UNIVERSITY of HAWAI'I®
MĀNOA

November 8, 2019

To the UHM Campus Community,

Attached is the final report for the Excellence in Academic Advising (EAA) self-study conducted over the past year by the 99 members of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa EAA taskforce. These faculty, staff and student taskforce members contributed countless hours to collection and evaluation of evidence used to develop and support the accompanying recommendations. This evidence-based self-study was supported by Provost Bruno to aid the campus in exploring how we can better support student success through improvements to academic advising.

Within the report are a series of recommendations and a proposed review and implementation timeline. We will be reaching out to the campus community to create working-groups that will focus on further exploration and implementation of these recommendations. We encourage engagement from all interested parties as we work to improve the student experience.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Kraft-Terry, Ph.D.
UHM EAA Institutional Liaisons

Jennifer Brown, Ed.D.

Excellence in Academic Advising Self Study Recommendations
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa
October 2019

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM) was selected as one of 12 institutions nation-wide to participate in the first Excellence in Academic Advising (EAA) Cohort in 2018. The goal was to conduct an evidence-based assessment of advising at UHM in an effort to improve the undergraduate student experience campus-wide through the lens of the nine Conditions identified by the project to promote Excellence in Academic Advising. The project is a partnership between NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising and the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education. In the first year of the project, 94 campus stakeholders serving as the EAA Task Force for UHM engaged in a data-informed self-study of academic advising across campus. The self-study included the evaluation of over ten years of data provided by the University of Hawai'i System Institutional Research Office, student and faculty surveys, and extensive institutional evidence collection. In examining the current state of advising across campus, the task force has developed recommendations to improve the student experience as it relates to academic advising at UHM.

Academic advising is grounded in the teaching and learning mission of higher education and is designed to help students synthesize their educational experiences in light of their goals and abilities.[1] The Conditions for Excellence in Academic Advising establish aspirational standards that acknowledge the role of advising in promoting student learning, success, and completion.[2] Excellence in advising is demonstrated by evidence of advising mission, vision, and learning outcome statements in alignment with the institution's mission, vision and learning outcome statements; a comprehensive, collaborative advising delivery system that is responsive to student needs; personal and professional ethics throughout the advising process; and evidence-based decision making and assessment to guide advising initiatives and technology use. The UHM Task Force engaged in a reflective, data-driven self-study process to evaluate the current state of advising in light of the EAA aspirational standards.

There were numerous indicators of quality advising and advising-related initiatives that are positively impacting students at UHM, such as the campus-wide implementation of mandatory advising, increased four-year graduation rates, an active Council of Academic Advisors (CAA), and positive accounts from students who felt cared for and listened to. While individual units are providing outstanding services to support students, the current student experience with advising is generally fragmented due to the decentralization of advising across campus. The lack of consistency is evident in the following ways:

---

[1] NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising. (2006). NACADA concept of academic advising. Retrieved from https://nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/Concept.aspx

[2] NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising (2018). Excellence in Academic Advising. Retrieved from https://nacada.ksu.edu/Programs/Excellence-in-Academic-Advising.aspx

- Differently resourced offices lead to: excessive advising wait times, frequent academic advisor turnover, an inconsistent student experience, and certain student populations perceived as being less important due to a lack of funding, staffing, or other resources.
- Faculty Specialist and APT (Administrative/Professional/Technical) classifications are both utilized to hire academic advisors, resulting in extensive overlap between the two position types, with different access to a career ladder, professional development, and earning potential, ultimately resulting in a class system that leads to frequent academic advisor turnover for units limited to hiring only APT advisors.
- Advisor training is inconsistent and generally lacking. There is currently no advising-specific campus-wide introduction to UHM, nor is there training on how to serve our diverse student population and support the institution's mission as a Native Hawaiian-serving institution.
- Inconsistent implementation of academic policies results in negative impacts on students, especially those students who frequently change their majors.
- Advising technology to support basic advising functions is not provided on a campus-wide basis. In cases when the technology is available, academic advisors are not the ones driving its development and implementation; the end result is a mismatch between the academic advisors' needs and resulting functionality, which ultimately hurts the available support for students.

The driving theme of the EAA Task Force recommendations is improvement of the student experience at UHM by providing consistency and equitable student outcomes across the decentralized advising units. Currently, there are 24 advising units housed across 18 different colleges, schools, and offices. This has led to vastly different student experiences across the units and is especially confusing when students change their program of study and must learn a whole new advising system. There are numerous examples of excellent advising practices and programming, but the disparity in the aforementioned areas means that only some students have access to these practices, and replication or development of parallel programs is not currently possible. The UHM advising community has made efforts to improve the student experience over the last several decades with some success, which has been acknowledged by receipt of the 2017 Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities Project Degree Completion Award and the NACADA Michael C. Holen Pacesetter Award, along with other advising awards received by individuals across campus. To reach true excellence across campus, a unified series of changes is needed. Further, a central position with the primary responsibility for undergraduate academic advising and the authority to coordinate advising efforts across the many academic units at UHM is crucial. Detailed recommendations and discussion on implementation strategies are included in later sections of this report; however, a summary of the recommendations for achieving academic advising excellence at the UHM include:

- **Create and fill an upper-level position for a campus-wide administrator for Academic Advising**. This administrator would work with the advising units in each of the schools/colleges, as well as with units that provide campus-wide services, to oversee the implementation and execution of campus-wide initiatives, coordinate advisor training and professional development, ensure accountability in conducting regular assessment of advising for continuous improvement, establish consistent execution of campus-wide policies in collaboration with the Mānoa Faculty Senate and the Deans and Directors.

