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Abstract

*Purpose*

The purpose of the study is to prove that student satisfaction is determined by the quality and approach method of advising at Texas State University with students in the Occupational Education Department and no statistical relationship exists between the age range and satisfaction. Support of the hypothesis will mean that no statistical relationship exists between the satisfaction of academic advising in the current calendar year and the status of traditional or nontraditional student. *Traditional* student categorization is defined by the age range of 18-24 years of age at the time of the survey completion and *nontraditional* student is defined as students over the age of 25. The advising style preferred and statistically correlated to student satisfaction and retention is the developmental model and age has not been found determining factor of advising satisfaction (Corts, Lounsbury, Saudergas, & Tatum, 2000). The Academic Advising Inventory (or AAI) is a valid and reliable inventory that measures the student perception of the advising in the past year, the model of advising, and the overall satisfaction of academic advising. The study will not include virtual university practices as Texas State does not do virtual education and the population and sample at Texas State receive personal academic advising. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation will be used to analyze the scores and determine is a relationship exists between category of traditional or nontraditional student and advising satisfaction.

*Procedures*

The procedures for this study include obtaining a sample of traditional and nontraditional Occupational Education students and distributing the AAI in a web-based form to the sample. Then the data will be entered into SPSS along with the biographical data and descriptive statistics and relational statistics will be calculated. Specifically, the Pearson Product Moment will be calculated to determine if the hypothesis is supported.

*Significance*

Academic advising involves guidance in academic or personal concerns, information on course selection, knowledge of extracurricular involvement opportunities, knowledge of university resources, and helpful action for at-risk students. Major criteria are impacted by the quality of student satisfaction such as student learning, collegiate success, and retention. Proper advising can appropriately guide, teach, and induce the development of autonomy and lifelong learning of a college student and counsel the college journey. With proper advising college students can achieve academic and personal success and become a valuable citizen.
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Chapter I

## *Statement of the Problem*

Texas State University’s mission is to be an institution dedicated to excellence in serving the educational needs of the diverse population of Texas and the world beyond (2008). The Texas State University commitment to excellence extends to academic advising of students in the Occupational Education program. Texas State is a diverse state institution and enrolls traditional and nontraditional students. Retention of these students is important at and if Texas State University is committed to excellence then the perception of the students will reveal it. In this study the Academic Advising Inventory will be administered to Occupational Education students of the traditional and nontraditional age to measure their satisfaction with advising. Research by Corts, Lounsbury, Saudergas, and Tatum (2000) found that student satisfaction is not significantly related to sex or year in school; however, is this true at Texas State University? In the study by Corts, Lounsbury, Saudergas, and Tatum, with all demographic variables controlled, satisfaction appears to be positively related to satisfaction with advising. Advising also resulted in the greatest number of student complaints. This finding is consistent with Korn et al. (1996) who found advising to be the fifth-ranked problem among surveyed departments. The Academic Advising Inventory, which will be administered to the sample in the Occupational Education Department, measures student satisfaction and in research on the norming process the high scores of satisfaction were linked to the use of the developmental model of advising (Winston & Sandor, 2002). Thus, the problem is evaluating current university practices to ensure the developmental model is used to best support students, and improve retention regardless of the status of traditional student or nontraditional. This evaluation could to prove or disprove what Corts, Lounsbury, Saudergas, and Tatum found, that age does not relate to satisfaction but the quality of advising. Thus, if Texas State University is committed to excellence then the academic advisors would use the developmental model and be able to impact retention through achieving satisfaction equally in the traditional and the nontraditional age range. If the hypothesis is supported then no statistical relationship will exist between age range and satisfaction with advising and Texas State University.

## *Purpose*

The purpose of the study is to prove that student satisfaction is determined by the quality and approach method of advising at Texas State University with students in the Occupational Education Department and no statistical relationship exists between the satisfaction of academic advising in the current calendar year and the status of traditional or nontraditional status. *Traditional* student categorization defined by the age range of 18-24 years of age at the time of the survey completion and *nontraditional* will be defined as students are over the age of 25. The advising style preferred and statistically correlated to student satisfaction and retention is the developmental model and age is not a determining factor of advising satisfaction (Corts, Lounsbury, Saudergas, & Tatum, 2000). The Academic Advising Inventory (or AAI) is a valid and reliable inventory that measures the student perception of the advising in the past year, the model of advising, and the overall satisfaction of advising. The study will not include virtual university practices as Texas State does not do purely education and the population and sample at Texas State receive personal academic advising. The Pearson Product Correlation will be used to analyze the scores and determine is a relationship exists between category of traditional, nontraditional and advising satisfaction.

## *Objectives*

The researcher will work with the faculty advisor in accomplishing the following specific objectives:

1. Identify a population of students that receives academic advising at Texas State University and select a reachable sample from within it that are enrolled the Occupational Education Program.
2. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University.
3. Distribute the Academic Advising Inventory to the sample selected and follow up to ensure an appropriate response rate to test the hypothesis.
4. Enter the AAI outcomes and biographical data into SPSS and complete descriptive and relational statistic calculations to determine if the hypothesis can be supported.
5. Write a report consistent with A.P.A. guidelines with conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the statistical analysis.

## *Assumptions and Limitations*

The research has the following assumptions:

1. Students at Texas State University are a diverse population of traditional and nontraditional students.
2. The Advisors at Texas State have been exposed to the developmental model of advising.
3. The students at Texas State University have internet access due to the requirement of the use of the Texas State University e-mail address.
4. The students at Texas State University have visited an advisor in the previous academic year.
5. The students at Texas State University are attending at least one class on a campus physically and are not solely online students.
6. Texas State University aims for academic success through retention.

This research has the following limitations:

1. The AAI measures student perception and not actual procedure or approaches delivered by advisors.

2. The students may recall incorrect memories of advising experiences or use advising experiences from previous times than the past year. The AAI is useful for measuring the last year’s interactions.

1. The Students at Texas State University may not be proven to be the person answering the AAI even though the inventory will be sent to their Texas State email address.

