

QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY IN SHREVEPORT

ENHANCING STUDENT LEARNING THROUGH IMPROVED ADVISING

BACKGROUND

Louisiana State University in Shreveport (LSUS) is the only public, four-year university in Shreveport, the third largest metropolitan area (population 350,000) in the state. Shreveport is the business and industrial center of the Ark-La-Tex region (northwest Louisiana, southwest Arkansas, and northeast Texas). The University currently serves approximately 4,400 regular students and 11,000 non-credit students per year. Minority students comprise one-third of the student population. (See Appendix A) Our students are drawn from an urban population, with a slight majority being the first in their families to attend college.

Given our history as a commuter school, we recognize the special value of effective advising. With a student body that does not linger on campus, our academic advising has tended to focus on course selection and scheduling. However, much has been done in recent years regarding orientation and peer mentoring. All of our first-time freshmen, and most of our transfer students, attend an orientation program held several times throughout the year. Overseen by the Division of Student Affairs, and conducted by successful upperclassmen, the sessions acquaint students with all aspects of the university community.

As a supplement to advising and outside-the-class educational experiences, the Division of Student Affairs administers two programs designed to increase student motivation, retention, achievement, and satisfaction. The Student Success Series is required of all students who are receiving University-funded scholarships, and open to all students.

Evolving over the last seven years, the program provides seminars and activities focused on developmental issues for each year of the college experience:

- Year 1 -- Adjustment to College
- Year 2 -- Personal Adjustment
- Year 3 -- Career Development and Job Search
- Year 4 -- Transition to the World of Work or Graduate School.

As part of the Student Success Series, freshman and sophomore University Scholarship recipients also participate in Focus programs (the program is open to all students who would like to participate but required for scholarship recipients). The Freshman and Sophomore Focus programs provide structured peer mentoring. Mentors monitor student adjustment and progress in personal and academic areas, provide references and referrals for students who need additional assistance, and can alert the Student Development and Counseling Center if serious problems arise.

Over the past couple of years LSUS has been involved in two major self-study efforts. One was part of a state-wide revision of the role, scope, and mission statements for every higher education institution in Louisiana. The third item in our revised mission statement says that we will “foster the academic and personal growth of students.” (See Appendix B) We have published eleven Guiding Principles that describe how we achieve our mission; the second principle states, “Effective advising and support are essential if students are to reach their potential.” (See Appendix C) Additionally, our interest in effective advising is reflected in our strategic goals, the first of which is to “recruit and retain an increasingly diverse student population.” The first objective supporting this goal states that LSUS will offer programs and services “to meet the academic, career and personal needs and goals of all students.” (See Appendix D) One meaningful way we help students reach their potential and meet their academic and career goals is through advising.

To accomplish this revision of our role, scope, and mission, the Chancellor established eleven Task Forces to examine the operation of every unit on campus, from Business

Affairs to Student Affairs to Academic Affairs. A number of recommendations from this work concerned increasing the amount and improving the quality of advising. One recommendation was to require all first-time full-time freshmen to attend an orientation and registration program. Another was to require that all students be assigned to an academic advisor, while another recommended a uniform faculty advising program.

The second self-study effort, funded by the Louisiana Board of Regents, had all campuses explore recruitment and retention with the help of an educational consulting firm. As part of this effort, conducted primarily throughout the 2002-2003 academic year, we completed a SWOT analysis, published in February 2003. This analysis recognized effective advising being conducted in selected units, while at the same time describing some advising as inconsistent and ineffective. (See Appendix E)

As part of the evaluation process for determining perceptions of student advisement, the QEP Committee sought feedback directly from students. We conducted a number of focus groups which included a structured survey and time for qualitative feedback from students. The responses indicated that many students perceived that the primary purpose for academic advisement was course scheduling, and that most of those surveyed were satisfied with that process. On the other hand, most students were not aware that academic advisement could also include discussions about academic performance, their involvement in out-of-class experiences, and their academic and career goals.

The process also revealed that while there are many faculty who are considered good advisors, these advisors tend to get overloaded. Other concerns included advisor accessibility, lack of knowledge about some aspects of the university, and a lack of interest on the advisor's part in doing more than course scheduling. One student put it this way: "I am upset with the way that I have been advised while here at LSUS. I found out some things too late to make a difference in my education, and this is making it harder for me to graduate on time. If my advisor had shared with me some of the things that I am just now finding out earlier on, I would have taken a different path to my degree."

The problems we have seen are ones that many in higher education would find familiar. Students take courses for which they lack the prerequisite. Some Liberal Arts students mistakenly take the introductory science courses for science majors instead of the section for non-science majors. Many incoming freshmen declare themselves to be “pre-med” majors without an understanding of the GPA and experience needed for admission to medical school. Students sometimes take a General Education course for a requirement they have already satisfied. Others may fail to take a course which is offered only sporadically and so delay their graduation. Students shop for a major that might seem to be easier, and others change majors because one set of requirements appears to be easier than another. Majors in their penultimate semester finally begin to wonder what they might do once they graduate. Some of these problems are more significant than others, but their number can be reduced with improved advising.