- **Create a single classification for UHM Academic Advisors (Specialist Faculty)** so that the advising community is comprised of individuals who are actively engaged in scholarship within advising, incentivized to develop strong student-serving programs, and guided by a career ladder focused on promoting academic advisor retention and ongoing professional development.
- **Create more equitable advisor workload and student-to-advisor ratios** so all students have access to the support they need, regardless of their discipline of study.
- **Develop student learning outcomes and a campus-wide mission and vision for academic advising** to ensure that student opportunities for learning through advising are consistent, and that students have equal opportunity to achieve the outcomes.
- **Create a campus-wide curriculum for academic advising** to ensure equitable campus-wide retention initiatives and a plan to ensure that campus-wide student learning outcomes are met by all students from entry through graduation.
- **Align advising assessment plans with campus-wide mission, vision and student learning outcomes**. This should be required of all advising units to ensure the assessment cycle is employed for continuous evidence-based improvement.
- **Create a campus-wide advising technology plan and software** to support consistent advising experiences for all students. Technology to support appointment scheduling, advising-related communication, early alert, course scheduling and more should be selected with input from academic advisors and made readily available campus-wide to ensure efficiency and positive student experiences.
- **Expand campus-wide advisor development and training** to include:
    - onboarding of new academic advisors;
    - ongoing professional development and support;
    - training on assessment and the use of institutional data;
    - training on the appropriate use of advising technology;
    - support for engagement in the scholarship of advising, including support for research, conference attendance and engagement with national organizations; and
    - intentional professional development tailored to support equity, inclusion and diversity on campus.
- **Define academic policies and procedures on campus** including universal procedures for student-related processes, and a policy body for the review and revision of academic policies regarding undergraduate students.

II. NARRATIVE ON GENERAL SITUATION

Academic advising plays a central role in the development of students and has three major components: curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes. Through academic advising, students learn how to participate in higher education and become lifelong learners while preparing to be educated citizens in society. Advising is rooted in social sciences, humanities, and education and contextualizes students' educational experiences. Academic advisors serve as an academic navigator for students as they learn to become members of the higher education community. To support student development, academic advising must be recognized by UHM as integral to students' educational experience and should be intentionally organized across the institution to align with its academic mission.[3] Academic advisors must be provided with training and rewarded appropriately, provided ongoing professional development and supported in their pursuit of scholarly engagement. Advising technology that complements, supports, and enhances advising practice must also be incorporated to best meet student needs. The academic advising community at UHM has long strived to meet these standards for our discipline. We have made many gains in the last several decades and joined the EAA project to build upon that success, aiming to continue to improve academic advising for students at UHM.

UHM has a decentralized model of academic advising with multiple advising units and approaches and minimal consistency across campus. While individual units have mission statements and learning outcomes, there are no campus-wide academic advising mission and vision statements or learning outcomes that drive institution-wide advising practice. There are 24 advising units, 17 housed within a college or school and seven housed within the Office of Undergraduate Education. This high level of decentralization results in inconsistencies in advising practices and procedures, academic policy implementation, advisor hiring and professional development practices. In addition, inequitable resources are a result, ultimately affecting: advising availability, space, programming, support of advising scholarship, and use of advising technologies. Ultimately, this changes the experience of advising for students and promotes inequitable student outcomes.

Within this disjointed model, the UHM advising community has made several efforts to improve student success and increase communication and support. Over the past several years, academic advising has focused on student engagement and success and developed a number of initiatives to support students in a step toward providing equitable outcomes. These include the creation of the CAA to support students from a cross-campus perspective, the implementation of mandatory advising, the development of program sheets and four-year plans to increase clarity of degree requirements and pathways, the revision of various policies found to be detrimental to students, the development of more communication pathways, and provision of professional development opportunities for academic advisors. While there is much to celebrate in the form of improved four-year graduation rates (18.6% to 35.3% over seven years; EAA Inventory table B1) and increased collaboration across campus, there is room for campus-wide coordination to achieve excellence in academic advising at UHM. Areas for improvement include the administration of

---

[3] NACADA: The Global Community for Academic Advising. (2006). NACADA concept of academic advising. Retrieved from https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Pillars/Concept.aspx

advising, curriculum development, advising technologies, advisor training and development, and clarification of policies and procedures.

A. Administration of Advising

Representation at the Administrative Level - UHM uses a fully decentralized model for academic advising and has no administrative position charged with overseeing academic advising for the campus. UHM's high level of decentralization results in little consistency across advising units in regards to implementation of university policy, allocation of space, funding, advising ratios, programmatic functions, or professional development resources (Evidence sources are labeled by EAA Platform number throughout this document and are available upon request: 48, 62, 95, 96, 104). There is minimal campus-wide coordination for any of these functions, making it difficult for the campus to deploy resources in response to needs and changes in enrollment. At the school or college level, many academic units require instructional faculty to serve as major advisors, while professional academic advisors provide all advising-related support outside of the major-related content. (57, 93, 173).

Academic advisors lack administrative representation related to campus-wide governance. There are two governance bodies closely related to advising: The CAA, which serves to coordinate among advising units at UHM, and the Academic Procedures Committee (APC), which serves to coordinate between student affairs and academic affairs (38, 97, 188). Currently, both serve as informal advisory bodies to UHM administration but do not themselves have authority to make decisions. Because UHM has no upper-level administrator to oversee academic advising for the campus, both campus-wide advising concerns and advising units within schools and colleges lack representation at the administrative level (57, 93, 173). While there is evidence of some institutional commitment to academic advising, it can be increased via the development of articulated campus-wide advising curricula and vision statements and inclusion of academic advising in the administration of the university.

Advisor Position Types - Professional academic advisors at UHM are currently hired in two different classifications: Faculty Specialist (Specialists) and Administrative, Professional, and Technical (APTs). Specialists and APT advisors are members of two different unions, University of Hawai'i Professional Assembly (UHPA) and Hawai'i Government Employees Association (HGEA), respectively, with each union having its own collective bargaining agreements. Like instructional faculty, tenure-track Specialists are required to undergo the tenure process and are required to show increasing professionalization and program development to remain at the university. APT positions do not have a similar professional development ladder. In addition to these two types of advising positions, some academic units require instructional faculty to serve as major or program advisors. The degree to which instructional faculty are trained or incorporated varies widely, and the quality of their academic advising is not assessed (62).

The organizational structure for hiring academic advisors at UHM is not centralized; instead, each unit elects whether to hire Specialists and/or APTs as their professional academic advisors, with additional oversight required by the Provost's Office when units decide to hire Specialists. The composition of advising offices is outlined in Table 1. There is variance within each

college/school/unit in whether instructional faculty members also assist with undergraduate advising.

