

Pioneer Pathways: Student Perspectives

Cal State East Bay, Summer 2021

Prepared by

Ruthie Chang, M.Ed., Senior Associate

Kristie Glatze, Senior Associate

Rachel Maas, M.P.H, Associate

Mayte Cruz, M.P.P., Associate

Hatchuel Tabernik and Associates



Introduction

In Spring 2021, Cal State East Bay surveyed all undergraduate students to learn more about their experience with academic advising, with a focus on General Education (GE) and Major Advising in particular. This report focuses on findings from that survey.

Survey sample

Survey administration period and method:

March 10, 2021 – April 7, 2021 via email to student East Bay horizon addresses using the Qualtrics survey platform. Automated email reminders were sent weekly to unfinished respondents. The survey was voluntary and did not have any forced-response questions (i.e., respondents did not have to answer any question they did not want to)

Population:

All 12,202 Cal State East Bay undergraduate students registered for the spring 2021 semester.

Response rate:

2,943 survey responses¹ = 24.1% response rate

Incentives:

Those who completed the entire survey had the option to opt into a raffle to win one of 20 East Bay Bookstore prizes by entering their NetID (e.g., sweatshirts, t-shirts, etc.)

Confidentiality:

This survey was noted as confidential to all potential respondents. This survey was not anonymous, as student identifiers were collected to merge demographic information.

¹ The original dataset had 2,967 responses; 11 of the responses were received from Post-Baccalaureate students and 12 of the responses were received from DCIE or Extension/Continuing Education students; These students do not have academic advisors, so their input would not be relevant for the purposes of this analysis and they were removed from the final dataset. In addition, one student was not matched to any demographic data, so their responses were also removed as their status was unclear. After removing these 24 students, our sample size totaled 2,943.

Findings

Survey respondent % demographics vs. Spring '21 population %

As can be seen from the demographic comparisons on the following pages, the survey sample very closely resembles the campus' undergraduate population, especially with regard to Race, First Generation Status, Pell Eligibility, and College Affiliation. Freshmen, and Juniors, were slightly overrepresented on the survey; females were overrepresented more so.

Table 1. Respondents and population by race

Race	% Survey Respondents (n=2,943)	% Spring 21 undergraduate population (n=12,202)
Asian	23.2%	22.8%
Black	8.5%	9.6%
Hawaiian/PI	0.9%	1.0%
International	4.9%	4.7%
Latinx	39.1%	37.7%
Multi-race	4.8%	5.1%
Native American	0.1%	0.1%
Unknown	3.6%	4.0%
White	14.9%	14.9%

Table 2. Respondents and population by sex

Sex	% Survey Respondents (n=2,943)	% Spring 21 undergraduate population (n=12,202)
F	72.7%	60.3%
M	27.3%	39.6%
N (nonbinary)	0.1%	0.1%

Table 3. Respondents and population by first generation status

First-Gen	% Survey Respondents (n=2,943)	% Spring 21 undergraduate population (n=12,202)
No	33.5%	35.4%
Yes	66.5%	64.6%

Table 4. Respondents and population by Pell eligibility

Pell Eligibility	% Survey Respondents (n=2,943)	% Spring 21 undergraduate population (n=12,202)
No	60.1%	62.9%
Yes	39.9%	37.1%

Table 5. Respondents and population by student level

Student Level (code)	% Survey Respondents (n=2,943)	% Spring 21 undergraduate population (n=12,202)
Freshmen (1)	13.8%	9.3%
Sophomore (2)	8.5%	9.7%
Junior (3)	38.2%	32.1%
Senior (4)	39.5%	48.9%

Table 6. Respondents and population by college affiliation

College Affiliation (code)	% Survey Respondents (n=2,943)	% Spring 21 undergraduate population (n=12,202)
College of Business and Economics (CBE)	19.1%	21.8%
College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS)	6.6%	6.5%
College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS)	34.6%	32.7%
College of Science (CSCI)	38.8%	37.8%
Undeclared (UNI)	0.9%	1.1%

Analysis for this summary included:

- Reporting descriptive statistics for all survey items including percentages and/or means as appropriate;
- Running Chi-Square tests on questions with dichotomous variables or that could be recoded into dichotomous variables, as appropriate, to look for statistically significant differences between:
 - First Generation (First Gen) and Not First Gen students
 - Low-income and Non-Low-income students
 - URM (all races other than White not including International or unknown) and Non-URM (White) students
 - Program Participant (Freshman EOP, Transfer EOP, EXCEL, GANAS, Renaissance, Sankofa, STEP, Veteran) and Non-Participant students
- Running independent samples t-tests using the same categories listed above to detect significant differences in the means for some questions, as appropriate.

Section 1. Academic Advising Overview

The first section of the survey included questions designed to assess students' overall experience with academic advising at East Bay. As shown in Table 7:

- The majority of survey respondents were positive about their academic advising experience. At least three-fourths of students agreed/somewhat agreed that they could easily access their advisor, they knew how to access their student degree roadmap, and they were familiar with academic advising support and services available to them.
- Almost three-fourths agreed that their current degree roadmap was clear, consistent, and noted the graduation requirements.
- Two-thirds of students met with their academic advisor every term.
- There were some significant differences across student subgroups. The most differences surfaced when running comparisons between Low-income and Non-Low-income students (Low-income students tended to agree with questions at slightly higher rates). However, there were also quite a few differences between URM and Non-URM students (URM students and Program Participants tended to agree with questions at slightly higher rates).

Table 7. Academic Advising Overview

Q3. Please respond to the extent that you agree or disagree with the following statements.	N	% Agree/ Somewhat Agree
I can easily access my advisor whenever I need or want to meet with him/her.	2,687	80.1%
I meet with my academic advisor every term.	2,677	62.5%
I know how to access my student degree roadmap.	2,686	76.9%
My current degree roadmap is clear, consistent, and notes the requirements for graduation from Cal State East Bay.	2,687	74.1%
I am familiar with the support and services that academic advising offers to me.	2,684	75.6%

Note: total responses range from 2,677 to 2,687; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	% Agree/Somewhat Agree		
I can easily access my advisor whenever I need or want to meet with him/her.	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	84%	78%	<.001
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	81%	76%	.013
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	86%	79%	<.001
I meet with my academic advisor every term.	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	67%	60%	<.001
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	63%	57%	.021
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	76%	60%	<.001
I know how to access my student degree roadmap.	First Gen	Not First Gen	p-value
	76%	79%	.049
My current degree roadmap is clear, consistent, and notes the requirements for graduation from Cal State East Bay.	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	77%	72%	.015
I am familiar with the support and services that academic advising offers to me.	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	79%	73%	<.001
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	77%	70%	.005
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	83%	74%	<.001

Section 2. Your Academic Advisors

The second section of the survey was designed to measure the ways students had interacted with academic advising in the past year, particularly with regard to how and with whom they had met. As shown in Tables 8 through 10:

- Students were most likely to have engaged with their academic advisor in the past year through email (65.5%) or Zoom (56.0%).
- Due to the pandemic, it is not surprising that they were much less likely to have engaged with their academic advisor in person (9.1%).
- Students were least likely to engage with academic advisors through PioneerChat (8.5%).
- One in ten students had not interacted with their academic advisor in any form (10.2%).

- Low-income and URM students were significantly more likely to have engaged with their academic advisor via Zoom (compared to their Non-Low-income and non-URM peers, respectively). URM students were also significantly more likely than non-URM students to have met with their advisor face-to-face.
- When asked who they identified as their academic advisor, it was most common for students to identify faculty in their major/department (57.0%), followed by the college advising center (34.1%), and General Studies faculty (21.9%).
- It was least common for students to identify Advisors at Concord (3.6%), Faculty not in their major/department (4.8%), and their Pioneer Success Coach Advisor (7.7%) as their academic advisor. There were quite a few differences as to who different student subgroups identified as their advisor.
- Students were most likely to report that they met with one advisor (69.4%) in a typical term.

Table 8. Your Academic Advisors: Engagement (N=2,943)

Q5. During the past year I have... (check all that apply)	Count	Percent
Emailed an academic advisor	1,928	65.5%
Met with an academic advisor in person, face-to-face	268	9.1%
Met with an academic advisor via Zoom meetings	1,648	56.0%
Texted PioneerChat regarding academic advising information	250	8.5%
I have not interacted with an academic advisor in any form <i>(skip to Q42)</i>	301	10.2%

Statistically Significant Differences

	% Agree/Somewhat Agree		
Met with an academic advisor in person, face-to-face	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	10%	6%	.005
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	14%	8%	<.001
Met with an academic advisor via Zoom meetings	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	60%	53%	<.001
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	58%	49%	.021
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	69%	53%	<.001
I have not interacted with an academic advisor in any form	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	7%	11%	.003

Table 9. Your Academic Advisors: Identification (n=2,642)

Q6. Please identify the individual(s) whom you consider to be your academic advisor (check all that apply)	Count	Percent
Faculty in my major/department	1,505	57.0%
In my college advising center (e.g., CBE Office of Undergraduate Advising, CSCI/CLASS/CEAS Student Service Center)	900	34.1%
General Studies Faculty Member	578	21.9%
Student Success Program (e.g., Athletics, Center for International Education, EOP, EXCEL, Renaissance, SANKOFA, Transfer APASS, Veterans)	370	14.0%
Advisor from Freshmen and Sophomore Success Team (FASST)	361	13.7%
Peer Advisor/Mentor (e.g., Peer Academic Coach)	354	13.4%
Pioneer Success Coach advisor	203	7.7%
Faculty not in my major/department	127	4.8%
Other	121	4.6%
Advisor at Concord	95	3.6%

A wide variety of “Other” academic advisors were named by 116 students, indicating that there may be some confusion as to who students should be seeing for academic advising. Among the most cited “Other” advisors were ADT, GANAS and PACE. Several students also cited advisors by name, suggesting that they might not be sure how they fit within the various categories. At least 10 students reported that they did not know, were not sure, did not have one, or were unable to get in touch with an advisor.