## *Relationship to Academic Program and Experience*

This research is related to coursework in student services specifically COUN 5390-Higher Education and Student Affairs. This research in academic advising will be an extension of my studies of student affairs and retention. Specifically, I hope to learn about retention as I have spoken with the office of retention management and the directors and learned from them their goals and was moved by their foster care program for the University and the holistic and caring approach towards the college experience. This research is a learning tool for my career in academic services and hopefully will provide insight and contribution to the body of knowledge for student affairs practitioners. I also hope to advise students professionally in the future and plan to utilize my understanding of student perceptions and needs to best motivate academic and personal growth for students as a practitioner. This research will give me practical experience to supplement my theoretical educational knowledge on how to best serve traditional and nontraditional students.

Chapter II – Review of the Literature

In 1972 the term *developmental advising* was coined by B.B. Crookston (2009). In 1993 Raushi expands on Crookston stating that “to advise from a developmental perspective is to view students at work on life tasks in the context of their whole life settings, including the college experience” (p. 6). Developmental advising takes a broad holistic approach including assessing stages of development. The field of academic advising is a conglomerate of theories on education, human development, and interpersonal development.

While the developmental model is most positively linked to student satisfaction multiple advising models exist such as the *intrusive model*, *advising as teaching,* the *prescriptive model*, *strengths-based advising*, *appreciative inquiry*, the *social constructivism approach*, and the developmental model. This review will focus on the reasoning behind the need for the developmental model as it is linked to student satisfaction and retention. It will also test research by Corts, Lounsbury, Saudergas, and Tatum (2000). In the study Corts, Lounsbury, Saudergas, and Tatum found that student satisfaction is not significantly related to sex or year in school rather student satisfaction is positively related to satisfaction with advising. Advising also resulted in the greatest number of student complaints. The students at Texas State University in the Occupational Education Department would be best served by receiving this model of advising whether of the traditional age or nontraditional age.

*The Value of Advising and the Developmental Advising Approach.* The Noel-Levitz (2007) National Student Satisfaction Report sampled a large number of universities identified academic advising is the second most important variable in student satisfaction second to teaching effectiveness.

The value of academic advising is proven in the work of Bahr (2008). Bahr set out to prove the harm of an academic advising practice called *cooling.* Cooling iswhere an advisor discourages and “cools-off” the high ambitions or lofty career goals of students. In the cooling process the advisor pushes the student toward academic degree plans that the university prepared for placement of underperforming students. The study surprisingly resulted in the value of academic advising being recognized as a beneficial service in direct relation to student’s chances of success, and even more so for disadvantaged students with “academic deficiencies” (p. 726). Bahr’s work shows the value of academic advising and the need for effective advising at Texas State University to make sure the students of a traditional age and nontraditional age are receiving quality developmental advisement benefits.

Advising has also been found to be a source of dissatisfaction among students when done improperly (Guinn& Mitchell, 1985; McAnulty, O’Connor, & Sklare, 1987; Korn, 1996). Specifically, Korn (1996) found advising to be ranked the fifth ranked problem among students surveyed but ranked high in number of complaints with student satisfaction.

Recent researches on best practices are highlighted in the work of José Coll and Patrick Draves. Coll and Draves research uses the Academic Advising Inventory (AAI) to link the developmental model and retention directly to student satisfaction (2009, p. 216). Coll and Draves research with traditional age students concluded that the student characteristic that best determines advising satisfaction is the use of the developmental model. Time discussing personal values and providing academic concentration information are positively correlated to student satisfaction. The single negative correlation is of advising and student satisfaction and retention is discussing financial aid. The authors determine that the necessity of discussing financial aid with an advisor significantly implies financial concerns.

Developmental advising is grounded and inclusive of theories such as psychosocial theory, cognitive developmental theory, and person-environment interaction theory (Creamer, 200; Creamer & Creamer, 1994; Raushi 1993; Winston, et al., 1984). Frost adds to the holistic approach the element of agency of the individual student noting that “developmental advising understands advising as a system of shared responsibility in which the primary goal is to help the student take responsibility for his or her decisions and actions (2003, p. 234).

*Other Academic Advising Approaches.* Multiple paradigms of advising exist in addition to the developmental model and Coll and Draves include research on intrusive model of advising in their literature review which incorporates advising for “at-risk” students. A classification of at-risk involves a status of one of the following such as socio-economic disadvantage, academic probation, mental illness, emotional problems, or a registered physical disability. Any of these factors which would place the student with specific unique needs that risk their academic success classify the student as at-risk (Heisserer, 2002; Miller & Murray, 2005; Upcraft and Kramer, 1995). Intrusive advising is action based concern for at-risk students by proactively creating a meaningful connection and preemptively initiating assistance to students in exploring services and programs to improve skills and increase academic motivation (Upcraft & Kramer, 1995).

Another approach to academic advising (Lowenstein, 2005) builds onto Crookston’s developmental model. The natural extension of the developmental model is advising as teaching. Lowenstein defines the role of the advisor as a person who “helps the student to understand, and in a certain sense, to create the logic of the student's curriculum. Thus, the advisor's instruction in the logic of the curriculum elevates the advisor's work to a central role in enhancing a student's education" (p. 65). The advisor’s role is to instruct the student how to choose curriculum, courses, and outcomes of various course choices and disciples. The goal is to impart the knowledge of designing the best education for the entirety of their education needs from a holistic perspective. The personal advising interactions grounded in psychological and intellectual theory in the advising as teaching paradigm emphasize that problem solving, decision making, and cognitive skills can be brought into the advising sessions (Frost 1991).

The prescriptive method of advising is named because of the parallel with a doctor and patient relationship. Doctors and prescriptive advisors authoritatively make a diagnosis and giving a set prescription to the patient. The student is reduced to a receptive participant in the education process. The student has no sense of contribution or responsibility in their academic choices and the advisor does not engage in a holistic approach but answers direct questions with prescribed answers (Crookston, 2009). In Coll and Draves research the prescriptive model is unanimously a source of student dissatisfaction when measured with the AAI.

The next model of advising is strengths-based advising. Schreiner and Anderson (2005) believe that the intrusive model of advising fixates on the weakness or “deficits” of students. The strengths-based approach is aimed at targeting and basing advising on the natural talents of students. Highlighting strengths and building on natural talent can facilitate motivation.