An examination of the academic advisor position descriptions found that UHM has fairly standardized position descriptions, as is demonstrated through the inclusion of listed duties and responsibilities, as well as required and preferred qualifications (15). However, a closer look comparing the positions descriptions of Specialist and APT advisors found there was overlap in their duties and responsibilities, with little distinction between the two classifications (15). Two primary differences between these classifications were identified:

1. Specialist positions require a higher level of education than the APT (Master's vs. Bachelor's degree), with fewer years of work experience.
2. Specialists are required to develop (versus simply implement) programming, which leads to the production of scholarship.

Table 1: Advising unit composition by position type for the 24 advising units (62, 215).

Advising Unit Composition	Number of Units
Exclusively Specialists	8
Exclusively APT	6
APT + Specialists	8
Exclusively Instructional Faculty	2
Utilize Undergraduate Peer Advisor(s)	11
Employ Graduate Assistants	1

Despite these differences, the broad overlap in duties and responsibilities leads to confusion about the academic advisor hiring and selection process, because the positions appear so similar in description yet belong to different labor unions. This complicates issues like access to professional development, equity in opportunities for advancement and promotion, and in some cases, supervision and labor union involvement.

Advising Resources - Advising units report vastly different student-to-advisor ratios, availability of administrative and technical support, funding to participate in professional development and scholarship, and access to space, including lack of accessibility and FERPA-insufficient offices (62). These inconsistencies contribute to varied student experiences, as some students can easily access advising services while others may find long wait times, and/or rushed or limited services. While it is evident that the university has devoted attention and resources toward improving academic advising in certain areas, concerns were raised in the 2018 external review of the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) regarding under-resourced units, poor and inappropriate facilities, and overextended staff (162, 163, 164).

B. Advising Curriculum Development

For UHM to engage in any meaningful and intentional improvement efforts in academic advising, it is paramount for institutional-level mission and vision statements to be created and shared with the campus community. These statements must be created to guide advising practice, promote a deeper understanding of the complex work inherent in the discipline, and support resource allocation. The university's mission should guide and inform this work, as academic advising is critical to achieving System-wide action strategies articulated in the University of Hawai'i Strategic Directions, 2015-2021 (63) and UH Strategic Directions Progress Report (64). Currently, mission statements at the unit level are largely focused on operational outcomes to be used for internal reference rather than clearly articulating a mission for academic advising (58,

181). These could be improved by aligning with the campus-wide advising mission and vision statements.

Currently, the advising units all have varied levels of articulation for their work with students. Of the 24 advising units, 14 have mission statements, 12 have identified student learning outcomes, and only 8 have an advising syllabus or curriculum (58). All items are individually developed within the unit because there is no campus-wide advising mission and vision to align with. All units report engaging in assessment in some way but only 5 of the 24 units have a written assessment plan for their units (58). Assessment of academic advising-related student learning outcomes is integral to continued improvement of learning in the advising setting and is not consistently implemented.

There is currently no set of academic advising learning outcomes used by the campus as a whole. An institution-wide mission and vision statement for academic advising, once developed, should be used to create advising learning outcomes for the entire campus. This will provide a foundation for implementing academic advising as pedagogy that is essential to student retention, matriculation and success.

Due to the highly decentralized model at UHM, there are inconsistencies in advising across the various programs, schools, and colleges. While there is evidence of the incorporation of advising best practices to assist students in the process of exploring and defining their educational goals and career and life aspirations, it is varied across the campus. To promote student success, learning-centered advising requires reflection and self-assessment from students. Inconsistencies with best practices may influence equity issues for students and their abilities to set realistic goals, apply their learning, and support further learning.

Numerous examples demonstrate the integration of career exploration from individual student pathway development to connected pathways between majors and career exploration and opportunities (42). Although several units introduce and provide resources to students as early as possible, the integration of career exploration within individual student pathway development is selective and varies depending on the student's program of study.

A variety of strong practices have been uncovered to support student success; however, these practices are not applied with all students across the campus. Some programs are more proactive with developing, maintaining, and utilizing advising syllabi, handbooks, and other documents. Other programs routinely administer intake, exit, and alumni surveys. Not all programs have transfer guides, assessment plans, or capstone courses. Promoting positive student success outcomes resulting from recommended practices may encourage more programs to consistently apply these practices.

Institutional commitment to improve student success is demonstrated through policies such as mandatory advising, which is required for all students through the sophomore year, yet implementation of this policy varies from unit to unit. Approximately half of the graduating or primary advising units require their students to meet with an academic advisor each semester. There is minimal tracking of student outcomes to determine the efficacy of the current policy (59). While academic advising is considered to be an effective way to improve student retention

and graduation rates inconsistent availability of mandatory advising for the entire student population coupled with limited evidence to assess efficacy is problematic.[4,5] Addressing the role of advising in student retention is a complex process that must consider the multiple factors that could derail a student's path to graduate (83). In terms of recruitment, application, and orientation, support varies across the decentralized units at UHM.

The current campus-wide New Student Orientation (NSO) at UHM is not planned in coordination with the schools/colleges or academic advising units. As a result, academic advisors do not know what students learn during the experience, making it challenging to recommend participation or to build an advising curriculum that reinforces the content presented during NSO. The lack of collaboration is a missed opportunity to mutually support student success from the onset.

C. Advising Technology

Currently, the UH system uses the homegrown STAR program for student educational information. STAR includes capabilities for registration, advising notes, academic planning, and scheduling appointments (still in development). No other single technology is used across campus and multiple advising units purchase additional software programs that they believe meet their functional needs (148). This inconsistency across units leads to extremely varied student experiences. Because each unit selects its own software, units may select technologies of varying complexity, efficiency, and price; based on needs, advisor to student ratios, and budgets. Many of the technology-related complaints in the student survey described significant differences between departments, and a strong desire for online appointment booking, and alternative modes for advising and advising-related communication. The lack of consistency can result in a negative student experience (183) due to confusion and unmet expectations. Ideally, advising technology would fully support scaffolding the advising mission and student learning outcomes identified by the UHM campus.