Statistically Significant Differences

	% Selected		
	First Gen	Not First Gen	p-value
Faculty in my major/department	55%	61%	.001
	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	54%	59%	.005
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	56%	63%	.012
In my college advising center (e.g., CBE Office of Undergraduate Advising, CSCI/CLASS/CEAS Student Service Center)	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	48%	59%	<.001
	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	30%	37%	<.001
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	22%	37%	<.001
General Studies Faculty Member	First Gen	Not First Gen	p-value
	21%	24%	.036
Pioneer Success Coach advisor	First Gen	Not First Gen	p-value
	7%	10%	.007

Student Success Program (e.g., Athletics, Center for International Education, EOP, EXCEL, Renaissance, SANKOFA, Transfer APASS, Veterans)	First Gen 16%	Not First Gen 10%	p-value <.001
	Low-income 21%	Non-Low-income 10%	p-value <.001
	URM 15%	Non-URM 7%	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 50%	Non-Participant 7%	p-value <.001
Advisor from Freshmen and Sophomore Success Team (FASST)	Low-income 17%	Non-Low-income 12%	p-value <.001
	URM 15%	Non-URM 6%	p-value <.001
Peer Advisor/Mentor (e.g., Peer Academic Coach)	Low-income 16%	Non-Low-income 12%	p-value <.001
	URM 14%	Non-URM 10%	p-value .035
	Program Participant 19%	Non-Participant 12%	p-value <.001
Advisor at Concord	URM 3%	Non-URM 6%	p-value .002
	Program Participant 2%	Non-Participant 4%	p-value .019
Other	Program Participant 6%	Non-Participant 4%	p-value .050

Table 10. Your Academic Advisors: Number of (n=2,642)

Q7. How many advisors do you typically meet with each term?	Count	Percent
I have not interacted with an academic advisor in any form (Q5)	301	11.8%
1 advisor	1,557	61.2%
2 advisors	636	25.0%
3 advisors	41	1.6%
4 or more advisors	9	0.4%
	<i>No response</i>	399
Total	2,943	100.0%

Mean response: 1.17 advisors

Statistically Significant Differences

	Avg. # of advisors		
How many advisors do you typically meet with each term?	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	1.21	1.15	.011
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	1.41	1.13	<.001

Section 3. General Education (GE) Academic Advising

The next series of questions asked students about their experience with **General Education (GE) Academic Advising**. Tables 11 through 14 feature student responses to questions about their experience with GE advising.

- The top three sources for information about GE were the Cal State East Bay catalog (48.8%), the Cal State East Bay Schedule of Classes (41.0%), and Staff advisors (37.9%).
- Very few students consulted Cal State East Bay co-workers (1.5%) and only 2.5% did not know how to find GE information.
- It was most common for students to meet with an advisor about GE 1 time (40.5%), although one in four (25.1%) reported that they met with an advisor about GE 2 times. Almost one in four (21.9%) did not meet with an advisor at all about GE.
- 86.4% of students who had met with an advisor about GE were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their GE advising.
- A wide variety of sources were named as primary GE advisors. However, faculty in students' majors/departments stood out as the most commonly identified primary advisor (31.5%). This was followed by the college advising center (17.1%) and general studies faculty (16.2%).
- Advisors at Concord (1.9%), faculty not in students' majors/departments (2.5%) and Pioneer Success Coaches (2.6%) were least likely to be identified as primary GE advisors.

Table 11. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Primary Sources (n=2,642)

Q9. Please indicate your primary source(s) of information about GE (Check all that apply)	Count	Percent
Cal State East Bay Catalog	1,288	48.8%
Cal State East Bay Schedule of Classes	1,084	41.0%
Staff advisor	1,000	37.9%
General Education webpage	834	31.6%
Faculty member	641	24.3%
Cal State East Bay students	505	19.1%
Peer mentor	136	5.1%
Friends outside of Cal State East Bay	122	4.6%
Family members	110	4.2%
Other	73	2.8%
I do not know how to find information about my GE requirements	66	2.5%
Co-worker at Cal State East Bay	39	1.5%

A wide variety of “Other” sources of information about GE were named by 73 students. Degree Audit Reports (DAR) were among the most cited “Other” sources. Some students mentioned that they were transfer students and/or their GE requirements were already completed.

Table 12. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Frequency (n=2,642)

Q10. During the past year, how often did you meet with an advisor about GE?	Count	Percent
None (<i>skip to Q24</i>)	801	31.0%
1 time	924	35.8%
2 times	573	22.2%
3 times	183	7.1%
4 or more times	102	3.9%
	<i>No response</i>	--
Total	2,943	100.0%

Mean response: 1.17 times

Statistically Significant Differences

	Avg. # of times met		
During the past year, how often did you meet with an advisor about GE?	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	1.28	1.10	<.001
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	1.20	1.05	.009
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	1.51	1.10	<.001

Table 13. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Satisfaction (n=2,142)

Q11. How satisfied have you been with GE advising overall at East Bay?	Count	Percent	
Satisfied	1,050	59.8%	
Somewhat satisfied	467	26.6%	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	125	7.1%	
Somewhat dissatisfied	78	4.4%	
Dissatisfied	36	2.1%	
	<i>No response</i>	386	--
	<i>Not applicable</i>	801	--
Total	2,943	100.0%	

No statistically significant differences found in relation to satisfaction with GE advising.

Table 14. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Primary Advisor for GE (n=2,142)

Q12. Who is the primary advisor you see for GE information?	Count	Percent	
Faculty in my major/department	546	31.5%	
In my college advising center (e.g., CBE Office of Undergraduate Advising, CSCI/CLASS/CEAS Student Service Center)	297	17.1%	
General Studies Faculty Member	281	16.2%	
Advisor from Freshmen and Sophomore Success Team (FASST)	189	10.9%	
Student Success Program (e.g., Athletics, Center for International Education, EOP, EXCEL, Renaissance, SANKOFA, Transfer APASS, Veterans)	148	8.5%	
Peer Advisor/Mentor (e.g., Peer Academic Coach)	84	4.8%	
Other	70	4.0%	
Pioneer Success Coach advisor	45	2.6%	
Faculty not in my major/department	43	2.5%	
Advisor at Concord	33	1.9%	
	<i>No response</i>	406	--
	<i>Not applicable</i>	801	--
Total	2,943	100.0%	

A wide variety of "Other" primary GE advisors were named by 69 students. Among the most cited "Other" primary GE advisors were AACE, ADT, GANAS and PACE. A few students also cited advisors by name, suggesting that they might not be sure how they fit within the various categories.

Usefulness of Advice

Students were then asked to rate the usefulness of advice received from their primary GE advisor falling under six different categories (GE Related, University Policies and Requirements, Enrollment Support, Academic Support, Co-curricular Interests, and Career).

As shown in Tables 15 through 20:

- Enrollment Support and GE Related advice tended to receive the highest average ratings for usefulness. Specifically, “Advice about dropping, adding, or withdrawing from courses” was rated as the most useful.
- Advice about Co-curricular interests tended to receive the lowest average ratings for usefulness. Specifically, “Advice about obtaining information on co-curricular activities (e.g., clubs, organizations, campus events)” was rated as the least useful.
- Low-income students and Program Participants tended to find GE advising much more useful than their non-Low-income and non-Participant peers.