Next, the appreciative inquiry model of advising is based on the strengths-based model. It is defined as “the cooperative search for the best in people, their organizations, and the world around them. Appreciative inquiry involves the art and practice of asking questions that strengthen a system’s capacity to heighten positive potential” (Cooperrider & Whitney, as cited in Bloom & Archer Martin, 2002, ¶2). This method focuses on advisors as facilitators of positive open-ended questions that facilitate student growth and learning.

The final approach to academic advising titled the social constructivism approach is based on collective cultures or “high relational groups.” Kirk-Kuwaye and Libarios (2003) argue that a new method based on social constructivist advising is needed. Kirk-Kuwaye and Libarios based the advising approach on the notion that collective cultures, specifically where the students view knowledge as “a production of meaningful social interactions,” seek group advising and to incorporate the important relationships in decision making. Individual counseling sessions are not entered into until after the student has accepted the advisor and established trust through group advising. Advisors focus on ways to capitalize on the social learning propensities and resources and maintain awareness that students of community-minded culture may not want the dominant individual based solutions and resources.

*Retention Research.* Previous mention of the research by Coll and Draves point to the developmental model as a direct correlation to student satisfaction and retention in the university setting (2009, p. 216). Other research also links retention to student advising satisfaction. Researchers Hale, Graham, and Johnson (2009) confirmed the link between developmental advising and student satisfaction. In the 2009 study the students perceived that 80% of the advising was developmental and the developmental advisors were overwhelmingly preferred by 96%of the students. Hale, Graham, and Johnson sampled 429 students of all traditional ages and majors in their study at a mid-South doctoral university using the AAI. Their suggestions for further research included rewards, recognition, and group pairing for prescriptive advisors (with developmental advisors) for improving retention. The research did not include nontraditional students or test whether the results were correlated to age range of traditional or nontraditional.

Measures of student satisfaction are also linked to retention in works by Koseke & Koseke (1991). Some research has gone beyond student satisfaction as a way to impact retention and looked at the wellness of the student. Koseke and Koseke argue that something bigger than retention should be set as the end goal for students such as achievement and success outside of the academic role and beyond college (Bean & Bradley, 1986; Pike, 1993).

*Academic Advising in Virtual Universities.* All of the previous research is applicable only for a traditional university and was conducted on samples in physical campuses. Academic advising in virtual universities is not addressed in this literature review or study. The reason for this is because the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA, 1999) has separate online standards that address critical challenges and approaches to evaluation that differ from traditional physical universities. Steele and Thurmond’s research in 2009 explored ways to maximize advising in education for online universities and came to the conclusion that advising needs human touch (p. 92). Academic advising- and particularly financial aid- require “human touch” and this is needed to facilitate “high–level cognitive interactions needed for students to prepare successful academic and career plans” (p. 92). Habley (2004) also corroborates this finding saying that “learners in a virtual university may be missing an opportunity for on-on-one ways to connect” particularly with a concerned member of the university personnel. For these reasons I will not attempt to address the online or virtual advising. Also, the population and sample of students from Texas State University will not receive academic advising or attend classes in purely virtual form.

*Advising Assessment Tools.* Academic advising assessment tools such as the AAI are relatively new to the field of advising and while some colleges use department made survey’s this is not recommended in NACADA’s advising practices. Effective program evaluation tools such as the AAI developed by Dr. Winston and Dr. Sandor in 1984 provide a documentable measure of effectiveness and can help create student outcomes (Campbell 2005; Nutt 2004). Further research is needed for tools other than the AAI which is recommended for use by the National Academic Advising Association as the only evaluation tool currently valid and reliable and considered a best practice. The research referenced in this literature review uses the AAI.

Eva Hester (2008) conducted a quantitative analysis of student academic advising evaluation tools while working as a faculty member with Audiology Speech-Language Pathology and Deaf Studies. Faculty members in the study were evaluated for tenure with half of the analysis weight on their academic advising performance. There was no valid, reliable, and normed tool with which the university conducted the mean scores used for decision making of tenure. Hester concludes that advising practice has an integral need and further research in assessment tools. Particularly, Hester scrutinizes student evaluation of advisors in simple means aggregated for evaluation. Hester recommends advanced assessment and anything more complex than an annual mean (like the AAI). Another recommendation is for various advising instruments for different demographics and student levels such as undergraduate and doctoral. This could be an area of further research so that evaluation of student satisfaction can be done with traditional and nontraditional students. Hester does uncover a positive correlation to academic advising frequency and rating of the advisor a in a professional manner and increased satisfaction and higher student success.

*Linking Age to Student Satisfaction.* To determine if advising satisfaction reported by students is controlled for age or if there is a relationship between advising satisfaction and status of traditional and nontraditional students a definition of each is needed. Along with the definition the needs and possible causes for the relationship is needed since it has been established that the developmental model is linked to student satisfaction.

In work by Corts, Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Tatum student satisfaction with the overall academic experience is studied (2000) resulting in academic advising ranked the lowest on overall satisfaction with overall department performance. The significance of traditional and nontraditional student needs is a gap in literature and research because in Corts, Lounsbury, Saudargas, and Tatum’s conclusions the results found that “student satisfaction was not significantly related to sex or year in school” (2000). With demographic variables controlled, satisfaction with the major appears to be positively related to satisfaction with advising. This brings all the research together into the study. If Texas State University students affirm the hypothesis then they uphold the work of Corts, Lounsbury, Saudargas, & Tatum and no relationship to age will exist in the satisfaction of advising.

*Traditional and Non-Traditional Student Definition.* According to the 2007 U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), one-fourth of students enrolled in 4-year institutions were ages 18-24, or traditional students. The NCES also reported that 18% of students in 2-year institutions were 18-24 year olds. The NECS differentiates traditional students by the age range of 18-24 and all other students age 25 and above fall into the nontraditional category. The National Research Center for Career and Technology Education (NRCCTE, 2009) also characterizes traditional students by their economic situation. Traditional students tend to stay financially dependent until the completion of education as opposed to past cohorts who were financially independent. For the purposes of this study the most recognized categorization tool for traditional and nontraditional students will be used and that is the stated age ranges.