D. Advisor Training and Development

Advisor Training - There is currently no campus-wide training for new academic advisors. Each unit develops its own training materials and guides and spends significant effort and time to onboard new academic advisors. This results in a wide variation in level of training and support for academic advisors and is inefficient. While some level of unit-specific training is required, there are many areas of advising that could be facilitated through a central academic advisor training program, which would be managed by the advising administrator in collaboration with CAA.

---

[4] Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus*, *16*(3), 8-12.

[5] Young-Jones, A. D., Burt, T. D., Dixon, S., & Hawthorne, M. J. (2013). Academic advising: does it really impact student success?. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *21*(1), 7-19.

Technology Training - There is no consistent training available for the various kinds of technology that advisors, students, student employees, front desk staff, and non-advisor employees are expected to use in their advising duties. STAR (155), UH's Online Registration System, provides Help Videos (156), Help Docs (157) and FAQs for training. STAR is by far the most commonly used technology among students, advisors, peer advisors, student employees and non-advisor employees (61), but even regarding the use of STAR, access and training is inconsistent across units.

Data-Informed Advising - The degree to which the institution collects, disseminates, and supports academic advisor use of student data varies depending on the type of information. Individual academic advisors have access to individual students' academic performance data through STAR, but do not have access to data related to their student populations. The Mānoa Institutional Research Office may have data which could be useful to assess academic advising, but advising offices rarely have access to this resource. Similar to the results of the assessment plan survey, approximately half of the faculty/staff survey participants did not know if UHM collects, disseminates, and supports academic advisor use of student data. For those who selected otherwise, the answers were generally evenly distributed between "never", "occasionally", and "often". It is important to note though that multiple directors in the Unit Director discussion group voiced the need for more training on how to access and use this information. Employing predictive analytics to anticipate student performance and design interventions to support student success, are not yet available.

Access to Professional Development - In the Unit Director discussion group, none of the seven directors present knew of any institution-based funding that is provided for academic advisors who wish to contribute to the scholarship of advising. Currently, some units provide limited funding for academic advisors to travel to conferences to present their work, but such support varies from unit to unit, further contributing to inequity within the UHM advising community. This translates to select student populations benefitting from advising-related research, program development and academic advisors' continued learning, while others lack the benefit of such a focus on continued improvement within their respective school/college due to a lack of institution-wide commitment to funding engagement in professional development outside UHM.

Advising Scholarship - While requirements for tenure and promotion for many academic advisor roles include scholarship, the committee could find no evidence of institution-wide support for academic advisors' research and scholarly contributions. In the faculty/staff survey, approximately half of the respondents did not know if the institution supports advisors' engagement in scholarship. Academic advisors seem to be left to develop this scholarly profile on their own time and often, at least partially, at their own expense. Tenure and promotion documents also seem to suggest that the meaning of "scholarship" varies throughout the university. Some departments are satisfied with conference attendance while others expect publication.

Academic advisors work to engage in research as demonstrated by pursuing advanced degrees, giving conference presentations and being elected into leadership positions. However, they are hampered by the overall low levels of support provided by the units and the institution, coupled with heavy workloads. In addition, some units are limited to hiring only APT advisors. In these cases, no one within the unit is expected to contribute to the scholarship of advising, which

ultimately disadvantages their student population. This general lack of advising-related scholarly engagement is exemplified in the results from the faculty and staff survey, with most of the participants stating that they do not contribute to the scholarship of advising within or outside of the institution. In addition, around a third of respondents reported that they do not remain current with scholarly literature regarding academic advising.

Equity, Inclusion and Diversity - UHM is recognized as being one of the most diverse institutions in the nation (194) and is uniquely poised to capitalize on this distinction. In order to benefit and best support our diverse student body as well as align ourselves with UHM's long-standing commitment to AlohaʻĀina (121, 138), we should foster understanding of Hawaiʻi throughout the UHM community.

UHM is making strides in increasing the number of underserved students who are graduating (43). In addition, there are a number of specialized advising and student affairs programs designed to support specific student populations that have been very successful (112, 113, 198, 199, 200, 201, 259, 260). However, these programs and their connections to advising offices were created out of individual efforts and investments of time and resources to build bridges to support and serve these specialized populations. Lower retention rates for non-Asian and out-of-state students were identified, highlighting the need to provide additional support to these student groups. For example, in Fall 2015, Asian students had a first-year retention rate of 89.04%, while white students had a rate of 62.93% and black students a rate of 57.14% (EAA Inventory Table D1). In the same year, students from Hawai'i persisted at a rate of 86.20%, compared with 66.85% for students from California (EAA Inventory Table D3). UHM recently entered into a sizeable contract with an external agency to bolster recruitment of students from the continental United States. With an ever-increasing proportion of non-resident students, programs to support the transition to Hawai'i is essential. Overall, there needs to be a focused, intentional effort to cultivate authentic equity, inclusion, and diversity on our campus.

Realistically, the compilation of diverse sources of knowledge to better inform our practice as academic advisors will be a complex and ongoing process. At the same time, actualizing a commitment toward understanding how to most effectively serve the highly varied populations that attend UHM requires no less than an ongoing and purposeful pursuit of multicultural, multidimensional knowledge, including a Kanaka ʻŌiwi (Native Hawaiian) world view.

E. UHM Policies and Procedures

Academic policy creation and revision processes are unclear at UHM. In the past several years, as the CAA has made suggestions for revisions to policies to increase student success, there has been confusion regarding what constitutes appropriate review and who has the authority to approve. Further, the decentralized nature of UHM advising and the reliance on individual units to interpret and enforce stated policies has led to inequitable student outcomes, as there is no clear policy pathway or process for common student issues on campus.

UHM does not have a comprehensive advising communication plan. Thirty-seven percent of respondents to the faculty/staff survey responded 'Never' to the following statements: 1) To what degree does the institution have a comprehensive advising communication plan that

incorporates a clear communication system; and 2) To what degree does the institution have a comprehensive advising communication plan that is intentional, timely and relevant for my role in advising.