Table 15. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – GE Related
Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q14. GE Related Average response: 2.31	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Obtaining information on Lower Division GE requirements	1,480	85.3%	2.35
Obtaining information on Upper Division GE requirements	1,612	85.0%	2.36
Obtaining transfer GE course information	1,426	81.8%	2.28
Obtaining double-counting information for GE and other course requirements	1,479	79.7%	2.24

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Obtaining Information on Lower Division GE Requirements	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.41	2.30	.004
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.47	2.32	.002
Obtaining information on Upper Division GE requirements	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.43	2.31	.001
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.49	2.33	<.001
Obtaining transfer GE course information	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.36	2.22	.003
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.44	2.24	<.001
Obtaining double-counting information for GE and other course requirements	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.33	2.17	<.001
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.38	2.21	.003

Table 16. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – University Policies and Requirements
Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q15. University Policies and Requirements	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Average response: 2.12			
Obtaining information on academic policies, including holds and fees	1,488	79.7%	2.19
Obtaining information on second English composition, University Writing Skills Requirement (UWSR)	1,301	77.6%	2.14
Obtaining information on American Institutions (CODE) requirement	1,163	72.2%	2.03
Obtaining information on Overlay requirements	1,380	75.6%	2.12

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Obtaining information on academic policies, including holds and fees	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.28	2.12	<.001
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.29	2.16	.018
Obtaining information on second English composition, University Writing Skills Requirement (UWSR)	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.21	2.09	.015
Obtaining information on American Institutions (CODE) requirement	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.12	1.96	.004
Obtaining information on Overlay requirements	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.19	2.06	.010
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.23	2.09	.022

Table 17. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Enrollment Support
 Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q16. Enrollment Support	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Average response: 2.32			
Scheduling/registration procedures	1,536	84.6%	2.33
Dropping, adding, or withdrawing from courses	1,484	86.7%	2.37
Withdrawing or transferring from this institution	1,228	82.2%	2.27

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Scheduling/registration procedures	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.41	2.28	.001
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.44	2.31	.007
Dropping, adding, or withdrawing from courses	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	2.44	2.32	.002

	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.47	2.35	.006
Withdrawing or transferring from this institution	First Gen	Not First Gen	p-value
	2.30	2.20	.046

Table 18. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Academic Support
 Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q17. Academic Support Average response: 2.09	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Providing a referral relating to online learning and technology	1,253	77.4%	2.16
Improving my study skills and habits (e.g., time management)	1,268	74.1%	2.08
Providing a referral to tutorial assistance (or information about how to access tutoring support)	1,226	74.1%	2.08
Coping with academic difficulties/probation	1,116	74.7%	2.08
Providing a referral to accessibility services and/or other student support offices	1,146	75.5%	2.13
Providing a referral to Student Health and Counseling Services	1,110	74.7%	2.10
Dealing with personal (non-academic) challenges	1,089	72.2%	2.03
Obtaining basic need assistance (e.g., H.O.P.E., CalFresh)	1,051	75.3%	2.11
Providing a referral to financial aid assistance	1,207	75.6%	2.10
Providing a referral to employment on campus	1,031	74.5%	2.07

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Improving my study skills and habits (e.g., time management)	Program Participant 2.19	Non-Participant 2.04	p-value .025
Providing a referral to tutorial assistance (or information about how to access tutoring support)	Low-income 2.15	Non-Low-income 2.03	p-value .032
	Program Participant 2.25	Non-Participant 2.04	p-value .001
Providing a referral to accessibility services and/or other student support offices	Low-income 2.20	Non-Low-income 2.07	p-value .015
	Program Participant 2.30	Non-Participant 2.08	p-value <.001
Providing a referral to Student Health and Counseling Services	Program Participant 2.25	Non-Participant 2.06	p-value .003
Dealing with personal (non-academic) challenges	Program Participant 2.18	Non-Participant 1.99	p-value .008
Obtaining basic need assistance (e.g., H.O.P.E., CalFresh)	First Gen 2.15	Not First Gen 2.01	p-value .017
	Low-income 2.17	Non-Low-income 2.05	p-value .034
	Program Participant 2.24	Non-Participant 2.07	p-value .011
Providing a referral to financial aid assistance	Low-income 2.20	Non-Low-income 2.02	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 2.24	Non-Participant 2.06	p-value .006
Providing a referral to employment on campus	Program Participant 2.23	Non-Participant 2.03	p-value .004

Table 19. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Co-curricular Interests

Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q18. Co-curricular Interests Average Response: 2.00	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Obtaining information on Internships and research opportunities	1,229	71.8%	2.01
Obtaining information on co-curricular activities (e.g., clubs, organizations, campus events)	1,211	70.4%	1.98

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

	Mean Response		
Obtaining information on Internships and research opportunities	Program Participant 2.13	Non-Participant 1.97	p-value .018
Obtaining information on co-curricular activities (e.g., clubs, organizations, campus events)	Program Participant 2.12	Non-Participant 1.94	p-value .006

Table 20. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice - Career

Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q19. Career Average Response: 2.03	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Clarifying life and career goals	1,347	71.7%	2.03

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

	Mean Response		
Clarifying life and career goals	Program Participant 2.16	Non-Participant 2.00	p-value .010

Experiences with Primary GE Advisors

Students were also asked to indicate their level of agreement with various aspects of their experiences with their primary GE advisor falling under three different categories (Academic-related, Communication and Interpersonal).

Tables 21 through 23 show that:

- Items related to the Interpersonal experience tended to receive the highest levels of agreement. In particular, the statement “Treats me with respect” received the highest rate of agreement in this section of the survey.
- Academic-related items tended to receive the lowest levels of agreement. In particular, the statement “Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest” received the lowest rate of agreement in this section of the survey.

- Once again, Low-income students and Program Participants tended to have a much more positive experience with GE advising than their non-Low-income and non-Participant peers.

Table 21. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Experience with Primary GE Advisor – Academic-related
 Agree=5, Somewhat agree=4, Neither agree nor disagree=3, Somewhat disagree=2, Disagree=1

Q21. Academic-related Average Response: 4.30	N	% Agree/ Somewhat Agree	Mean Response
Provides me with accurate information about GE courses and requirements.	1,513	90.2%	4.52
Provides me with accurate information about required courses in my major, elective courses, academic policies, etc.	1,498	89.5%	4.50
Helps me understand why required courses are important for my academic program	1,444	84.8%	4.40
Helps me select courses or programs of study that match my personal abilities, talents, and interests	1,408	80.7%	4.25
Assists me in developing a long-term educational plan	1,418	82.5%	4.32
Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest	1,258	72.9%	4.07
Refers me to campus resources (e.g., SCAA, student health services, etc.)	1,226	78.5%	4.17
Helps me identify academic obstacles I need to overcome to reach my educational goals	1,244	77.1%	4.15

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Provides me with accurate information about GE courses and requirements.	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	4.60	4.47	.001
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	4.64	4.50	.002
Provides me with accurate information about required courses in my major, elective courses, academic policies, etc.	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	4.57	4.46	.006
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	4.53	4.37	.037
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	4.58	4.49	.051
	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value

Helps me understand why required courses are important for my academic program	4.52	4.31	<.001
	URM 4.43	Non-URM 4.18	p-value .005
Helps me select courses or programs of study that match my personal abilities, talents, and interests	Low-income 4.35	Non-Low-income 4.18	p-value .003
	Program Participant 4.40	Non-Participant 4.22	p-value .007
Assists me in developing a long-term educational plan	Low-income 4.43	Non-Low-income 4.23	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 4.50	Non-Participant 4.27	p-value <.001
Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest	Low-income 4.20	Non-Low-income 3.96	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 4.27	Non-Participant 4.01	p-value <.001
Refers me to campus resources (e.g., SCAA, student health services, etc.)	Low-income 4.27	Non-Low-income 4.09	p-value .005
	Program Participant 4.46	Non-Participant 4.09	p-value <.001
Helps me identify academic obstacles I need to overcome to reach my educational goals	Low-income 4.28	Non-Low-income 4.05	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 4.40	Non-Participant 4.08	p-value <.001

Table 22. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Experience with Primary GE Advisor - Communication
 Agree=5, Somewhat agree=4, Neither agree nor disagree=3, Somewhat disagree=2, Disagree=1

Q22. Communication Average Response: 4.35	N	% Agree/ Somewhat Agree	Mean Response
Has been available when needed	1,511	86.6%	4.41
Allows sufficient time to discuss issues or problems	1,479	86.0%	4.43
Takes the initiative to arrange meetings with me	1,423	75.6%	4.10
Actively listens to my concerns	1,470	86.3%	4.45

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Has been available when needed	Program Participant 4.59	Non-Participant 4.37	p-value <.001
Allows sufficient time to discuss issues or problems	Low-income 4.50	Non-Low-income 4.39	p-value .021
	Program Participant 4.59	Non-Participant 4.40	p-value <.001
Takes the initiative to arrange meetings with me	First-Gen 4.15	Not First-Gen 4.00	p-value .039
	Low-income 4.24	Non-Low-income 3.99	p-value <.001
	URM 4.16	Non-URM 3.72	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 4.37	Non-Participant 4.03	p-value <.001
Actively listens to my concerns	Low-income 4.53	Non-Low-income 4.40	p-value .004
	Program Participant 4.63	Non-Participant 4.41	p-value <.001

Table 23. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Experience with Primary GE Advisor - Interpersonal
Agree=5, Somewhat agree=4, Neither agree nor disagree=3, Somewhat disagree=2, Disagree=1

Q23. Interpersonal Average Response: 4.38	N	% Agree/ Somewhat Agree	Mean Response
Takes a personal interest in me	1,394	74.0%	4.11
Encourages me to express my thoughts and feelings	1,368	75.2%	4.16
Respects my identity and culture	1,364	86.1%	4.52

Cares about my overall well-being	1,397	80.7%	4.35
Treats me with respect	1,480	91.8%	4.67
Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students	1,465	86.0%	4.48

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Takes a personal interest in me	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	4.18	4.05	.039
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	4.13	3.93	.043
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	4.38	4.04	<.001
Encourages me to express my thoughts and feelings	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	4.23	4.11	.045
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	4.19	3.98	.041
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	4.46	4.08	<.001
Respects my identity and culture	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	4.69	4.47	<.001
Cares about my overall well-being	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	4.54	4.30	<.001
Treats me with respect	First-Gen	Not First-Gen	p-value
	4.70	4.61	.022
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	4.75	4.65	.016
Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students	Low-income	Non-Low-income	p-value
	4.55	4.43	.010
	URM	Non-URM	p-value
	4.52	4.31	.014

	Program Participant	Non- Participant	p-value
	4.62	4.45	.002

Reasons for not visiting with a GE advisor

Question 10 asked students how often they met with an advisor about GE. Students who selected “None” as their answer choice were skipped forward to the following question:

Q24. Please explain why you have not visited with a GE advisor in the past year.

