9%	5.262*
Family members	7.0%	12.3%	7.1%	4.291*
I do not have any sources of GE information at present	5.7%	4.3%	5.1%	0.432
Peer mentor	5.1%	8.6%	10.5%	4.334*
Co-worker	2.3%	2.3%	3.1%	0.265

¹* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$; *** $p < .0005$

Usefulness of GE Advisor Advice

Care should be taken when analyzing the results from this section. The Likert scales for the 2009 survey are different from the 2011 & 2014 surveys. For instance, in 2009 the Likert scale was...

Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Very Useful	Not at All Useful	Does Not Apply
-------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

In 2011 & 2014 the Likert scale was...

Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not at All Useful	Does Not Apply
-------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

In order to compare means between the three years we consolidated 2009 responses for 'Not Very Useful' and 'Not at All Useful' into one. This allowed us to have three response levels for each year. This made comparing means and performing a one-way ANOVA possible.

However, this type of consolidation of Likert scales might not give us accurate results. In order to see if the technique is accurate we performed a t-test on the 2011 and 2014 responses only. Then we compared to see if both techniques gave us similar results.

In Table 6 are the mean responses for the common questions in survey years 2009, 2011, and 2014. Three out of the seventeen questions showed significant improvement in both analyses. Responses showed improvement in the usefulness of an advisor advice in clarifying life and career goals, obtaining information about internships, and improving study habits.

It should be noted that in the one-way ANOVA analysis of 2009, 2011, and 2014 data, students saw significant improvement in other areas as well. Students thought the usefulness of advice advisors gave regarding selecting/changing majors, dropping/adding courses, obtaining financial aid improved over time, and dealing with personal issues improved significantly over time. The 2011 & 2014 t-test did not find significance. However, there was increase in the usefulness of advice in these areas between 2011 and 2014. Therefore, these areas might have improved over time even though they do not meet the criteria for recognizing that improvement.

Table 6.
Usefulness of GE Advisor Advice

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	2009-14 ANOVA (F) ²	2011-14 t-test (F) ²
Obtaining information on Core GE requirements	2.42	2.37	2.41	1.871	0.000
Selecting/changing my major	2.29	2.39	2.38	4.314*	0.318
Dropping/adding courses	2.25	2.33	2.35	3.839*	0.000
Obtaining information on academic policies	2.22	2.24	2.28	1.587	1.519
Obtaining information on transfer credit/articulation	2.22	2.19	2.22	0.496	0.846
Coping with academic difficulties/probation	2.07	2.13	2.17	2.498	5.099**
Obtaining financial aid	2.05	2.15	2.17	3.949*	0.356
Receiving tutorial assistance	2.05	2.11	2.14	2.524	0.046
Obtaining information on remedial requirements	2.25	2.16	2.14	4.468*	0.300
Continuing my education after graduation	2.03	2.09	2.13	2.809	0.876
Clarifying life and career goals	1.99	2.05	2.13	5.904*	4.858*
Obtaining information on Internships	1.95	2.00	2.11	6.440**	9.437**
Improving my study skills and habits	1.92	2.06	2.10	9.036***	4.826*
Dealing with personal issues	1.95	2.07	2.08	4.079*	1.578
Obtaining information on co-curricular activities	1.98	1.99	2.03	0.780	6.552*
Withdrawing or transferring from this institution	2.00	2.04	2.02	0.245	0.218
Obtaining employment on campus	1.87	1.92	2.00	3.492*	0.029

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Not at all useful 2 = Somewhat useful; 3 = Very useful (Note: This analysis excluded "Does not apply"= 4)

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Student's Relationship to GE Advisor

Students were asked about their relationship to their GE advisor. For the most part students rated their GE advisor highly saying they were helpful, effective and treated them with respect. This relationship has also significantly improved throughout the years (Table 7).