The primary means of communication across units is the CAA, listserv, through which important updates or announcements are shared (28). In addition, there are other avenues in which the institution attempts to create collaborative relationships across units (e.g., CAA, CAA Summer Conference, the GUIDE advisor mentor program, and other institutional bodies such as Academic Policy Committee or Faculty Senate). However, these efforts aim to facilitate communication and collaboration across advising units but do not address communication with students. The institution overall lacks academic advisor training that adequately prepares advisors for their positions. The results from the faculty/staff survey indicate that 47% of respondents "do not agree at all" that they have received relevant training on the advising systems they are expected to use. In addition, the majority of focus group participants indicated that they would like to see improved academic advisor training on institutional processes, procedures, forms, and STAR (149, 154). While online advising training modules exist (3), participants stated that the modules are not engaging and are not consistently utilized. This concern was also brought up in the EAA workshop synthesis discussion group, with participants expressing concern that faculty (i.e., major) advisors were especially lacking in training and support.

There is a demand for opportunities that would allow academic advisors to share what they are doing and to engage in discussion. While some opportunities do exist (26, 28, 34, 36), focus group participants indicated that there is a strong desire for a platform where academic advisors can informally share resources, engage in discussion and seek help (154).

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

A. Administration of Advising

Create and hire an upper-level Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising - This key leadership position would be tasked with creating a positive, consistent, student-friendly experience for all undergraduate students and facilitating collaboration among administration, school/college advising units, auxiliary campus-wide advising units, and the various student success and administrative positions that have a stake in student academic success. Inconsistency arises because there are 17 school/college advising units who each approach the implementation and execution of university policy uniquely, providing an inconsistent and inequitable experience for students. A campus-wide advising advocate would ensure the best possible student experience by improving campus-wide communication and collaboration between units; managing policies and procedures related to academic advising; ensuring consistency, integration, and quality of advising; ensuring equitable access to advising for all students; and representing academic advisors and their concerns to upper administration and in campus decisions. The position would provide leadership for all academic advising units at UHM, including those housed within a college or school, and would be responsible for the following:
- Development of campus-wide academic advising mission/vision/goals/values
- Development and implementation of advising policy
- Coordination between administration, academic units, and student services
- Coordination of advising-related resources to ensure equitable distribution
- Oversight of the Council of Academic Advisors
- Creation and maintenance of academic advisor training and development
- Promotion and support of advising research and scholarship
- Development and implementation of advising-related best practices
- Administration of advising awards and recognition
- Monitoring assessment of advising

Single Classification for UHM Academic Advisors - To improve advising services for students campus-wide, UHM should move toward a single classification system for all professional academic advisors. The Faculty-Specialist classification promotes ongoing academic advisor education to support student success and development and provides a clear advising career ladder, ensuring essential relationship building with students through academic advisor retention. In addition, UHM students benefit from required program development and scholarly contributions, as UHM continues to be at the forefront of innovation and progress in higher education student success initiatives.

In addition, the work of academic advisors is highly specialized in nature and involves work on curriculum matters, as demonstrated by the following:
- UHM's Governance documents state that the curriculum is owned by the faculty.
- Academic advisors have expertise about the curriculum and articulate this knowledge with students, colleagues, and other UHM stakeholders.
- Academic advisors serve and make decisions on curriculum committees within their unit, across campus (General Education Committees/Boards and Faculty Senate - all faculty-only membership), and at the UH system level.

- Academic advisors work alongside instructional faculty members to discuss curriculum issues, with consideration of students' interests and needs.

Specialists work autonomously, require little oversight, and are expected to be highly productive. This includes being responsible for conducting assessment and identifying needs for their units, which leads to the design and implementation of programming to meet these needs. Furthermore, Specialists are expected to conduct research on these initiatives and share their findings via scholarship and presentations. Advising units, UHM, and national associations are the beneficiaries of such leadership.

The latest strategic plan focuses on undergraduate student success and implies that new programs and initiatives will need to be created to support student academic success, with the intent of increasing undergraduate retention and graduation rates. In addition, UHM plans to implement an early alert system, which will directly impact the work of advising units. This growing scope of responsibility will require academic advisors at UHM to have increasing levels of expertise and a higher level of productivity, which is required for Specialist positions and which will ultimately impact students in a beneficial way (219).

In addition, there is built-in development and a clear career ladder via the Tenure and Promotion process. NACADA's Pillars of Academic Advising (135) align with the roles and responsibilities of Specialist advisors and include the creation of programming and scholarship, in addition to typical advising duties. Ideals for academic advising professionals also align with the role of the Specialist Advisor (expertise, career ladder, scholarship, etc.). UHM is seen as a leader in the nation for advising professionals because of the Specialist classification, which builds prestige for UHM.

Equitable academic advisor workload and student-to-advisor ratios - commit financially and philosophically to campus-wide equitable academic advisor workload, with student-to-advisor ratios of no more than 285:1 for advisors within schools/colleges, the national average for public doctoral granting institutions. Student survey responses continually referred to the need for more academic advisors, more advisor availability, more personal connection with academic advisors (which can be obtained through smaller caseloads), and less turnover in academic advisors for continuity in the student experience and development of a deeper knowledge base.

Adequate, appropriate, and equitable space for academic advising - Develop a master plan for allocating adequate and appropriate space for academic advising equitably, based on the needs of individual advising units. All advising spaces should provide appropriate privacy to ensure compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

B. Advising Curriculum Development

UHM Academic Advising Mission and Vision Statements - Develop mission and vision statements for academic advising at UHM to establish clear guiding principles for all those who are practitioners in the academic advising discipline at the UHM. It is vital that there be cohesion between the university's mission and vision and the direction that academic advising will take following this review. Statements should be in line with UHM's mission and vision and reflect

the growing recognition that academic advising is a critical component of the student's academic journey and a key factor in student retention (73, 210, 212).