434 of the 500 students who were asked this question responded. Among the primary reasons cited for not visiting with a GE advisor:

- GE courses were already complete (mentioned by nearly half of the respondents)
- They could figure things out for themselves/advice was not needed
- It was difficult to schedule appointments/connect with an advisor
- It was unclear how the advising system worked or who their advisor was
- COVID-19 made it more challenging to meet for both personal and logistical reasons
- Email was sufficient for handling questions or the only way advisors could be reached
- Other advisors answered their questions about GE
- Past meetings with advisors had not been helpful or were unpleasant
- Personal schedules were too busy and/or conflicted with advisor schedules.

“Completed most of my GE at a community college and only had a few classes left. I felt it was pretty straight forward.”

“I had a sense of what I needed to take in order to complete my GEs from the degree audit report from my CSUEB.”

“I have tried. I have emailed and called and been told every time no one is available.”

“It was too difficult to find somebody to talk to. The hours and navigation were not clear.”

“I don't know how or where or what the procedure is. I just struggle and try to figure everything out on my own.”

“Lack of access/inconsistent follow-up. Connecting with advising has been difficult during pandemic restrictions.”

“My advisor is only reachable via email.”

“I have found my athletic advisor more helpful with GE information in the past.”

“It felt like I was on my own. When I reached out my questions weren't answered. I felt like I may have been a burden or the advisor was too busy to help me.”

“Last one didn't provide adequate details. Seemed like they were new.”

“Seemed like too much work for little reward; didn't want to use time to potentially feel unsatisfied with hearing something I might've already known.”

Section 4. Major Academic Advising

The next series of questions asked students about their experience with their **major academic advisor**. Tables 24 through 27 feature student responses to questions about their experience with their major academic advisor.

- The top three sources for information about majors were the Cal State East Bay catalog (46.6%), the Cal State East Bay Schedule of Classes (34.6%), and Staff advisors (33.8%).
- Very few students consulted Cal State East Bay co-workers (1.5%), and only 2.5% did not know how to find GE information.
- It was most common for students to meet with an advisor about their major 1 time (43.8%), although nearly one-third of respondents (29.2%) reported that they met with an advisor about their major 2 times. Only around one in ten respondents (12.2%) did not meet with an advisor at all about their major.
- 88.8% of students who had met with an advisor about their major were satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their advising.
- Faculty in students' majors/departments stood out by far as the most common primary advisor for major information (54.0%). This was followed by the college advising center (14.4%) and FASST advisors (8.1%).
- Advisors at Concord (1.1%), faculty not in students' majors/departments (1.6%), Pioneer Success Coaches (2.5%), and Peer Advisors/Mentors (2.5%) were least likely to be identified as primary advisors for major information.

Table 24. Major Academic Advising (n=2,642)

Q26. Please indicate your primary source(s) of information about your major (Check all that apply)	Count	Percent
Cal State East Bay Catalog	1,230	46.6%
Cal State East Bay Schedule of Classes	914	34.6%
Staff advisor	894	33.8%
Faculty member	701	26.5%
General Education webpage	550	20.8%
Cal State East Bay students	440	16.7%
Peer mentor	91	3.4%
Friends outside of Cal State East Bay	87	3.3%
Family members	86	3.3%
Other	60	2.3%
Co-worker at Cal State East Bay	28	1.1%
I do not know how to find information about my major requirements	23	0.9%

A wide variety of "Other" primary sources of information about majors were named by 59 students. Degree Audit Reports/Roadmaps were among the most cited "Other" sources of information.

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Faculty member	First Gen 24%	Not First Gen 32%	p-value <.001
Cal State East Bay students	URM 18%	Non-URM 12%	p-value .004
Peer mentor	Program Participant 5%	Non-Participant 3%	p-value .043
Friends outside of Cal State East Bay	Pell eligible 4%	Non-Pell eligible 3%	p-value .046
Family members	First Gen 3%	Not First Gen 5%	p-value .011
	Program Participant 2%	Non-Participant 4%	p-value .045

Table 25. Major Academic Advising: Frequency (n=2,642)

Q27. During the past year, how often did you meet with an advisor about your major?	Count	Percent
None (<i>skip to Q41</i>)	546	23.6%
1 time	881	38.1%
2 times	587	25.4%
3 times	183	7.9%
4 or more times	115	5.0%
	<i>No response</i> 631	--
Total	2,943	100.0%

Mean response: 1.33 times

	Avg. # of times met		
During the past year, how often did you meet with an advisor about your major?	First Gen 1.29	Not First Gen 1.39	p-value .052
	Program Participant 1.53	Non-Participant 1.29	p-value <.001

Table 26. Major Academic Advising: Satisfaction (n=2,397)

Q28. How satisfied are you with academic advising related to your major to meet the requirements of your major?	Count	Percent	
Satisfied	1,115	64.8%	
Somewhat satisfied	414	24.0%	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	99	5.7%	
Somewhat dissatisfied	61	3.5%	
Dissatisfied	33	1.9%	
	<i>No response</i>	675	--
	<i>Not applicable</i>	546	--
Total	2,943	100.0%	

No statistically significant differences found in relation to satisfaction with major-related advising.

Table 27. Major Academic Advising: Primary Advisor for major advising (n=2,397)

Q29. Who is the primary advisor you see for major information?	Count	Percent	
Faculty in my major/department	923	54.0%	
In my college advising center (e.g., CBE Office of Undergraduate Advising, CSCI/CLASS/CEAS Student Service Center)	246	14.4%	
Advisor from Freshmen and Sophomore Success Team (FASST)	138	8.1%	
Student Success Program (e.g., Athletics, Center for International Education, EOP, EXCEL, Renaissance, SANKOFA, Transfer APASS, Veterans)	108	6.3%	
General Studies Faculty Member	107	6.3%	
Other	56	3.3%	
Peer Advisor/Mentor (e.g., Peer Academic Coach)	42	2.5%	
Pioneer Success Coach advisor	42	2.5%	
Faculty not in my major/department	28	1.6%	
Advisor at Concord	19	1.1%	
	<i>No response</i>	688	--
	<i>Not applicable</i>	546	--
Total	2,943	100.0	

A wide variety of “Other” primary sources of information about majors were named by 56 students. Among the most cited “Other” primary major advisors were ADT, Online Business Program Advisors, and PACE. Several students also cited advisors by name. Many are unsure how their advisors fit within the various categories/advising structure at CSUEB. In the words of one student, “I don’t understand these options. I met with [AW] and [TP] who are both great.” And another, “I don’t know where they are from or what department.”

Usefulness of Advice

Students were then asked to rate the usefulness of advice received from their primary major advisor falling under six different categories (Major Related, University Policies and Requirements, Enrollment Support, Academic Support, Co-curricular Interests, and Career).

As shown in Tables 28 through 33:

- Major Related advice tended to receive the highest average ratings for usefulness. In particular, “Advice about obtaining information on major requirements for graduation” was rated as the most useful.
- Advice about Co-curricular interests tended to receive the lowest average ratings for usefulness. In particular, “Advice about obtaining information on Internships and research opportunities” was rated as the least useful.
- There were far fewer significant differences in usefulness of advice from major advisors compared to GE advisors. However, there were many instances in which Program Participants found advice to be more useful than their non-Participant peers. There were also some instances in which First Gen, Low-income, and Non-URM students found advice to be more useful than their Not First Gen, Non-Low-income, and URM peers, respectively.