However, when asked about what specific qualities the advisor possesses or what they do for them personally, there were areas most students thought their advisor did not do a sufficient job. Indeed, on average, most students did not agree that their advisor helped select courses or programs, encourage them to express their feeling, took a personal interest in them, help explore careers, or helped arrange meetings with them.

It should be noted that there were some areas that a majority of the students thought that their advisor had done a good job. These were: providing accurate information about required courses, allowing time to discuss problems, and being available for assistance.

Finally, in 2009 most students thought that their advisor did not help them identify obstacles they needed to overcome or referred them to campus resources. By 2104 both areas had improved significantly so that a majority of students thought they were helping them satisfactorily.

Table 7.
Relationship with GE Advisor

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	2009-14 ANOVA (F) ²
Treats me with respect	3.36	3.40	3.45	3.731*
Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students	3.16	3.17	3.25	3.175*
Provides me with accurate information about required courses in my major, elective courses, academic policies, etc.	3.20	3.18	3.21	0.352
Allows sufficient time to discuss issues or problems	3.12	3.12	3.15	0.505
Is available when I need assistance	3.09	3.09	3.14	1.192
Helps me identify the obstacles I need to overcome to reach my educational goals	2.96	3.02	3.12	7.606**
Refers me to campus resources (e.g., learning center, counseling services, etc.)	2.97	2.99	3.08	3.607*
Assists me in developing a long-term educational plan	2.98	2.98	3.06	2.305
Helps me understand why required courses are important for my academic program	3.02	2.98	3.03	0.957
Helps me select courses or programs of study that match my personal abilities, talents, and interests	2.92	2.93	2.99	1.347
Encourages me to express my thoughts and feelings	2.86	2.90	2.95	2.433
Takes a personal interest in me	2.82	2.84	2.91	2.068
Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest	2.81	2.79	2.89	2.224
Takes the initiative in arranging meetings with me	2.67	2.62	2.76	4.175*

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree (Note: This analysis excluded "Does not apply"= 5)

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Major-Related Advising

This part of the paper analyzes the second part of the survey, major-related advising.

Overall View of Advising Within the Major

There is an upward trend in the satisfaction with students' major-related advising (Table 8). However, this trend is not significant. On average, students are moderately satisfied with their major-related advisor. It should be noted that satisfaction with major-related advisor is higher than with GE advisor (Table 2).

Table 8.
Satisfaction with Major-related Advising

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	ANOVA (F) ²
How satisfied have you been with advising overall related to your major at SJSU?	3.04	3.04	3.11	1.884

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Very dissatisfied; 2 = Moderately dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat satisfied; 4 = Very Satisfied (Note: This analysis excluded "Don't Know"=5)

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Table 9 summarizes the number of times students who answered the survey saw their major-related advisor in the last year. The average number of times is nearly twice a year. This number has remained nearly flat over the study period (2009-2014). Looking at the frequencies (Appendix: Table C), we find that there is a decline from 16.8% to 15.2% in the percentage of students that have not seen their major-related advisor in the last year.

Table 9.
Number of Visits to Advisor about Major

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	ANOVA (F) ²
During the past year how often did you meet with an advisor about your major?	2.65	2.58	2.67	1.882

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = None; 2 = Once; 3 = Twice; 4 = Three times; 5 = More than three times

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Table 10 summarizes the sources where students sought major-related advice. Not surprisingly, the biggest source of advice is a faculty advisor in a student's major. In 2009 a majority of students (55.6%) sought advice from faculty in their major. This number increased in 2014 to 62.3%. Students also made use of staff members in their major, which increased from 3.8% in 2009 to 6.5% in 2014.

Most other sources declined during this time period including college-based advising center and AARS. College based advising declined from 23.7% in 2009 to 18.7% in 2014. AARS declined

from 8.4% in 2009 to 5.0% in 2014. It should be noted that both types of advising experienced similar declines in GE advising during the same time period.