Create a Campus-wide Curriculum for Academic Advising - To ensure advising initiatives are aligned with the campus-wide advising mission, an advising curriculum should be designed around a universal set of advising-related student learning outcomes. This curriculum should account for the lifecycle of an undergraduate student, beginning with the transition into the university, building through the student's undergraduate career, and culminating in the completion of the degree and the transition out into society. The curriculum should include a collaborative student onboarding program that provides both academic and co-curricular orientation; ongoing student self-assessment and reflection; the integration of career exploration within individual student pathways; and assessment of advising programs and practices to ensure student success. With the guidance of the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising, UHM should develop a shared, articulated, and documented curriculum for advising to improve consistency, equity, and quality of academic advising for all students.

Incoming Transitions - A New Student Orientation (NSO) designed through a collaborative partnership between student success and college/school advising units was identified as something that would greatly benefit students. This partnership would ensure that students are connected with the wide variety of services available to support their success and emphasize the importance of building a relationship with their academic home.

Assessment Plan - Under the guidance of the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising, an advising assessment plan must be developed for the UHM campus to ensure continuous evidence-based improvement of advising. This includes identifying essential outcomes for all units on campus and providing a framework for assessment.

C. Advising Technology

Form an Advising Technology Governance Committee - This group would be responsible for working with the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising to identify technology-related campus needs for advising and then create a technology plan to be integrated across campus. The technology plan would include training, resources, and continued support. The committee should include IT specialists (including a STAR representative), academic advisors, and other stakeholders and must also seek the feedback of undergraduate students when needed to ensure it meets student needs. This committee would provide consistency across the campus in regard to the use of advising technology. It would also ensure that new technology meets student and academic advisor needs.

Campus-wide Advising Software – To ensure all students have advising tools that support easy access to advising, just-in-time communication and outreach when at-risk, the campus, under the guidance of the Advising Technology Governance Committee, must implement advising software that will connect with existing campus software (such as Banner), to include the following functionality:

- Case management

- Early alert
- Student flagging and tracking
- Referral to resources
- Document management
- Workflow
- Report-generation
- Other key functions to assist academic advisors across units, and with other student support units

If the software is provided by the institution (148), integrates effectively with existing systems on campus, includes training opportunities (149), and is better for the students (Student Survey Data), there may be more buy-in from units. Furthermore, if the institution purchases or creates software for all units to use, student access to technology will not be limited by differences in individual unit resources.

D. Academic Advisor Training and Development

Comprehensive academic advisor development program –UHM needs to develop and implement a comprehensive academic advisor training and development program that progresses from onboarding new academic advisors through continuous learning and professional development for advisors in all classifications and levels. Participation in this program should be mandated and incentivized, possibly leading to certification upon completion. This will ensure equitable student experiences with well-trained and professionally engaged academic advisors. The following items should be included within the training program:

- **Online Academic Advisor Training Modules -** Further develop the existing asynchronous online Academic Advisor Training Modules that are currently managed by CAA. This will ensure that the content is consistent and accessible by all units across campus, with appropriate tiers of knowledge for all advisor types (APT, S-Faculty, I-Faculty, peer advisors, etc.). These modules should also be ADA-compliant.
- **Technology Training** - All academic advisors should go through required training devoted to advising technology widely used on campus. UHM has developed award-winning software, but has not consistently provided training to ensure academic advisors are capitalizing on the resources available to them to improve interactions with their students. This recommendation extends to any new technologies that may be adopted campus-wide in the future.
- **Data-Informed Decision-Making** - Employing data to make informed decisions to support student needs in a timely fashion requires access to data and training to ensure appropriate use. We request that all advising units receive access to institutional research data on student enrollment, performance and retention, along with the training needed to support its use for continual assessment and improvement. This will require coordination with the following offices:
  - UH Institutional Research Office
  - Mānoa Institutional Research Office (MIRO)
  - STAR (Academic Logic DB)
- **Access to Professional Development** - To ensure positive student experiences, all academic advisors on campus should have equitable access to advising training and

professional development. Access to professional development opportunities and resources currently vary by unit and by appointment. Establishment of a campus-wide policy requiring academic advisors in all classifications to have access to and participate in regular professional development is recommended. This policy should also require units to provide release time for academic advisors to engage in such activities to ensure all students receive accurate information and the same, informed level of support.

- **Adequate and equitable funding for professional development -** Commit financially to excellence in academic advising by providing adequate and equitable funding for ongoing professional development for all academic advisors. This includes off-island conference travel, where academic advisors can disseminate advising scholarship originating at UHM and learn from leaders in the advising field for implementation when they return. Funding should be managed by the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising to ensure that all academic advisors are encouraged to engage with the broader global community of advising beyond UHM. Ultimately, students benefit from continued scholarly engagement and global professional development through continued improvement of supports available to students to promote success.
- **Scholarly Engagement** - Academic advisors should be encouraged to engage in scholarship in the field of academic advising. Supporting scholarship in advising incentivizes continued improvement of advising to enhance the student experience. Such support reinforces UHM's role as a leader within the global advising community and the need for academic advisors to be classified as Specialists.
- **Train and Support Instructional Faculty** - Advising for the major is often conducted by instructional faculty and is an integral component of many students' advising experiences. Instructional faculty should commit to and be professionally rewarded for high-quality advising through engagement in continued professional development. Criteria should be examined and reviewed for promotion and tenure to acknowledge the commitment required by instructional faculty to achieve excellence in academic advising at the program/major level.
- **Mandate culturally sensitive, appropriate practices and pedagogy training** - To align with the Native Hawaiian Place of Learning Advancement Office's goal that "all staff and faculty at the UHM are more knowledgeable and culturally rooted in Mānoa and Hawaiʻi (103)," UHM should design and implement mandatory diversity training for incoming academic advisors that will introduce them to the significance of the Native Hawaiian world view and provide them with a better understanding of the UHM and Hawaiʻi's host culture. This training should promote the integration of culturally appropriate practices and pedagogies in advising.
- **Ongoing Professional Development to Support Equity, Inclusion and Diversity** - To ensure students feel connected to the campus and appropriately supported, academic advisors should be required to attend annual ongoing professional development that provides multi-faceted cultural perspectives. Of equal importance is that the training integrate effective practices tailored to academic advisors and reflect cultural humility and responsiveness, taking into consideration factors such as ethnicity, abilities, veteran status, first generation background, and LGBTQ+. Currently, these types of trainings are periodically offered for academic advisors, but an effort should be made to define a comprehensive training curriculum and ensure regular offerings of all essential training.