Table 28. Major Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Major Related
 Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q31. Major Related Average Response: 2.39	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Selecting/changing my major	1,241	86.6%	2.43
Obtaining information on major requirements for graduation	1,550	87.5%	2.44
Obtaining information on major electives	1,514	83.6%	2.35
Completing my major form and/or graduation application	1,270	84.6%	2.39
Obtaining Associate Degree for Transfer Information	1,014	83.7%	2.34

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Selecting/changing my major	URM 2.43	Non-URM 2.57	p-value .014
Obtaining information on major requirements for graduation	Low-income 2.49	Non-Low-income 2.41	p-value .049
	Program Participant 2.52	Non-Participant 2.42	p-value .052
Completing my major form and/or graduation application	Program Participant 2.49	Non-Participant 2.36	p-value .024
Obtaining Associate Degree for Transfer Information	Program Participant 2.48	Non-Participant 2.30	p-value .013

Table 29. Major Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – University Policies and Requirements
 Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q32. University Policies and Requirements Average Response: 2.24	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Obtaining information on academic policies, including holds and fees	1,264	82.5%	2.29
Obtaining information on second English composition, Writing Skills Test (WTS)	1,087	81.0%	2.25
Obtaining information on American Institutions (CODE) requirement	975	75.8%	2.15

Obtaining information on Overlay requirements	1,191	80.0%	2.26
---	-------	-------	------

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Obtaining information on academic policies, including holds and fees	Program Participant 2.41	Non-Participant 2.26	p-value .014
Obtaining information on second English composition, Writing Skills Test (WTS)	Program Participant 2.38	Non-Participant 2.22	p-value .016
Obtaining information on Overlay requirements	Program Participant 2.38	Non-Participant 2.23	p-value .018

Table 30. Major Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Enrollment Support

Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q33. Enrollment Support Average Response: 2.36	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Scheduling/registration procedures	1,414	84.3%	2.36
Dropping/adding/withdrawing from courses	1,350	85.4%	2.37
Withdrawing or transferring from this institution	1,060	83.3%	2.34

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Scheduling/registration procedures	Low-income 2.44	Non-Low-income 2.30	p-value .003
	Program Participant 2.48	Non-Participant 2.33	p-value .008
Dropping/adding/withdrawing from courses	Program Participant 2.47	Non-Participant 2.35	p-value .017

Table 31. Major Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Academic Support
 Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q34. Academic Support Average Response: 2.21	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Providing a referral relating to online learning and technology	1,124	82.2%	2.27
Improving my study skills and habits (e.g., time management)	1,138	78.9%	2.19
Providing a referral to tutorial assistance (or information about how to access tutoring support)	1,074	79.4%	2.20
Coping with academic difficulties/probation	995	79.3%	2.21
Providing a referral to accessibility services and/or other student support offices	1,048	81.0%	2.24
Providing a referral to Student Health and Counseling Services	991	79.5%	2.23
Dealing with personal (non-academic) challenges	1,005	78.0%	2.17
Obtaining basic need assistance (e.g., H.O.P.E., CalFresh)	918	77.8%	2.17
Providing a referral to financial aid assistance	1,039	79.9%	2.22
Providing a referral to employment on campus	929	77.0%	2.16

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Improving my study skills and habits (e.g., time management)	Program Participant 2.31	Non-Participant 2.15	p-value .028
Providing a referral to tutorial assistance (or information about how to access tutoring support)	Program Participant 2.33	Non-Participant 2.17	p-value .019
Coping with academic difficulties/probation	Program Participant 2.33	Non-Participant 2.18	p-value .041
Providing a referral to accessibility services and/or other student support offices	URM 2.21	Non-URM 2.47	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 2.38	Non-Participant 2.20	p-value .009
Providing a referral to Student Health and Counseling Services	URM 2.21	Non-URM 2.40	p-value .036
	Program Participant 2.35	Non-Participant 2.20	p-value .029
Dealing with personal (non-academic) challenges	Program Participant 2.32	Non-Participant 2.13	p-value .015
Obtaining basic need assistance (e.g., H.O.P.E., CalFresh)	Program Participant 2.32	Non-Participant 2.13	p-value .011
Providing a referral to financial aid assistance	Program Participant 2.34	Non-Participant 2.19	p-value .043
Providing a referral to employment on campus	Program Participant 2.31	Non-Participant 2.12	p-value .018

Table 32. Major Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Co-curricular Interests

Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q35. Co-curricular Interests	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Average Response: 2.12			
Obtaining information on Internships and research opportunities	1,186	74.5%	2.12
Obtaining information on co-curricular activities (e.g., clubs, organizations, campus events)	1,109	75.9%	2.12

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
	First Gen	Not First Gen	p-value
Obtaining information on Internships and research opportunities	2.16	2.04	.049
	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.26	2.08	.011
Obtaining information on co-curricular activities (e.g., clubs, organizations, campus events)	Program Participant	Non-Participant	p-value
	2.26	2.08	.014

Table 33. Major Academic Advising: Usefulness of Advice – Career Exploration
 Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

Q36. Career Exploration	N	% Very Useful/ Useful	Mean Response
Average Response: 2.14			
Clarifying life and career goals	1,274	75.7%	2.14

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

No statistically significant differences found in relation to usefulness of major advising related to career exploration.

Experiences with Primary Major Advisors

Students were also asked to indicate their level of agreement with various aspects of their experiences with their primary major advisor falling under three different categories (Academic-related, Communication and Interpersonal).

Tables 34 through 36 show that:

- Items related to the Interpersonal experience tended to receive the highest levels of agreement. In particular, the statement “Treats me with respect” received the highest rate of agreement.
- Academic-related items tended to receive the lowest levels of agreement. However, the lowest rated item overall fell under the Communication category. The statement “Takes the initiative to arrange meetings with me” received the lowest rate of agreement.
- There were fewer significant differences in the advising experience with major advisors compared to GE advisors. However, there were again many instances in which Program Participants had a more positive advising experience than their non-Participant peers, and there were some instances in which First Gen, Low-income, and URM students had a more positive advising experience than their Not First Gen, Non-Low-income, and Non-URM peers, respectively.

Table 34. Major Academic Advising: Experience with Primary Major Advisor – Academic-related
Agree=5, Somewhat agree=4, Neither agree nor disagree=3, Somewhat disagree=2, Disagree=1

Q38. Academic-related Average Response: 4.33	N	% Agree/ Somewhat Agree	Mean Response
Provides me with accurate information about GE courses and requirements.	1,374	86.7%	4.43
Provides me with accurate information about required courses in my major, elective courses, academic policies, etc.	1,449	88.8%	4.51
Helps me understand why required courses are important for my academic program	1,369	85.5%	4.41
Helps me select courses or programs of study that match my personal abilities, talents, and interests	1,333	81.9%	4.29
Assists me in developing a long-term educational plan	1,364	84.6%	4.35
Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest	1,211	78.9%	4.18
Refers me to campus resources (e.g., SCAA, student health services, etc.)	1,098	80.0%	4.22
Helps me identify academic obstacles I need to overcome to reach my educational goals	1,154	80.2%	4.21

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Provides me with accurate information about GE courses and requirements.	Low-income 4.50	Non-Low-income 4.39	p-value .032
	Program Participant 4.54	Non-Participant 4.41	p-value .041
Helps me understand why required courses are important for my academic program	Low-income 4.47	Non-Low-income 4.37	p-value .048
Assists me in developing a long-term educational plan	Program Participant 4.51	Non-Participant 4.32	p-value .003
Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest	Program Participant 4.36	Non-Participant 4.14	p-value .007
Refers me to campus resources (e.g., SCAA, student health services, etc.)	Program Participant 4.40	Non-Participant 4.18	p-value .010
Helps me identify academic obstacles I need to overcome to reach my educational goals	Program Participant 4.36	Non-Participant 4.18	p-value .029

Table 35. Major Academic Advising: Experience with Primary Major Advisor - Communication
 Agree=5, Somewhat agree=4, Neither agree nor disagree=3, Somewhat disagree=2, Disagree=1

Q39. Communication Average Response: 4.35	N	% Agree/ Somewhat Agree	Mean Response
Has been available when needed	1,444	86.1%	4.43
Allows sufficient time to discuss issues or problems	1,425	86.0%	4.45
Takes the initiative to arrange meetings with me	1,347	75.5%	4.08
Actively listens to my concerns	1,393	85.7%	4.44

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Has been available when needed	Program Participant 4.53	Non-Participant 4.41	p-value .050
Takes the initiative to arrange meetings with me	First Gen 4.16	Not First Gen 3.95	p-value .006
	Low-income 4.19	Non-Low-income 4.01	p-value .012
	URM 4.16	Non-URM 3.74	p-value <.001
	Program Participant 4.31	Non-Participant 4.04	p-value .001
Actively listens to my concerns	Program Participant 4.57	Non-Participant 4.41	p-value .005

Table 36. Major Academic Advising: Experience with Primary Major Advisor - Interpersonal
 Agree=5, Somewhat agree=4, Neither agree nor disagree=3, Somewhat disagree=2, Disagree=1

Q40. Interpersonal Average Response: 4.43	N	% Agree/ Somewhat Agree	Mean response
Takes a personal interest in me	1,325	78.5%	4.22
Encourages me to express my thoughts and feelings	1,321	80.4%	4.29
Respects my identity and culture	1,311	87.2%	4.55
Cares about my overall well-being	1,328	82.8%	4.41
Treats me with respect	1,398	91.0%	4.63
Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students	1,399	85.7%	4.46

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Statistically Significant Differences

	Mean Response		
Treats me with respect.	Program Participant 4.72	Non-Participant 4.62	p-value .025

Reasons for not visiting with a major advisor

Question 27 asked students how often they met with an advisor about their major. Students who selected “None” as their answer choice were skipped forward to the following question:

Q41. Please explain why you have not visited with a major advisor in the past year.