Table 10.
Best Description of Primary Advisor for Major

	2009	2011	2014
Faculty advisor in my major	55.6%	62.5%	62.3%
Advisor from college-based advising center (e.g., BSAC, COSAC, or Engineering Student Success Center)	23.7%	20.5%	18.7%
Staff member in my major	3.8%	4.1%	6.5%
Advisor from Academic Advising and Retention Services (located at 10th Street Garage)	8.4%	6.1%	5.0%
Peer mentor/advisor	2.8%	2.9%	3.0%
Other	3.9%	2.2%	2.3%
Faculty advisor from other major/college	1.8%	1.7%	2.2%

Alternate Sources of Major-Related Advice

In 2009, students who indicated they had not visited with an advisor were asked their sources of major-related information. In 2011 and 2014 all students were asked which sources of major-related information they used. In all three years students could check all sources that they used.

In order to get a complete understanding of the responses to these questions two types of analysis were prepared. The first analysis compares only those students who have not visited an advisor in the last year (Table 11). It was found that from 2009 to 2014 students increased their usage of the Advising Hub and peer mentoring. All other sources of information did not differ significantly.

The second analysis compares sources of major-related information for all students (Appendix: Table D). Because of the restrictions in the survey method, 2009 did not ask all students this question, so only 2011 and 2014 data is shown. The table shows that for these students some sources of information are declining (SJSU Catalog, family member, and co-worker), while others are increasing significantly (Advising Hub and peer mentoring).

What this analyses show is that for major-related information, students are relying more on the Advising Hub and peer mentoring. This is true whether the students are going to see an advisor for major-related information or not.

Table 11.
Primary Sources of Information about Major for Students Who Had Not Visited an Advisor in
the Past Year

	2009 (%)	2011 (%)	2014 (%)	2009-14 ANOVA (F) ¹
SJSU Catalog	67.9%	69.7%	60.0%	1.885
SJSU Schedule of Classes	45.4%	52.2%	42.9%	1.720
Other SJSU students	33.3%	36.3%	37.9%	0.453
Friend	24.5%	26.9%	30.7%	0.882
Other areas on SJSU website	22.5%	28.9%	26.4%	1.216
Advising Hub on SJSU website	9.6%	18.4%	17.9%	4.268*
Peer mentor	3.6%	7.5%	11.4%	4.486*
Family members	16.1%	14.4%	10.7%	1.053
I do not have any sources of GE information at present	6.8%	6.0%	7.9%	0.232
Other	6.4%	7.5%	7.9%	0.165
Co-worker	4.4%	4.5%	4.3%	0.004

¹* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Usefulness of Major-Related Advisor Advice

Respondents for the most part were satisfied with the advice they receive from their major-related advisors (Table 12). It should be noted that the top five areas of usefulness for major-related advisors were also the top five areas of usefulness for GE advisors. This is not surprising since in 2014 over a 41% of the GE advisors are faculty or staff from a student's major. Therefore, for a sizeable portion of the respondents GE advisors may also major-related advisors.

However, students rated the advice given by their major-related advisor as better than the advice by their GE advisor. This correlates with an earlier question about satisfaction with advisor. Students are more satisfied with their major-related advisors than with their GE advisor.

Respondents also say that the usefulness of major-related advisors in receiving tutorial assistance and improving their study skill has significantly increased from 2009 thru 2014.