E. UHM Policies and Procedures

Clarify Process for Creating Academic Policy - To ensure regular review and improvement of policies to support student success, UHM must clarify the process for creating and codifying policy at UHM, i.e., which bodies are responsible for generating and approving policy, which stakeholders need to be consulted for different decisions, and what the processes are for making a policy official, documenting policy, notifying the campus, and ensuring consistent implementation. In clarifying the process, the following should be included:

- **Universal Procedures** – These would facilitate uniform implementation of policies across schools and colleges.
- **Curriculum Review** - Involve academic advisors from the schools and colleges in their respective curriculum review processes.
- **Create a UHM Policy-Making Body –** This group would be tasked with reviewing UHM Catalog and academic policy items regularly to recommend student-friendly improvements.

Establish an Institutional Advising Communication Plan – This communication plan should be established and should incorporate important deadlines and information from key units across campus (e.g., registrar's office, admissions office, housing, financial aid, student life). The plan should be used across units as a general plan (i.e., timeline) but should be adapted to fit the unique communication needs of each unit.

IV. STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The breadth of recommendations will require gradual implementation; thus, we have created a prioritized implementation timeline for consideration. Individual condition committee reports should be utilized during the implementation process, as each report contains significant detail and guidance for implementation.

The following items can be executed simultaneously and are recommended as the first focus for optimal efficiency and impact:

1. **Create and staff the upper-level, Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising position** - Many of the recommendations will require coordination by this position; thus, we recommend that this be the first priority for implementation.
2. **Clarify the process for creating academic policy -** Creating a transparent process for policy creation and modification will help to ensure outdated policies are addressed and future suggestions for policy have a clearly defined process for review.
3. **Define the UHM advising mission and vision statements and student learning outcomes** - A committee with academic advisors and other campus stakeholders including faculty, staff, and students should be created to draft campus-wide advising mission and vision statements. Once approved by CAA, the committee should draft campus-wide student learning outcomes, which can guide advising curriculum development and academic advisor training.
4. **Work with the Academic Procedures Committee (APC) to create a campus-wide communication plan** - APC has representation from both academic advising and student services units across campus and can facilitate the creation of a campus-wide communication plan to create consistency in tone of messaging and timing of notifications, in addition to ensuring awareness of university-wide timelines.
5. **Include academic advisors in New Student Orientation (NSO) planning** - To create a well-rounded onboarding experience for all new students, academic advisors should be part of the NSO planning and implementation team. This will help to bridge academic and student affairs perspectives to foster student success.

While the search for a Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising is being conducted, the groundwork can be laid to ensure committees are in place for their start. The following committees should be created and vetted by CAA to ensure coherence of governance, and appropriate stakeholder participation. Each committee should be staffed by members of the UHM community and should include professional academic advisors, instructional faculty advisors, student services staff and students when appropriate. Committees would include:

1. **Academic Advisor Training Committee** - The initial charge for this committee will be to outline the necessary training for academic advisors from hire through long-term professional development, while ensuring alignment with the newly created mission/vision statement and SLOs. Following vetting by CAA, the committee will work with the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising to outline a sustainable implementation plan to build the various training components and create training materials and a timeline for regular training administration.

2. **Academic Advisor Career Ladder Committee** -This committee will work with the report from the Advisor Selection and Development Condition Committee, in addition to HR and the unions, to further explore the current recommendation for Faculty Specialist to be the only academic advisor classification on campus. The committee should also explore whether or not both APT and Faculty Specialist positions should be available for units to select from. Ultimately, the committee will work with the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising to create a position guide, clearly defining which position classification(s) can serve as academic advisors at UHM, a career ladder for all classifications, and a master guide to inform position descriptions and corresponding classifications for future hires. The committee will also work to define the optimal career ladder necessary to create an advising community that has the ability to train, grow and retain academic advisors for the benefit of the students.

3. **Advising Curriculum Committee** - This committee will work to establish a defined advising curriculum for the campus to ensure all students have the opportunity to learn and develop as they progress through their undergraduate program. It will take into account the various university initiatives the campus has embraced to support student success. They will work with the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising, CAA, and in consultation with the Mānoa Faculty Senate to ensure cross-campus buy-in, which is essential to an effective curriculum. This curriculum development will be created through backwards design, which will ultimately result in the creation of an assessment plan in addition to the advising curriculum.

4. **Technology Committee** - This committee will start by reviewing existing campus-wide technology and determining what the long-term technology needs are to support the student learning outcomes for academic advising. Some of these have been outlined by the Technology Enabled Advising Conditions report and should be used as a springboard for conversation. Working with the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising and other stakeholders, such as STAR, the committee should create a comprehensive technology plan for the campus that includes long-term software needs and a prioritized development plan to ensure software is developed with user needs in mind.

Finally, the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising will work with the Deans to ensure equitable staffing and workload for academic advisors in all units on campus. This will include creating plans to ensure all units have the funds necessary to fully staff their advising units, including appropriate support staff, to ensure optimal functioning and appropriate ratios so that all students have access to their academic advisors throughout the year. In addition, the Campus-wide Administrator for Academic Advising will work to ensure equitable access to professional development activities on-campus and incentivize engagement in scholarship and the broader global advising community through access funding to disseminate the results of work performed at UHM through attending regional, national and international conferences.