214 of the 245 students who were asked this question responded. The primary reasons cited for not visiting a major advisor were almost identical to the reasons for not meeting with a GE advisor.

Among the reasons:

- There was no need either because they were about to graduate or because it was too soon (e.g., they were freshmen)
- There was no need because they could figure it out on their own
- It was difficult to schedule appointments/connect with an advisor
- It was unclear how the advising system worked or who their advisor was; several students did not realize that there was such a thing as a major advisor
- COVID-19 made it more challenging to meet for both personal and logistical reasons
- Email was sufficient for handling questions or was the only way advisors could be reached
- Questions were answered through other sources/advisors
- Past meetings with advisors had not been helpful or had been unpleasant
- Personal schedules were too busy and/or conflicted with advisor schedules.

“I had no reason to in terms of discussing my major. I am about to graduate and only needed to take a few last classes.”

“To be honest, I didn’t think I needed to. I was keeping track of what classes I needed on my own, specifically using my DAR.”

“I have tried by emailing 2 advising faculty members (once last semester and once this semester) and neither of them ever wrote back to me.”

“Everything is booked up and I have no idea who to go to.”

“They don’t seem available...not interested in me.”

“I feel like a number and I don’t even know what it is.”

“I don’t know who this person is. I didn’t realize there is an advisor for GE and another for my major.”

“Tried to reach a few advisors. Two of them responded. One gave me directions to go to someone else. And other advisor didn’t help.”

“They offer conflicting, often outdated and misleading information. They do not have student’s best interests in mind, and some faculty are not understanding of financial difficulties and are not impartial toward student’s issues.”

Feedback from Students Who Have Not Interacted with An Academic Advisor in Any Form

Question 5 asked students about their various interactions with advisors in the past year. Those who reported that they “have not interacted with an academic advisor in any form,” were skipped forward to a series of questions that asked for feedback about advising from their unique perspective.

- As shown in Table 37, among students who had not interacted with an academic advisor in any form, catalogues, schedules and websites were the most common sources of information used to obtain information about GE, major and university requirements. Individual sources such as faculty, family members, friends and colleagues were not cited as frequently.
- Only 3% of respondents who had not interacted with an advisor did not know how to find information.
- Non-URM students were more likely than URM students to get their information from family members. Program Participants were less likely than non-Participants to get their information from the General Education page on Cal State East Bay website and friends outside of Cal State East Bay.

Table 37. Major Academic Advising (n=301)

Q42. Please indicate where you go to most often for information or advice on General Education (GE), major, or university requirements. (Check all that apply)	Count	Percent
Cal State East Bay Catalog	139	46.2%
Cal State East Bay Schedule of Classes	136	45.2%
General Education page on Cal State East Bay website	108	35.9%
Other areas on Cal State East Bay website	75	24.9%
Cal State East Bay students	59	19.6%
Faculty member	32	10.6%
Family members	22	7.3%
Other	21	7.0%
Friends outside of East Bay	20	6.6%
Staff advisor	19	6.3%
Peer mentor	15	5.0%
I don't know how to find information about my GE, major, or university requirements	9	3.0%
Co-worker at Cal State East Bay	6	2.0%

A variety of “Other” information sources were named by 21 students. There were no predominant themes although MyCSUEB and DAR Reports were mentioned more than once.

Statistically Significant Differences

	y		
General Education page on Cal State East Bay website	Program Participant 2%	Non-Participant 4%	p-value .008
Family members	URM 6%	Non-URM 16%	p-value .037
Friends outside of East Bay	Program Participant 0%	Non-Participant 1%	p-value .045

*1 cell had an expected count of less than 5, so Fisher's Exact Test results were used to test for significance.

These same students who had not interacted with an academic advisor in any form were also asked two additional questions to gather feedback about advising from their perspective. The first was: **Q43. Can you tell us why you have not visited with an academic advisor in the past year?**

243 students shared feedback. Reasons were along the same vein as those which were given earlier in the survey for not meeting with GE and major advisors. Among the most predominant themes:

- There was no need to meet.
- COVID-19 made things more challenging.
- Advisors were unresponsive/difficult to contact.
- The advising system is difficult to navigate/unclear; several students feel as if they are just being shuffled around.
- Past experiences were unpleasant or not helpful.
- Personal schedules were too busy and/or conflicted with advisor schedules.

"Didn't know I had to. I get emailed my checklist of what I have taken I know what I need to take. I just sign up and take my classes."

"After the pandemic I did not know how to contact them."

"Appointments are booked."

"I emailed several time and ask to be in contact with an advisor but no one has replied to me since January."

"Had no info on who it was and how it worked. I tried once and a very rude person said you don't call us and didn't tell me who to talk to. I figured it out myself."

"Every time I have tried to contact someone to help me figure out which upper division classes I need, I am told to contact a different person, and it has happened multiple times. And no matter what contact information I find on the website or am given it doesn't seem to be the correct person. So I have given up..."

"I need a major advisor but they keep sending me to a GE advisor even though I have seen a GE advisor 3 times and know I finished my GE classes 2 years ago. I got tired of being rerouted and handed off to different people."

"I'm confused as to who is my advisor now. Freshmans have one advisor, STEP has another, and now that I'm a junior, I don't know who's my advisor now. I also heard advisor change based on major and I changed my major a couple of times."

"When I transferred into the school, I had a bad experience with the advisor. I didn't want to deal with that again so I just look everything up on my own."

"All he does is tell me what classes will fulfill my degree requirements which I can easily look up myself. I felt that my academic advisor was also very rude and I feel misguided by their comments regarding my degree. I feel like my academic advisor wanted to see me fail."

The second question was:

Q44. How can academic advisors at East Bay create a relationship with you to better support your educational and career goals?

203 students shared feedback. In light of the reasons that students gave for not meeting with an advisor, their recommendations were not surprising, and mainly fell under some very basic themes related to communication and personalization, much of which is aligned with the Predictive Analytics and Proactive Advising (PAPA) initiative. Students would like to see more...

Kindness

"Sometimes they are a little intimidating. It would be nice not to feel so judged."

"Try to be helpful and don't ignore or bat away concerns students have."

"Get better general advisors that actually care about the students."

Student-centeredness

"Advice centered around helping students succeed."

"Listen to our needs."

"By actually giving useful information, and taking the time to give me the understanding to make good decisions for myself instead of just making decisions for me."

Outreach

"Maybe have assigned advisor that check in. Or if the advising team sees students aren't meeting their requirements, to reach out because some of us don't even know we need one more class and then when we apply to graduation they're like, hey you can't graduate unless you finish just one more class...!"

"Contact me, introduce themselves, and let me know how they can help."

"For them to check up on students. People like me tend to get blindsided by certain things so having them set the record straight is better."

"Reach out to us. I know emailing all of us is hard but it's nice to know they're here."

Accessibility

“Have more hours and be more flexible.”

“Respond to emails.”

“I think advisors can give us their email so we can directly contact them when we have questions.”

“Connect with me. I am struggling with what to do with my degree after college.”

Clarity

“Advertise what exactly they can do for us so that it will be less of a gamble of spending the time and energy to try and meet/talk to one of them.”

“Make it easier to locate and contact your major advisor. The only way I found out who my major advisor was supposed to be was by attending one of her classes and having all the other students tell me that is who they have as a major advisor.”

Accuracy

“Advising correctly on what classes to take.”

“I would like advisors to have more familiarity with the catalog for the upcoming semester. I first met with an academic advisor who recommended a GE course and said that they had directed students to that class before, but the class in question had not been available for about a year at that point and was absent from the upcoming catalog.”

Section 5. Additional Feedback and Suggestions from Students

At the end of the survey, there was space for all students to provide additional comments or suggestions for improving advising at CSUEB. These responses were coded in Nvivo qualitative software. Students were asked two questions: 1) If you could change one thing about academic advising, what would it be? And 2) In what ways can academic advisors at East Bay develop a closer relationship with you as a student? Because students responded to both questions in a similar vein, they were coded together for analysis. The predominant themes, presented on the following pages, were similar to those which were echoed throughout the survey, reiterating how consistent and important they are to students.

There is a need for more outreach and communication

By far, the most frequent suggestion for both qualitative questions—the one thing they would change about advising and how advisor-student relationships could be improved—was increased outreach and communication from advising at CSUEB. One of the most common suggestions within this theme was for advisors to be more proactive in reaching out to students first, rather than the relying on students to initiate contact. Some students pointed out that one advantage to this approach is that it may inform or remind students of the advising resources available to them.