Table 12.
Usefulness of Major-Related Advisor Advice

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	2009-14 ANOVA (F) ²
Obtaining information on major requirements	2.57	2.57	2.61	1.234
Selecting/changing my major	2.45	2.51	2.51	2.609
Dropping/adding courses	2.30	2.34	2.38	2.455
Obtaining information on academic policies	2.29	2.32	2.37	2.300
Obtaining information on transfer credit/articulation	2.27	2.28	2.30	0.313
Receiving tutorial assistance	2.13	2.17	2.28	6.260**
Obtaining information on remedial requirements	2.34	2.25	2.27	2.762
Coping with academic difficulties/probation	2.16	2.20	2.25	2.093
Continuing my education after graduation	2.17	2.20	2.24	1.115
Obtaining financial aid	2.11	2.15	2.22	2.881
Improving my study skills and habits	2.11	2.18	2.22	3.493*
Clarifying life and career goals	2.13	2.20	2.22	2.750
Obtaining information on Internships	2.13	2.21	2.21	2.727
Dealing with personal issues	2.10	2.15	2.19	1.844
Withdrawing or transferring from this institution	2.11	2.19	2.19	2.014
Obtaining information on co-curricular activities	2.14	2.18	2.16	0.513
Obtaining employment on campus	2.04	2.04	2.14	2.480

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Not at all useful 2 = Somewhat useful; 3 = Very useful (Note: This analysis excluded "Does not apply"= 4)

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Student's Relationship to Major-Related Advisor

Students were asked about their relationship to their major-related advisor. For the most part students rated their major-related advisor highly saying they were helpful, effective, and treated them with respect. This relationship has also significantly improved throughout the years (Table 13). This was essentially the same results that we saw with the relationship with GE advisors (Table 6).

However, respondents rated their major-related advisor higher in specific aspects of their relationship as compared to GE advisors. On average such aspects as helped select courses or programs, encourage them to express their feeling, took a personal interest in them, and help explore careers respondents rated their major-related advisor as doing a sufficient job. GE advisors were perceived as not doing a sufficient job in these areas

Respondents expressed the opinion that both major-related advisors and GE advisors need to take the initiative in arranging meeting.

Table 13.
Relationship with Major-Related Advisor

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	2009-14 ANOVA (F) ²
Treats me with respect	3.39	3.44	3.48	3.772*
Provides me with accurate information about required courses in my major, elective courses, academic policies, etc.	3.32	3.34	3.35	0.455
Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students	3.24	3.30	3.34	3.388*
Is available when I need assistance	3.18	3.21	3.26	2.449
Allows sufficient time to discuss issues or problems	3.19	3.24	3.24	1.302
Provides me with accurate information about remedial and GE courses, GE requirements and remediation policies, etc.	3.14	3.19	3.21	1.599
Assists me in developing a long-term educational plan	3.13	3.12	3.21	2.446
Helps me understand why required courses are important for my academic program	3.09	3.15	3.20	3.110*
Helps me identify the obstacles I need to overcome to reach my educational goals	3.04	3.13	3.20	7.654***
Helps me select courses or programs of study that match my personal abilities, talents, and interests	3.04	3.06	3.15	3.473*
Refers me to campus resources (e.g., learning center, counseling services, etc.)	3.01	3.05	3.15	4.912*
Encourages me to express my thoughts and feelings	3.00	3.04	3.07	1.656
Takes a personal interest in me	2.98	2.99	3.07	2.222
Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest	2.95	2.99	3.06	2.926
Takes the initiative in arranging meetings with me	2.78	2.78	2.93	5.541**

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly agree (Note: This analysis excluded "Does not apply"= 5)

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Miscellaneous Questions

The survey also asked questions related to advising in areas other than GE and major-related advising. These were: Preparation for advising session and Advising Hub

Preparation for Advising Session

Students reported that over half of them bring their Tower Card, bring a copy of their Unofficial Transcript, and bring prepared list of questions to their advising session (Table 14). Just under half call up their advisor for an appointment and necessary documents during advising session. Finally, less than a third of students bring their Degree Progress Audit Report to the advising session.

For all types of preparation, the percentage of students remained virtually the same except for bringing a copy of the Unofficial Transcript. This type of preparation increased from 46.8% in 2009 to 56.5% in 2014.