In addition to the age categorization of traditional college student as18-24 year olds Hollis emphasizes that traditional students resides on campus for one period of their 4-year education. The traditional student does not have to reside on campus to be classified as traditional. According to Hollis, traditional students are typically a recent high school graduate and less advanced along Maslow’s hierarchy of needs of developmental stages. Traditional students may lack the sense of themselves and or the ability to perform metacognition, or “thinking about thinking” (Hollis, 2009, ¶6). Traditional students’ most recent concern may have been what to wear to prom. Hollis expounds on the needs of traditional students stating that they will not necessarily be able to understand or navigate academic hardship or poor grades which are common elements of the college experience. Advisors “should be prepared to coach through setbacks,” (¶ 13) because some traditional students “have a steeper hill to climb” and will need advisors to facilitate the concept of self-efficacy. Specifically, traditional students’ needs require the developmental advising process according to Hollis (2009, ¶10). Further research on Hollis’ work will be conducted in this study to determine if the differences in needs of traditional students have to do with their satisfaction reporting.

The remaining students fall into the category of adult “nontraditional” learner. (Nunley, 2007, ¶ 1). The nontraditional age range is 25 and above but more specifically the nontraditional learner is facing more outside commitments which can interfere with academic achievement (Hollis, 2009). The NRCCTE 2009 report characterizes nontraditional students as financially independent working adults who commute. Unfortunately, nontraditional students are less likely than traditional students to complete their degree program. A Fayetteville Professor, Dr. Jinkens, researched the mindsets of nontraditional students in December 2009 and found that life changing events, work experience, the ability to depend on themselves for livelihood characterized nontraditional students. Because of these experiences nontraditional students could make critical decisions and had experience dealing with comprehensive issues and most primarily nontraditional students did not rank education as their primary activity. This characterization by more advanced developmental stages and experience placement could make the definition of nontraditional or traditional student more fluid than an age range. Academically the mindset of a nontraditional student is characterized by the practical mindset of education being judged by what can be gained from knowledge. Traditional students reported focusing on getting good grades. Jinkens also notes that nontraditional students move into the area of active learning, scholarship, linking scholarship to real life, and self-directed learning. This relates to academic advising because Jinkens’ research he notes that “highly authoritarian” approaches may be an instant turnoff for non-traditional students. Authoritarian behavior is a characteristic of the prescriptive method of advising and linked to student dissatisfaction in Coll and Draves work (2009). So not only do traditional students need the developmental advising approach but research shows that nontraditional students do as well.

Corroborating research by Brilliant (2000) goes so far as to argue that advisors need to receive in-service training and a specific action plan to address the particular needs and understand the perspective of the nontraditional student. Brilliant also argues the developmental model indirectly when concluding that advisors must “spend time with their students, listen to their stories, and pay particular attention” in order to have insight into the needs of students and address their individual action plans and act as a role model. These behaviors are exhibited explicitly in the developmental model and the results diction parallels the developmental model approach.

The recently discussed research on nontraditional students clearly points to the use of the developmental model in advising and even says that authoritarian behavior will turn off the student and the nontraditional demographic is already at rick for incompletion of their degree. It follows that proper advising would be the developmental model and that retention for the university is effected by the use of the developmental model. In fact in Perna’s research on the working college students (2010) the recommendations include aspects of the developmental model and Perna recommends further development and exploration into ways to increase career counseling and occupational placement as a burgeoning role for advisors. Perna also recommends future expansion of advising to support night and weekend time frames as the students attend classes most frequently in that time period. Finally, Perna encourages child-care options in advising discussion and work space as well as increase advising on ways to meaningfully connect employment and education for nontraditional students.

*Conclusion.* The developmental model of advising is a positively related to student satisfaction and university retention. Not only do researchers recommend that traditional student receive this approach but nontraditional students as well. According to Corts, Lounsbury, Saudargas, and Tatum (2000) student satisfaction is not significantly related to sex or year in school. With demographic variables controlled, satisfaction with the major appears to be positively related to satisfaction with advising, which has been found to be linked to the use of the developmental model. From all the research in the field of academic advising it is clear that it is important for the retention and the growth and learning of the college student that appropriate advising take place; therefore it is important that the students in the Occupational Education Department whether traditional or nontraditional at Texas State University receive this standard of advising and are satisfied students.

## *Need for the Research Activity*

Texas State’s commitment to excellence in the field of academic advising needs to meet best practices in order to meet the mission of pursing excellence in the Occupational Education program.

*Hypothesis*

Students in the Texas State University Occupational Education Program perceive no noticeable difference in satisfaction with the academic advising by age categorization of traditional (18-24) or nontraditional (25 and above) student.

*Null hypothesis*

There is a statistical relationship between Texas State University advising satisfaction in the Occupational Education Program and the age categorization of the student as traditional (18-24) or nontraditional (25 and above).

Chapter III – Methodology and Procedures

*Overview*

The method will be administration of the Academic Advising Inventory accessed through membership in NACADA.

*Population and Sample*

The sample will be a convenience sample of students at Texas State University in the Occupational Education undergraduate and graduate program. The purpose of selecting Texas State University students in both the undergraduate and graduate program is to gather traditional and nontraditional students enrolled in a physical university. The population sampled will literally be the maximum allowed student in the department to get the best response rate to test the hypothesis. Texas State University students are commuters located in the hill country of Texas and in the surrounding cities. The graduate population is generally nontraditional students. The study will only sample students currently enrolled in classes at Texas State University either full or part-time. The age range will be recorded by the student at the time of the competition of the survey and then classified as traditional or nontraditional.

*Variables / Constructs*

The satisfaction scores generated by the AAI are interval variables, because there is an even distribution possible between the scale numbers and there is the capability for dissatisfaction so no true zero can exist. The dependent variable is the satisfaction scoring and the independent variable is the advising approach and delivery of the advisors at Texas State University. The type and quality of advising is nominal as it is categorized by approach such as prescriptive and developmental. The biographical data gathered to categorize the students is nominal and includes age, academic department, gender, and email. The AAI is a likert scale but the correlation analysis using relational statistics generally require interval data and the scale has been normed by the author Dr. [Roger Winston](mailto:rwinston2@bellsouth.net).