“I would say some need to be more proactive. I just found out that my major advisor is supposed to reach out to me every semester, but that is not the case.”

“Have advisors reach out themselves maybe. A lot of students aren’t aware how to approach advisors or where to go.”

“Have the academic advisor reach out yearly to make sure students are on track with the necessary classes and see if their health and well-being is good.”

“Advisors should proactively contact students, especially new students like me, to discuss about academic plan[s] and goals and to provide the guide in details fitting each student if possible.”

“Make it well known that they are the main people to talk with when things are unclear.”

“Don’t assume that students are aware of every support system on campus.”

Many students are having difficulty navigating advising resources

When asked the one thing they would change about advising, CSUEB students also expressed having difficulty with navigating advising resources. Some shared that it was challenging to book advising appointments online.

“Make the online appointment advising service more accessible and user friendly. I am never able to book an appointment online with my Excel counselor for some reason. The system does not allow me to make an appointment using the online service page.”

“...have an appointment button in MyCSUEB because getting an advisor is difficult to navigate.”

Others shared that they needed more information regarding whom to reach out to for advising and how. These responses ranged from students not knowing who their advisors are, to others not knowing how to go about selecting a major advisor. Some students shared that they would prefer all their advisors being assigned to them from the start.

“It would be nice if students are made aware who to contact for specific advising, whether it would be general education advising or major advising.”

“Tell us who exactly our advisor is—like, I had to go through so many advisors to figure out who my advisor was.”

“I think a list of advisors and contact information should be readily available to students, i.e. information should be easily found in MyCSUEB.”

“An assigned advisor from the beginning of the transfer.”

Some students also suggested that resources could be expanded or improved. Some of these suggestions were regarding potential changes to the online advising resources, while others focused on creating more digestible handouts or checklists for course requirements.

“Under the ‘majors’ tab, list the advisors for that concentration with their emails. Like you have for the professors.”

“The UI/UX on the platform really needs to be fixed. It’s super confusing and the furthest thing from intuitive.”

“It was confusing about the number of units I needed to have to graduate between total and upper division. Maybe have something that explains this more clearly available for students.”

“Maybe giving an initial roadmap to students for both GE and majors, like a rubric. Advising is nice once you get into it but just even knowing to do that would be nice coming into the college, rather than finding out halfway through the semester.”

“Having visuals of what they are discussing. Example is GE/class requirements that is equal what CSU is offering if you came from a community college.”

Students expressed concerns about advisor accessibility and responsiveness

Students shared their concerns about the accessibility and responsiveness of advisors. This theme was prevalent in responses to both qualitative questions. In particular, students expressed difficulty with long wait times, getting advisors to respond when they reach out, scheduling appointments, overall access to advising. Some also shared that when they are able to make an appointment, the meetings are too short to have all their questions answered. Others suggested that there’s a need more advisors in general.

“Continue to be available and [show] willingness to help with any questions students may have (especially providing support for new students).”

“More available appointments or longer appointments to have time to discuss everything needed.”

“Making it easier for students to make an appointment or having more availability since appointments get filled very quick.”

“From my experience, AACE has always been very difficult to contact. Even when going in person I have been turned down.”

Some students shared how advisor responsiveness had impacted their academic planning and trajectory—for some, responses or available appointments with advisors came too late after they had already had to make decisions about courses.

“To divide the work amongst the counselors rather than having one person handle it all. It adds so much stress on the individual [...] students fall behind in planning their future in this college because of someone carrying a heavy load of students.”

“I would appreciate for the online program if the advisors would actually communicate. I’ve emailed the advisor previously for the online business program to get a one sentence response when questioning a class transfer from CSU Sacramento only to be told I cannot transfer it. I repeat the class and next semester I find out the CSU Sacramento class is honored and I’ve unnecessarily repeated a class. [It] feels like the advisors don’t care about advising.”

“I emailed the Advising Department on October 31, 2020 to schedule an appointment to talk about my enrollment that was coming up in 2 weeks, and nobody responded to me until the middle of February. I felt that I couldn’t take Advising seriously anymore and it made me even more mad that I am paying tuition for an advisor that got back to me four months later.”

Others pointed out that improved email communication could actually alleviate some of the need for advisor meetings—freeing up valuable time for both staff and students.

“That they should respond to their emails more or have different ways of managing it. I want to ask little questions that don’t require me to make an appointment so I don’t want to have to make an appointment to ask a 5 minute question.”

Along similar lines, when students did engage with advisors, they reported sometimes feeling rushed or intimidated. Some recommended that advisors should allot more time to students based on their needs. Others noted that if advisors made efforts to be more approachable to students, this would improve accessibility.

“I feel like the times I’ve met with an advisor it almost feels rushed, I think time management would be a good place to start. Making sure the meeting time matches the students needs.”

“Be more approachable. Many staff members approach students in a manner that makes it seem like they’re only doing it because they’re supposed to.”

Better social-emotional awareness and support can help improve relationships

When asked how advisor-student relationships could be improved, there was a prominent theme around social-emotional awareness and support. Students expressed that it was important to them to know that advisors are genuinely invested in their success and there to help. Some students reported feeling that advisors did not always extend grace and patience during advising meetings, especially given how difficult it can be to navigate advising resources. One student even noted that while their unpleasant interactions had been with faculty and not their advisor, these moments still made them hesitant to seek out advising help.

“First and foremost, by being friendly, and by being genuinely concerned about their students. By taking on initiative or provide tips and helping the student set up small goals relating to the student’s academic major.”

“Open communication, showing interests and concerns to students and being approachable and supportive as well.”

“I understand advisors have a lot of workload, but it is important to show students you remember them and care about their success.”

“The times I have had to talk to some sort of faculty, they come off as intimidating and make us feel less than because we’re lost and it somehow feels we’re expected to know what is happening. This was not about an advisor, but it’s experiences like these that at least for me prevent me from reaching out to an advisor.”

Some also shared that they wished advisors would take personal context into consideration more when providing advice to students. For example, some students work full-time or have children and need advisors to factor that into their interactions and recommendations.

“I would like the AACE advisors to be more understanding when a student has a different schedule/ course load from other students due to personal reasons or concerns.”

“Understand that not all students are older and we need more guidance while we complete our program.”

There is a need for personalized support around goals

Similar to the need that students expressed for more social-emotional awareness from advisors, students shared that personalized support could also improve advisor-advisee relationships. In particular, students noted that it is important for advisors to get to know students and their personal goals and take that into consideration while advising students. Not only did they feel it would improve relationships between students and advisors, but it would also allow for the advising to be more useful, as advisors would be tailoring their recommendations based on the students’ academic and career goals.

“Most of the time, my advisor was focused on helping me with any question I had about my academics. Perhaps also trying to ask about things we do outside of our classes might help them form better ideas of what we can do in order to reach a place where we are satisfied with our major and future career plans.”

“Instead of just answering questions, maybe ask about what students’ plans are and work together with the students to plan out the coming years. It will definitely require a lot more time commitment and personal interest for each student, so not sure how that’ll work for many students to one advisor.”

“Probably believe in our capabilities. I feel that there have been times where I was told ‘no that’s too many units for you to handle’ when I know I can do it.”

Attention should be paid to making sure that information provided is accurate

When asked how advisor-student relationships could be improved, students expressed that more time and attention should be given to ensuring that the information advisors are sharing is accurate. This was similar to a concern that was shared among advisors, with some faculty advisors in particular fearing that they did not have the capacity to ensure that all the information students are receiving is accurate.

“They should be more careful when they arrange classes for students. Advisor[s] must have good knowledge about the course catalog and GE upper division with overlay classes.”

“Do not make students spend more time at the school because YOU overlooked the requirements.”

“I don’t need a close relationship. I need reliable information and a roadmap spelling out exactly what classes are required to graduate.”

“It would be helpful if they could fully read my question before dismissing me. I felt lost and was told to ask my correct advisor when she was in fact my advisor as listed per the advising sheet. Who am I suppose[d] to get help from if the person listed as my advisor immediately dismissed me?”

Despite the frustrations and challenges, many students did mention positive experiences with their advisors

While students provided plenty of suggestions for how advising could be improved at Cal State East Bay, they also shared the positive impact that their advisors had had in their academic careers.

“I have never felt more comfortable talking with an advisor about my major plans and requirements. They [offer] me the best advice and really relate with me and want to get to know me as an individual as well as my story. I’ve never felt more motivated to continue my education.”

“They are very encouraging and supportive. They take the time to know me as a student.”

“I like what the advisors in sankofa [do] which is send a welcome back email each semester and encourage student[s] to schedule a meeting to check in. Also Bobby Ewing is one of the best advisors I’ve ever had in school—he responds back to emails in a timely fashion and always points me in the direction of resources.”

“I really appreciate the GE advisors I have communicated with throughout my experience at East Bay so far. They are very hands on and determined to answer any questions and help you succeed.”