Table 14.
How Students Prepare for Advising Session

	2009	2011	2014
Know my ID number or bring Tower Card	61.7%	63.2%	61.6%
Bring a copy of my Unofficial Transcript (from MySJSU page)	46.8%	51.0%	56.5%
Prepare a list of questions to ask my advisor in advance	52.1%	51.8%	51.1%
Contact an advisor for appointment and necessary documents for advising session	45.2%	48.8%	49.5%
Complete a departmental advising form	33.4%	30.5%	32.0%
Bring a copy of my Degree Progress Audit Report	31.0%	36.0%	27.0%
Other	4.7%	5.0%	3.7%

The Advising Hub:

Students were asked two questions about the Advising Hub. The first question dealt with how often they use the Advising Hub (Table 15). The average student replied that they ‘sometimes’ use it. However, the usage has significantly increased over the years. This is not surprising since other questions asked if they had used the Advising Hub (See Tables 5 & 11) and showed similar results.

In Table 16 we see the results of the second question, which is, satisfaction with the Advising Hub. Most students are satisfied with the Advising Hub and this has not changed significantly throughout the years.

Table 15.
How Often Do You Use the Advising Hub?

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	ANOVA (F) ²
How often have you used the Advising Hub (www.sjsu.edu/advising)?	1.37	1.58	1.65	48.389**

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Never; 2 = Sometimes; 3 = Often; 4 = Very often

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Table 16.
Satisfaction with Advising Hub

	2009 Mean ¹	2011 Mean ¹	2014 Mean ¹	ANOVA (F) ²
How satisfied are you with your experience using the Advising Hub?	2.91	3.00	2.95	1.445

¹ Rating Scale: 1 = Very dissatisfied; 2 = Moderately dissatisfied; 3 = Somewhat satisfied; 4 = Very Satisfied (Note: This analysis excluded "Don't Know"=5)

²* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Appendix

Appendix: Table A
How often have you met with your GE advisor

	2009	2011	2014
None	35.3%	33.9%	32.0%
Once	33.5%	32.8%	34.1%
Twice	20.9%	21.7%	23.9%
Three times	5.8%	7.0%	6.1%
More than three times	4.5%	4.6%	4.0%

Appendix: Table B.
Primary Sources of Information about GE for All Students

	2011 (%)	2014 (%)	t-test (F) ¹
SJSU Catalog	71.5%	67.0%	18.510***
SJSU Schedule of Classes	60.4%	58.6%	2.557
Other SJSU students	37.0%	37.5%	0.229
Friend	26.1%	26.3%	0.066
Other areas on SJSU website	24.9%	21.9%	9.894**
Advising Hub on SJSU website	22.4%	19.3%	11.256**
Family members	10.9%	7.0%	35.930***
Peer mentor	8.8%	12.4%	26.967***
Other	6.2%	5.1%	4.693*
I do not have any sources of GE information at present	2.4%	3.9%	13.903***
Co-worker	2.2%	2.7%	1.791

¹* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$, *** $p < .0005$

Appendix: Table C
How Often Have You Met with Your Major-Related Advisor

	2009	2011	2014
None	16.8%	19.5%	15.2%
Once	32.7%	31.0%	30.9%
Twice	29.1%	30.6%	34.5%
Three times	11.2%	9.8%	9.9%
More than three times	10.1%	9.0%	9.4%

Appendix: Table D.
Primary Sources of Information about Major

	2011 (%)	2014 (%)	t-test (F) ¹
SJSU Catalog	67.2%	61.2%	29.083***
SJSU Schedule of Classes	55.3%	54.2%	1.060
Other SJSU students	37.0%	36.2%	0.499
Other areas on SJSU website	28.8%	26.5%	4.925*
Friend	24.1%	24.4%	0.067
Advising Hub on SJSU website	18.4%	20.9%	7.835*
Peer mentor	9.4%	12.6%	20.971***
Other	8.4%	6.8%	7.417*
Family members	7.8%	5.8%	12.578***
I do not have any sources of information about my major areas of study at present	1.9%	2.6%	3.773
Co-worker	3.1%	2.3%	5.195*

¹* $p < .05$; ** $p < .005$; *** $p < .0005$