*Instrumentation:*

The AAI is a five-point likert scale with values "strongly agree", "agree", "neutral", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" and dissatisfaction is possible as no true zero exists when measuring satisfaction. The AAI created by Dr. Winston and Dr. Sandor of the University of Georgia measures only advising received in the last year by the student and was developed in 1984 when no assessments of advising existed. The inventory is an interval measure as the author normed and tested the intervals between each of these five values in terms of satisfaction with service with reliability and validity testing. First Dr. Winston and Dr. Sandor, the authors of the AAI, tested the inventory validity on a control group of students and a special test group. The control group however was not deprived of academic advising as the authors found that unethical but instead used a wide variety of advisors with arts and science backgrounds and degrees to contrast the test group of specifically trained advisors. The result was a significantly different result with a alpha level of p˂.001 (Winston & Sandor, 2002, p.20). For reliability the Chronbach Alpha coefficient was tested. The AAI includes several possible subscale items in addition to student satisfaction and perception of advising. The measures include in depth developmental vs. prescriptive advising measure, personalized education, academic decision making, and selecting courses measures are possible. The alpha coefficient found the internal consistency reliability to be around .78 and that the subscales are “relatively homogenous and stable enough measures (Winston & Sandor, 2002, p.15). The AAI is a normed scale and Dr. Winston and Dr. Sandor found correlations to the more developmental perceptions of advising and student satisfaction and report this in the manual for the AAI (2002).

*Data Collection Process*

To collect data the online survey on SurveyMonkey will alert me when a student in the sample has taken the AAI and will report the data to me for use in SPSS. I will follow up with students who have not completed the survey with one reminder to get a maximum response rate. In the instance of low response rate I will seek to expand the sample size to more students at Texas State in a class. Incomplete information will not be useable and blank answers will not be incorporated in the research. The answered questions will be captured and used.

*Data Analysis Process*

The data gathered from the AAI inventory will be a score of satisfaction with the advising at Texas State University in the past year. The biographical data will be nominal data used to categorize the students into traditional and nontraditional categories. Once the data has been gathered from an appropriate response rate of Occupational Education students then the data will be entered into SPSS for statistical analysis. The descriptive statistics will be run for information on the traditional and nontraditional populations at Texas State University. Then relational analysis will be run to determine if they hypothesis can be supported. Pearson Product Moment Correlation will be run to see if a significant relationship exists between the satisfaction of the advising at Texas state and the student category of traditional or nontraditional. Then based upon the calculations results and recommendations will be made and the hypothesis either rejected or confirmed.

*Expected Presentation of Research Results*

The presentation of the results in the classroom will involve a handout and sample of the AAI and possible PowerPoint slides.

*Procedures for Semester 1 (OCED 5301):Pre-contractual –Post-contractual*

1. Identify a population of students that receives academic advising at Texas State University and select a reachable sample from within it that are enrolled the Occupational Education Program.

1.a. Obtain consent from any administration personnel and fill out any paperwork that consents to the use of Texas State University students as a sample for research.

1.b. Draft a letter to the sample that will explain what the research is and that it is not a part of a grade and is voluntary that will be included as a coversheet to the AAI.

1. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University.

2.a. Create the SurveyMonkey version of the AAI that is an exact replication and will have the exact outcomes as the paper AAI.

2.b. Download the excel version of the AAI from the creators as a backup to be emailed to students in case of emergency.

2.c. Keep a paper copy of the AAI for emergencies.

2.d. Enter the emails of the sample into SurveyMonkey for distribution and follow-up.

1. Distribute the Academic Advising Inventory to the sample selected and follow up to ensure an appropriate response rate to test the hypothesis.

3.a. Draft a follow-up email about the research and send it to the students in the population that have not completed the AAI so that a good response rate is received.

*Start Date and Duration of Activity.*

See chart for Chapter 3 at the end of the proposal.

*Procedures for Semester 2 (OCED 5302)Pre-contractual – Post-contractual*

1. Enter the AAI outcomes and biographical data into SPSS and complete descriptive and relational statistic calculations to use to determine if the hypothesis can be supported.

4.a. Type the biographical data in SPSS and label as nominal.

4.b. Type the outcomes in SPSS from the AAI scores.

4.c. Classify each student by traditional or nontraditional based on their demographic information given.

4.d. Run descriptive statistics in SPSS on the data.

4.e. Perform relational statistics on the traditional and nontraditional satisfaction scores using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

4.f. Perform the standard deviation calculation in SPSS.

4.g. Create a table in Microsoft Word with the data that is A.P.A. compliant to easily understand the data.

1. Write a report consistent with A.P.A. guidelines with conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the statistical analysis.

5.a. Draft conclusions based on the SPSS calculations.

5.b. Draft recommendations based on the conclusions.

5.c. Have the independent evaluator look over the conclusions and recommendations to make sure the interpretations are correct and consistent with ethical research standards.

5.d. Apply to Graduate Research Forum for presentation of final proposal.

1. Present the report to the Graduate Research Forum at Texas State University in December 2011.

Chapter IV – Research Evaluation Plan

*Formative Evaluation*

*Procedures to be Evaluated*. The researcher will assume evaluative accountability for the following:

1. Identify a population of students that receives academic advising at Texas State University and select a reachable sample from within it that are enrolled the Occupational Education Program.

1.a. Obtain consent from any administration personnel and fill out any paperwork that consents to the use of Texas State students as a sample for research.

1.b. Draft a letter to the sample that will explain what the research is and that it is not a part of a grade and is voluntary that will be included as a coversheet to the AAI.

1. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University.

2.a. Create the SurveyMonkey version of the AAI that is an exact replication and will have the exact outcomes as the paper AAI.

2.b. Download the excel version of the AAI from the creators as a backup to be emailed to students in case of emergency.

3.c. Keep a paper copy of the AAI for emergencies.

3.d. Enter the emails of the sample into SurveyMonkey for distribution and follow-up.

1. Distribute the Academic Advising Inventory to the sample selected and follow up to ensure an appropriate response rate to test the hypothesis.