“The events with EOP are great and they gave me a chance to get closer with advisors and students—so events like that are good.”

“They have listened to my thoughts and helped me find suitable classes based on my strengths.”

“There wouldn’t be anything I’d change, East Bay’s advising is great and very accessible.”

“I enjoy meeting with my academic advisor, she takes the time to research my concerns and returns productive advice that covers not only my academics but my personal/professional development.”

Appendix A: Comparison Tables: Students Assessments of GE Advising and Major Advising

Since many similar questions were asked about both GE Advising and Major Advising, the following tables present side by side comparisons of student responses between the two categories.

- Students identified the same top three sources of information (the Cal State East Bay Catalog, the Cal State East Bay Schedule of Classes, and Staff Advisors) about both GE and their major in nearly identical proportions.
- It was most common for students to report having met with their advisor about GE and their major one time. However, higher percentages of students reported meeting with an advisor about their major 2 or 3 times, and higher percentages of students reported not meeting with an advisor about GE.
- Students tended to be slightly more satisfied with their Major advising than their GE advising; the percentage of students who reported being Satisfied/Somewhat Satisfied was 88.8% for Major advising compared to 86.4% for GE advising. In addition, a higher percentage of students was Satisfied (as opposed to Somewhat Satisfied) with Major advising compared to GE advising (64.8% compared to 59.8%).
- It was most common for students to identify “Faculty in my major/department” as their primary advisor for GE/major information (31.5% and 54.0% respectively). Higher percentages of students identified other sources for GE advising.
- In nearly all areas, major academic advisors tended to receive slightly more favorable ratings as to usefulness of advice and the advising experience, especially with regard to university policies and requirements, academic support, co-curricular interests, and career advice.
- However, GE advisors had a slight edge when it came to providing accurate information about GE courses and requirements, taking the initiative to arrange meetings, actively listening to students, treating students with respect, and being helpful and effective as advisors.

Table 38. General Education (GE) Academic Advising: Primary Sources

	GE Academic Advising	Major Academic Advising
Q9/26. Please indicate your primary source(s) of information about GE/your major (Check all that apply)	Percent	Percent
Cal State East Bay Catalog	48.8%	46.6%
Cal State East Bay Schedule of Classes	41.0%	34.6%
Staff advisor	37.9%	33.8%
General Education webpage	31.6%	20.8%
Faculty member	24.3%	26.5%
Cal State East Bay students	19.1%	16.7%
Peer mentor	5.1%	3.4%
Friends outside of Cal State East Bay	4.6%	3.3%
Family members	4.2%	3.3%
Other	2.8%	2.3%
I do not know how to find information about my GE/major requirements	2.5%	0.9%
Co-worker at Cal State East Bay	1.5%	1.1%

Table 39. GE/Major Academic Advising: Frequency

	GE Academic Advising	Major Academic Advising
Q10/27. During the past year, how often did you meet with an advisor about GE/your major?	Percent	Percent
None (<i>skip to Q24/41</i>)	21.9%	12.2%
1 time	40.5%	43.8%
2 times	25.1%	29.2%
3 times	8.0%	9.1%
4 or more times	4.5%	5.7%

Table 40. GE/Major Academic Advising: Satisfaction

	GE Academic Advising	Major Academic Advising
Q11/28. How satisfied have you been with GE advising overall at East Bay/are you with academic advising related to your major to meet the requirements of your major?	Percent	Percent
Satisfied	59.8%	64.8%
Somewhat satisfied	26.6%	24.0%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	7.1%	5.7%
Somewhat dissatisfied	4.4%	3.5%
Dissatisfied	2.1%	1.9%

Table 41. GE/Major Academic Advising: Primary Advisor for major advising (n=2,397)

	GE Academic Advising	Major Academic Advising
Q12/29. Who is the primary advisor you see for GE/major information?	Percent	Percent
Faculty in my major/department	31.5%	54.0%
In my college advising center (e.g., CBE Office of Undergraduate Advising, CSCI/CLASS/CEAS Student Service Center)	17.1%	14.4%
General Studies Faculty Member	16.2%	6.3%
Advisor from Freshmen and Sophomore Success Team (FASST)	10.9%	8.1%
Student Success Program (e.g., Athletics, Center for International Education, EOP, EXCEL, Renaissance, SANKOFA, Transfer APASS, Veterans)	8.5%	6.3%
Peer Advisor/Mentor (e.g., Peer Academic Coach)	4.8%	2.5%
Other	4.0%	3.3%
Pioneer Success Coach advisor	2.6%	2.5%
Faculty not in my major/department	2.5%	1.6%
Advisor at Concord	1.9%	1.1%
	<i>No response</i>	--
	<i>Not applicable</i>	--
Total	100.0%	100.0%

Table 42. Usefulness of Advice

Very useful=3, Useful=2, Somewhat useful=1, Not at all useful=0

	GE Academic Advising	Major Academic Advising
Q14/Q31. GE/Major Related	Mean response 2.31	Mean response 2.39
Obtaining information on Lower Division GE requirements	2.35	--
Obtaining information on Upper Division GE requirements	2.36	--
Obtaining transfer GE course information	2.28	--
Obtaining double-counting information for GE and other course requirements	2.24	--
Selecting/changing my major	--	2.43
Obtaining information on major requirements for graduation	--	2.44
Obtaining information on major electives	--	2.35
Completing my major form and/or graduation application	--	2.39
Obtaining Associate Degree for Transfer Information	--	2.34
Q15/Q32. University Policies and Requirements	Mean response 2.12	Mean response 2.24
Obtaining information on academic policies, including holds and fees	2.19	2.29
Obtaining information on second English composition, University Writing Skills Requirement (UWSR)	2.14	--
Obtaining information on second English composition, Writing Skills Test (WTS)	--	2.25
Obtaining information on American Institutions (CODE) requirement	2.03	2.15
Obtaining information on Overlay requirements	2.12	2.26
Q16/Q33. Enrollment Support	Mean response 2.32	Mean response 2.36
Scheduling/registration procedures	2.33	2.36
Dropping, adding, or withdrawing from courses	2.37	2.37

Withdrawing or transferring from this institution	2.27	2.34
---	------	-------------

	GE Academic Advising	Major Academic Advising
Q17/Q34. Academic Support	Mean response 2.09	Mean response 2.21
Providing a referral relating to online learning and technology	2.16	2.27
Improving my study skills and habits (e.g., time management)	2.08	2.19
Providing a referral to tutorial assistance (or information about how to access tutoring support)	2.08	2.20
Coping with academic difficulties/probation	2.08	2.21
Providing a referral to accessibility services and/or other student support offices	2.13	2.24
Providing a referral to Student Health and Counseling Services	2.10	2.23
Dealing with personal (non-academic) challenges	2.03	2.17
Obtaining basic need assistance (e.g., H.O.P.E., CalFresh)	2.11	2.17
Providing a referral to financial aid assistance	2.10	2.22
Providing a referral to employment on campus	2.07	2.16
Q18/Q35. Co-curricular Interests	Mean response 2.00	Mean response 2.12
Obtaining information on Internships and research opportunities	2.01	2.12
Obtaining information on co-curricular activities (e.g., clubs, organizations, campus events)	1.98	2.12
Q19/Q36. Career	Mean response 2.03	Mean response 2.14
Clarifying life and career goals	2.03	2.14

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).

Table 43. Experience with Primary Advisors

Agree=5, Somewhat agree=4, Neither agree nor disagree=3, Somewhat disagree=2, Disagree=1

	GE Academic Advising	Major Academic Advising
Q21/Q38. Academic-related	Mean response	Mean response
	4.30	4.33
Provides me with accurate information about GE courses and requirements.	4.52	4.43
Provides me with accurate information about required courses in my major, elective courses, academic policies...	4.50	4.51
Helps me understand why required courses are important for my academic program	4.40	4.41
Helps me select courses or programs of study that match my personal abilities, talents, and interests	4.25	4.29
Assists me in developing a long-term educational plan	4.32	4.35
Helps me explore careers in my fields of interest	4.07	4.18
Refers me to campus resources (e.g., SCAA, student health services, etc.)	4.17	4.22
Helps me identify academic obstacles I need to overcome to reach my educational goals	4.15	4.21
Q22/Q39. Communication	Mean response	Mean response
	4.35	4.35
Has been available when needed	4.41	4.43
Allows sufficient time to discuss issues or problems	4.43	4.45
Takes the initiative to arrange meetings with me	4.10	4.08
Actively listens to my concerns	4.45	4.44
Q23/Q40. Interpersonal	Mean response	Mean response
	4.38	4.43
Takes a personal interest in me	4.11	4.22
Encourages me to express my thoughts and feelings	4.16	4.29
Respects my identity and culture	4.52	4.55
Cares about my overall well-being	4.35	4.41
Treats me with respect	4.67	4.63

Is a helpful, effective advisor whom I would recommend to other students	4.48	4.46
--	-------------	------

Note: total responses range from; percentages reported are valid percents (missing values and responses of “Does not apply” are excluded).