V. PARTICIPANTS

A. Liaisons

Name	Title
Jennifer Brown	Chair, Mānoa Transfer Coordination Center Transfer Specialist
Ronald Cambra	Assistant Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education
Stephanie Kraft-Terry	Interim Director of Advising in the College of Natural Sciences

B. Steering Committee

Name	Title
Kari Ambrozich	Academic Advisor
Ruth Bingham	Director
Matt Eng	Academic Advisor
Penny-Bee Kapilialoha Bovard	Academic Advisor
Megumi Makino-Kanehiro	Director
Jolene Muneno	Academic Advisor
Siobhán Ní Dhonacha	Academic Advisor
Jennifer Oshiro	Academic Advisor
Lauren Prepose-Forsen	Transfer Specialist
Heather Saito	Academic Advisor
Kiana Shiroma	Director

Lorey Takahashi	Executive Director
Diana Thompson	Academic Advisor
Wendi Vincent	Director
Linda Voong	Human Resources Specialist
Rosemarie Woodruff	Director
Seth Yoshioka-Maxwell	IT Support Specialist

C. Condition Committees

Name	Title	Committee Role	Course
Kari Ambrozich	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Advisor Selection and Development
Christy Burt	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Advisor Selection and Development
Lisa Fujikawa	Academic Coordinator	Committee Member	Advisor Selection and Development
Brent Fujinaka	Career Counselor	Committee Member	Advisor Selection and Development
Rikki Mitsunaga	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Advisor Selection and Development
Katharine Moffat	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Advisor Selection and Development
Mark Nakamoto	Program Coordinator	Committee Member	Advisor Selection and Development
Linda Voong	Human Resources Specialist	Committee Chair	Advisor Selection and Development

Brian Akiyama	Academic Advisor and Admissions Specialist	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Chris Ashida	Student Services Specialist	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Karen Blakeley	Assistant Director for Conduct and Community Standards	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Priscilla Faucette	Associate Director/ Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Eve Millett	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Leslie Mitchell	Interim Director	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Jolene Muneno	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Collaboration and Communication
Adam Pang	Program Coordinator	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Lauren Prepose-Forsen	Transfer Specialist	Committee Chair	Collaboration and Communication
Barbara Watanabe	Director/Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Collaboration and Communication
Robert Bachini	Director/Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Pattie Dunn	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Vanessa Ito	Associate Director	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity

Alyssa Kapaona	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Penny-Bee Kapilialoha Bovard	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Kenny Lopez	Assistant Director	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Megumi Makino-Kanehiro	Director	Committee Chair	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Dawn Nishida	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Amber Noguchi	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Mari Ono	Director of Student Services	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
George Wang	Associate Professor	Committee Member	Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity
Barbara Joyce	Undergraduate Advisor/Instructor	Committee Member	Improvement and the Scholarship of Advising
Ryan Kurasaki	Junior Specialist	Committee Member	Improvement and the Scholarship of Advising
Jayme Scally	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Improvement and the Scholarship of Advising
Kiana Shiroma	Director	Committee Chair	Improvement and the Scholarship of Advising
Rayna Tagalicod	Director	Committee Member	Improvement and the Scholarship of Advising
Leilani Takeuchi Harjati	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Improvement and the Scholarship of Advising

Kamakana Aquino	Native Hawaiian Social Sciences Coordinator	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Kai Noa Lilly	Program Coordinator	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Agnes Malate	Director	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Kieko Matteson	Associate Professor	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Andrew Nguyen	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Siobhán Ní Dhonacha	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Institutional Commitment
Ann Sakuma	Director	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Julie Takamatsu	Educational Specialist	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Tina Tauasosi-Posiulai	Community Partnership & Research Specialist	Committee Member	Institutional Commitment
Wendi Vincent	Director	Committee Chair	Institutional Commitment
Duncan Farrah	Assistant Specialist	Committee Member	Learning
Clare Fujioka	Undergraduate Admissions Advisor	Committee Member	Learning
Kenton Harsch	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Learning
Reynold Kajiwara	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Learning
Lynn Koyamatsu	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Learning

Rachel Lentz	Communications Specialist/Science Writer	Committee Member	Learning
Julie Lezzi	Associate Chair & Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Learning
Shannon Mark	Master Programs Advisor	Committee Member	Learning
Jennifer Oshiro	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Learning
Malia Perreira	Counselor	Committee Member	Learning
Nathalie Segeral	Assistant Professor	Committee Member	Learning
Rosemarie Woodruff	Director	Committee Chair	Learning
Ruth Bingham	Director	Committee Chair	Organization
Dennis Chase	University Preparation Program Coordinator	Committee Member	Organization
Crystal Costa	Program Specialist	Committee Member	Organization
Daniel Harris-McCoy	Associate Professor & Chair	Committee Member	Organization
Kay Jernigan	Specialist Faculty	Committee Member	Organization
Francie Julien-Chinn	Assistant Professor	Committee Member	Organization
Diane Nakashima	Catalog Coordinator	Committee Member	Organization
Heather Saito	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Organization
Megan Terawaki	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Organization
Leona Anthony	Director of Student Services	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways

Sharleen Chock	Learning Specialist	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways
Matt Chong	Student Services Specialist	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways
Matt Eng	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Student Purpose and Pathways
Tina Gomes	Student Services Specialist	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways
Cathy Iwashita Raqueno	Director of Student Services	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways
Melissa Jones	Transfer Specialist	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways
Pratibha Nerukar	Associate Professor	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways
Kenny Quibilan	Mānoa Peer Advisor (MPA)	Committee Member	Student Purpose and Pathways
Lorey Takahashi	Executive Director	Committee Chair	Student Purpose and Pathways
Emily Ball	Student	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
Kay Hamada	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
Jason Higa	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
June Lee	Director, Student & Academic Services	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
Julie Motooka	Instructional & Student Support Specialist	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising

Kehau Newhouse	Maui Program Coordinator, Transfer Specialist	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
Joy Nishida	IT Specialist	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
Jill Sur	Program Coordinator, Distance Education Options	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
Diana Thompson	Academic Advisor	Committee Chair	Technology Enabled Advising
Karen Wilson	Academic Advisor	Committee Member	Technology Enabled Advising
Seth Yoshioka-Maxwell	IT Support Specialist	Committee Chair	Technology Enabled Advising

VI. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE

Sources of evidence for this study are listed throughout by reference number. All sources are located in the Excellence in Academic Advising platform and are available by request.