4.a. Draft a follow-up email about the research and send it to the students in the population that have not completed the AAI so that a good response rate is received.

1. Enter the AAI outcomes and biographical data into SPSS and complete descriptive and relational statistic calculations to use to determine if the hypothesis can be supported.

4.a. Type the biographical data in SPSS and label as nominal.

4.b. Type the outcomes in SPSS from the AAI scores.

4.c. Classify each student by traditional or nontraditional based on their demographic age given.

4.d. Run descriptive statistics in SPSS on the data.

4.e. Perform relational statistics on the traditional and nontraditional satisfaction scores using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

4.f. Perform the standard deviation calculation in SPSS.

4.g. Create a table in Microsoft Word with the data that is A.P.A. compliant to easily understand the data.

1. Write a report consistent with A.P.A. guidelines with conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the statistical analysis.

5.a. Draft conclusions based on the SPSS calculations.

5.b. Draft recommendations based on the conclusions.

5.c. Have the independent evaluator look over the conclusions and recommendations to make sure the interpretations are correct and consistent with ethical research standards.

*Evaluation Parameters (Time and Quality).* For evaluation parameters the charts in the end of the proposal lay out the process of the research. There are time frames and the process can be evaluated on the completion of each step and attempt or re-attempt of them until completion of the process is done. The weight for the formative parameters is discussed in weight section next.

*Weight.* The weight for the formative evaluation should be 70%. The process of learning to conduct research is highly valuable and not dependent upon the outcomes. There may be many unforeseen problems or additional learning opportunities in the execution of the objectives and procedures. The most important part is the process of conducting research so that in the future should I wish I can conduct more research because I am familiar with the procedures.

*Summative Evaluation*

*Products to be Evaluated.*

1. Identify a population of students that receives academic advising at Texas State University and select a reachable sample from within it that are enrolled the Occupational Education Program.

Academic Advising is best studied at a University and a convenience sample of Occupational Education students is the best use of resources for the purposes of the research proposal. The product to be evaluated will be the completion of the objective and the selection of an appropriate sample.

1. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University.

The product of the objective will be the web survey of the AAI. This will be the easiest and most accessible way for the students to take the AAI and will be the best means for a good response rate. Also the web survey can capture information from partially completed surveys.

1. Distribute the Academic Advising Inventory to the sample selected and follow up to ensure an appropriate response rate to test the hypothesis.

The product of this summative outcome will be the scores received from the AAI and a hopefully a good response rate to receive the most data to test the hypothesis.

1. Enter the AAI outcomes and biographical data into SPSS and complete descriptive and relational statistic calculations to use to determine if the hypothesis can be supported.

The product to be evaluated here will be easily printable and in a Word document form as learned in the Saturday labs with Dr. Pendergraft. The output from SPSS can be converted to tables and charts in Word for visual ease and for writing conclusions and recommendations based on the results.

1. Write a report consistent with A.P.A. guidelines with conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the statistical analysis.

The product to the evaluated will be the final written proposal for OCED 5302. The template will be used and filled in accordingly in a Word document.

*Evaluation Parameters*. The products for summative evaluation are the end outcomes in the objectives. They will be evaluated on an attempted completion basis. Several attempts will be made if an outcome is not initially achieved. I will meet with my research advisor, Dr. Stephen Springer, or Dr. Eichler to gain advice on any outcomes I am not achieving. If there is no way to successfully reach the outcome after the meeting with the research advisor or Dr. Eichler then I will document and an explain any products not completed and a discussion with the faculty advisor. Then a new or modified summative product will be chose to a give a second method of completion of the product in case of emergency so that I learn the lesson needed in that outcome. Then the summative evaluation can be done and all the products completed in 5302 and every one completed.

*Weight*. The weight will be 30% in the summative evaluation. The reason for this is that the process of conducting research and the trial and error is more important than the outcomes. Learning to conduct research is contained in the procedural attempts of conducting research. Learning to conduct research is more important than gaining socially acceptable outcomes without fully working through the process.

*Independent Evaluator.* Dr. Stephen Springer will be the independent evaluator. Dr. Springer is an advisor and an LPC so he is an expert in the area of my master’s degree. Dr. Springer will also be able to give his expert opinion on the interpretations of student satisfaction as he is involved in program assessment and advising himself.
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Research Contract I

Texas State University

Student Heather Cook

Address 1206 West Ave unit #3 Austin, TX 78701

Work Phone Number 512-232-1371 Course Number 5301

Title of Proposed Activity Academic Advising Research Proposal

Faculty Advisor Matthew Eichler, PhD Agency Texas State University

Address Occupational Education San Marcos, Texas 78666

Work Phone Number 512-245-2115

1. GOALS
2. Assist the researcher in translating theory into practice.
3. Develop and refine the research skills of the researcher.

II. OBJECTIVES

The researcher will work cooperatively with the faculty advisor in accomplishing the following objectives:

1. Identify a population of students that receives academic advising at Texas State University and select a reachable sample from within it that are enrolled the Occupational Education Program.

1.a. Obtain consent from any administration personnel and fill out any paperwork that consents to the use of Texas State students as a sample for research.

1.b. Draft a letter to the sample that will explain what the research is and that it is not a part of a grade and is voluntary that will be included as a coversheet to the AAI.

1. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University.

2.a. Create the SurveyMonkey version of the AAI that is an exact replication and will have the exact outcomes as the paper AAI.

2.b. Download the excel version of the AAI from the creators as a backup to be emailed to students in case of emergency.

2.c. Keep a paper copy of the AAI for emergencies.

2.d. Enter the emails of the sample into SurveyMonkey for distribution and follow-up.

1. Distribute the Academic Advising Inventory to the sample selected and follow up to ensure an appropriate response rate to test the hypothesis.

3.a. Draft a follow-up email about the research and send it to the students in the population that have not completed the AAI so that a good response rate is received.

III. PROCEDURES

The research will accomplish the aforementioned objectives by completing the following:

1. Identify a population and a sample.
2. Create a web-based version of the AAI.
3. Distribute the AAI via the internet.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES

1. University
2. The faculty advisor will provide supervision and guidance to the researcher.
3. The faculty advisor will provide consultation on problem related to the research.
4. Researcher
5. The researcher will participate in weekly meetings with the faculty advisor.
6. The researcher will assume full responsibility for executing the objectives of the contract.

C. Duration and Hours per Week

Beginning Date Ending Date

Number of Weeks

Total Number of Contractual Hours

Average Hours/Week

V. TERMINATION

By the University:

The faculty advisor reserves the right to terminate the contract upon clear evidence that the research does not contribute to the researcher’s professional competencies, or if the researcher’s personal actions are deemed to be a source of embarrassment to or detrimental to the best interests of the University.

Researcher Date Faculty Advisor Date

Research Contract II

Texas State University

Student Heather Cook

Address 1206 West Ave unit #3 Austin, TX 78701

Work Phone Number 512-232-1371 Course Number 5302

Title of Proposed Activity Academic Advising Research Proposal

Faculty Advisor Matthew Eichler Agency Texas State University

Address Occupational Education San Marcos, Texas 78666

Work Phone Number 512-245-2115

I. GOALS

1. Assist the researcher in translating theory into practice.

2. Develop and refine the research skills of the researcher.

II. OBJECTIVES

4. Enter the AAI outcomes and biographical data into SPSS and complete descriptive and relational statistic calculations to use to determine if the hypothesis can be supported.

4.a. Type the biographical data in SPSS and label as nominal.

4.b. Type the outcomes in SPSS from the AAI scores.

4.c. Classify each student by traditional or nontraditional based on their demographic age given.

4.d. Run descriptive statistics in SPSS on the data.

4.e. Perform relational statistics on the traditional and nontraditional satisfaction scores using the Pearson Product moment correlation.

4.f. Perform the standard deviation calculation in SPSS.

4.g. Create a table in Microsoft Word with the data that is A.P.A. compliant to easily understand the data.

1. Write a report consistent with A.P.A. guidelines with conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the statistical analysis.

5.a. Draft conclusions based on the SPSS calculations.

5.b. Draft recommendations based on the conclusions.

5.c. Have the independent evaluator look over the conclusions and recommendations to make sure the interpretations are correct and consistent with ethical research standards.

III. PROCEDURES

The research will accomplish the aforementioned objectives by completing the following:

1. Enter the data from the AAI in SPSS and conduct calculations to test hypothesis.
2. Write final report.

IV. RESPONSIBILITIES

A. University

1. The faculty advisor will provide supervision and guidance to the researcher.
2. The faculty advisor will provide consultation on problem related to the research.

B. Researcher

1. The researcher will participate in weekly meetings with the faculty advisor.
2. The researcher will assume full responsibility for executing the objectives of the contract.

C. Duration and Hours per Week

Beginning Date Ending Date

Number of Weeks

Total Number of Contractual Hours

Average Hours/Week

V. TERMINATION

By the University:

The faculty advisor reserves the right to terminate the contract upon clear evidence that the research does not contribute to the researcher’s professional competencies, or if the researcher’s personal actions are deemed to be a source of embarrassment to or detrimental to the best interests of the University.

Researcher Date Faculty Advisor Date

**Formative Evaluation Form for Quantity – Semester 1**

Research Name: Academic Advising Satisfaction of Traditional and Nontraditional Students at Texas State University Occupational Education

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week No.** | **Hours/Week** | **Advisor’s Initials & Date** | **Objective No.** | **Procedure No.** |
| Third | 2-5 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Fourth | 2-5 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Fifth | 2-5 |  | 1 | 1 |
| Sixth | 2-5 |  | 2 | 2 |
| Seventh | 2-5 |  | 2 | 2 |
| Eighth | 2-5 |  | 2 | 2 |
| Ninth | 2-5 |  | 2 | 2 |
| Tenth | 2-5 |  | 2 | 3 |
| Eleventh | 2-5 |  | 3 | 3 |
| Twelfth | 2-5 |  | 3 | 3 |
| Thirteenth | 2-5 |  | 3 | 3 |
| Fourteenth | 2-5 |  | 3 | 3 |
| Fifteenth | 2-5 |  | 3 | 3 |
| TOTAL HOURS EXPENDED |  |  |  |  |

I certify that the above information is accurate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor: Date:

/ =

Hours Contracted

Expended Hours

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Formative Evaluation Form for Quality – Semester 1

Student Heather Cook

Please evaluate the researcher’s performance on the following specific duties and check the box that best describes their performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Specific procedural statements performed by the researcher: | Unsat. 20 pts. | Poor  40 pts. | Average  60 pts. | Good  80 pts. | Superior  100 pts. |
| 1. Identify a population of students that receives academic advising at Texas State University and select a reachable sample from within it that are enrolled the Occupational Education Program. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.a. Obtain consent from any administration personnel and fill out any paperwork that consents to the use of Texas State students as a sample for research. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.b. Draft a letter to the sample that will explain what the research is and that it is not a part of a grade and is voluntary that will be included as a coversheet to the AAI. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.a. Create the SurveyMonkey version of the AAI that is an exact replication and will have the exact outcomes as the paper AAI. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.b. Download the excel version of the AAI from the creators as a backup to be emailed to students in case of emergency. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.c. Keep a paper copy of the AAI for emergencies. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.d. Enter the emails of the sample into SurveyMonkey for distribution and follow-up. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.a. Draft a follow-up email about the research and send it to the students in the population that have not completed the AAI so that a good response rate is received. |  |  |  |  |  |

/ =

### Total Points No. of Procedural

Sentences

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

Please identify areas that need to be improved.

Please make any general comments that you feel are appropriate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor Date

**Formative Evaluation Form for Quantity – Semester 2**

Research Name: Academic Advising Satisfaction of Traditional and Nontraditional Students at Texas State University Occupational Education

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Week No.** | **Hours/Week** | **Advisor’s Initials & Date** | **Objective No.** | **Procedure No.** |
| Third | 2-5 |  | 4 | 4 |
| Fourth | 2-5 |  | 4 | 4 |
| Fifth | 2-5 |  | 4 | 4 |
| Sixth | 2-5 |  | 4 | 4 |
| Seventh | 2-5 |  | 4 | 4 |
| Eighth | 2-5 |  | 4 | 4 |
| Ninth | 2-5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Tenth | 2-5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Eleventh | 2-5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Twelfth | 2-5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Thirteenth | 2-5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Fourteenth | 2-5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| Fifteenth | 2-5 |  | 5 | 5 |
| TOTAL HOURS EXPENDED |  |  |  |  |

I certify that the above information is accurate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor: Date:

/ =

Hours Contracted

Expended Hours

## FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Formative Evaluation Form for Quality – Semester 2

Student Heather Cook

Please evaluate the researcher’s performance on the following specific duties and check the box that best describes their performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Specific procedural statements performed by the researcher: | Unsat. 20 pts. | Poor  40 pts. | Average  60 pts. | Good  80 pts. | Superior  100 pts. |
| 1. Enter the AAI outcomes and biographical data into SPSS and complete descriptive and relational statistic calculations to use to determine if the hypothesis can be supported. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.a. Type the biographical data in SPSS and label as nominal. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.b. Type the outcomes in SPSS from the AAI scores. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.c. Classify each student by traditional or nontraditional based on their demographic age given. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.d. Run descriptive statistics in SPSS on the data. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.e. Perform relational statistics on the traditional and nontraditional satisfaction scores using the Pearson Product moment correlation. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.f. Perform the standard deviation calculation in SPSS. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.g. Create a table in Microsoft Word with the data that is A.P.A. compliant to easily understand the data. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Write a report consistent with A.P.A. guidelines with conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the statistical analysis. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.a. Draft conclusions based on the SPSS calculations. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.b. Draft recommendations based on the conclusions. |  |  |  |  |  |

/ =

### Total Points No. of Procedural

Sentences

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

Please identify areas that need to be improved.

Please make any general comments that you feel are appropriate.

Signature of Faculty Advisor Date

Summative Evaluation Form I

Name: Heather Cook

Product Description: Summative Product 1: Select a population and sample.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. A population and sample

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Qualitative Characteristic(s)

1. A population and sample

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not Consistent |  |  |  | Very Consistent |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form I

Name: Heather Cook

Product Description: Summative Product 2: Disseminate an electronic version of the AAI

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. An electronic dissemination of the AAI to send to sample

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Qualitative Characteristic(s)

2. An electronic dissemination of the AAI to send to sample

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not Consistent |  |  |  | Very Consistent |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form I

Name: Heather Cook

Product Description: Summative Product 3: Collect mean scores from AAI and enter into SPSS along with biographical data.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Collect mean scores from AAI and enter into SPSS along with biographical data.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Qualitative Characteristic(s)

3. Collect mean scores from AAI and enter into SPSS along with biographical data.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not Consistent |  |  |  | Very Consistent |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form I

Name: Heather Cook

Product Description: Summative Product 4: Conduct statistical analysis in SPSS with data.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Conduct statistical analysis in SPSS with data.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Qualitative Characteristic(s)

1. Conduct statistical analysis in SPSS with data.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not Consistent |  |  |  | Very Consistent |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

Summative Evaluation Form I

Name: Heather Cook

Product Description: Summative Product 5: Write the final report.

Quantitative Characteristic(s)

1. Write the final report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Chapters  3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Qualitative Characteristic(s)

1. Write the final report.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not Consistent |  |  |  | Very Consistent |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Points:  60 | 70 | 80 | 90 | 100 |

Independent Evaluator Date

##### **Proposal Evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Characteristic** | **Unsatisfactory**  **20 pts.** | **Poor**  **40 pts.** | **Average**  **60 pts.** | **Good**  **80 pts.** | **Superior**  **100 pts.** |
| 1. How well is the research problem stated? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Is the research purpose clearly stated? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Are the research objectives formatted correctly? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Do the assumptions and limitations seem to addresses consequences associated with the proposed research? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Does the review of the literature provide a reasonable theoretical argument for conducting the research? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Is the review of the literature well organized? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Do the research questions align with the purpose of the research and the review of the literature? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. How appropriate is the scope and sequence of the procedures for the research? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Is the formative evaluation model adequately described? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Does the summative evaluation model identify products, standards, and the product evaluation forms? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. How clearly is the proposal written and presented overall? |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. Is the proposal consistent with APA guidelines? |  |  |  |  |  |

Total points / 12 =

Researcher’s Signature

Charts for Chapter 3 – 5300 (Only tasks up to and after data collection)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Task | Pre  3 weeks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | Post  2 weeks | Hrs. | Finish Date |
| Meet with class to discuss course structure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | January 2011 |
| Review Proposal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .5 | January 2011 |
| Review Objectives and Tasks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | January 2011 |
| IRB submission and approval |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.0 | January 2011 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identify a population of students that receives academic advising at Texas State University and select a reachable sample from within it that are enrolled the Occupational Education Program. |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.5 | By Week 2 |
| 1.a.Obtain consent from any administration personnel and fill out any paperwork that consents to the use of Texas State students as a sample for research. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | By Week 2 |
| 1.b.Draft a letter to the sample that will explain what the research is and that it is not a part of a grade and is voluntary that will be included as a coversheet to the AAI. |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | By Week 3 |
| 2. Create a web-based method of distribution such as email or a product such at SurveyMonkey to send the survey to the sample of students at Texas State University. |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.0 | By Week 4 |
| 2.a. Create the SurveyMonkey version of the AAI that is an exact replication and will have the exact outcomes as the paper AAI. |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.0 | By Week 6 |
| 2.b. Download the excel version of the AAI from the creators as a backup to be emailed to students in case of emergency. |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | By Week 6 |
| 2.c. Keep a paper copy of the AAI for emergencies. | X |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .10 | Done |
| 2.d. Enter the emails of the sample into SurveyMonkey for distribution and follow-up. |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | By Week 7 |
| 3. Distribute the Academic Advising Inventory to the sample selected and follow up to ensure an appropriate response rate to test the hypothesis. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |  | 2.0 | By Week 10 |
| 3.a. Draft a follow-up email about the research and send it to the students in the population that have not completed the AAI so that a good response rate is received. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  | 3.5 | By end of semester |

\*See drop box for instrument!

The Academic Advising Inventory is a PDF and attached in the drop box. There is no Word version of it.