Another result of this second self-study effort was the creation of two campus-wide committees, one for recruitment and one for retention. The initial work of the retention committee has led to a strategic plan with nine strategies and 30 action plans, five of which relate directly to advising (See Appendix F):

- To revise the university-wide incentive system to recognize the value of effective advising and service to students in tenure, promotion and salary consideration.
- To develop models incorporating academic advising best practices for review, modification and adoption by programs.
- To design and deliver ongoing professional development for advisors.
- To expand and strengthen student mentoring programs.
- To conduct required meetings of all students in each academic major.

THE FOCUS

In April 2003, the Chancellor formed our SACS Leadership Team, the Compliance Committee, and the QEP Committee. After attending the training session in June in Atlanta, the chair of the QEP committee prepared the committee members for their task through a series of three emails in July 2003, designed to describe the expectations for the QEP, and to solicit suggestions for organizing the work of the committee. The first meeting of the committee was held September 4, 2003, at which we discussed the results of the recent self-studies described above and identified three major concerns of the campus:

A) BUILDING A COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE

Our history as a commuter campus has prevented us from developing a traditional campus culture, one that provides academic, social, and cultural experiences for students. We should develop a plan to increase these kinds of experiences.

B) INCREASING THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF PERSONAL ATTENTION GIVEN TO STUDENTS

From the recent SWOT analyses and the work of our recruitment and retention teams, we recognize we could do more to personalize students' interaction with LSUS in all areas: orientation, financial aid, academic advising, counseling, career services. We should develop a plan to improve the quality of personal attention students receive.

C) ATTUNING STUDENTS TO OUR CAMPUS CULTURE

We can identify two distinct groups of students---first-time freshmen and transfers---that place various demands on the institution. Both need help making the transition to LSUS, getting acclimated to this institution, and then engaging fully in the life of the university. We should develop a plan to improve the processes that assimilate students into LSUS.

The committee then conducted a ballot among faculty by email, in which they were asked to rank the three. We received 101 replies (a 70% response). Option B received 52 first-choice votes, with option A receiving 38 and C receiving 11. Option C was the least attractive, receiving 44 last-choice votes, with option A receiving 40. Choice B, on the other hand, received only 18 last-choice votes. When comparing options A and B, 59 of the participating faculty preferred B to A. With these results, which we reviewed at a September 25, 2003 meeting, we felt we had identified a major area of concern across campus, which could serve as a suitable focus for our QEP.

Following the above meeting, the committee members took a week to brainstorm suggestions for sharpening the focus. We met on October 2, 2003 to discuss these ideas and decided that one of the most meaningful ways to improve the personal attention given to students, in a way that would result in enhanced learning (as required of the QEP), would be to improve academic advising.

From this point through April we met eight times to work out the details of the plan, an outline of which was emailed to faculty on April 26, 2004 for review and feedback. Based on this feedback we made revisions to the plan which brought it to its present state. One result of these discussions was the recognition that our concern was with undergraduate advising; hence, graduate advising is not included in our QEP, though we will look at this at some point in the future. During this time committee members each reviewed a chapter from *Faculty Advising Examined* (Ed. Gary L. Kramer, Anker, 2003) to help us think about measurement and assessment.

Because advising has been an ongoing concern across campus among both students and faculty, this issue makes a meaningful focus for our QEP. We believe we find ourselves at a moment in the history of LSUS that will allow for significant improvement in our academic advising, which in the long term will enhance student learning.

THE PLAN

The QEP is supposed to “describe a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issue(s) related to enhancing student learning” (*Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation*, p.21). Before describing our course of action, we first need to examine the concept of student learning.

We see learning—that is, what students know and can do—as occurring both inside and outside the classroom. According to a number of experts (Pascarella and Terenzini, *How College Affects Students: Findings and Insights from Twenty Years of Research, Volume I*; Chickering and Reisser, *Education and Identity, 2nd Edition*; University of South Carolina, *National Resource Center for the First Year Experience and Students in Transition*) outside the classroom students engage in a host of activities that result in learning:

- Making the transition to college
- Adjusting to college culture and life
- Managing time
- Improving self-discipline and motivation
- Managing money
- Managing relationships
- Learning about one’s major
- Learning about career paths
- Setting priorities
- Identifying personal strengths
- Developing strategies for success

Some of the most meaningful out-of-classroom interactions students have throughout their college experience are those that involve faculty members. According to Kramer (*Faculty Advising Examined*), effective faculty-student interaction has a positive impact

on motivation to succeed, persistence, cognitive development, and academic achievement. Specifically in terms of advising, Astin (*What Matters in College?: Four Critical Years Revisited, 1997*) notes that there is a high correlation between student satisfaction and the quality of advising. Light (*Making the Most of College*) concludes from his research that “good advising may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college experience” (quoted in Kramer p.201). We expect to enhance student learning by improving our undergraduate academic advising.

This focus on advising is especially pertinent to our student body. In a number of respects, LSUS can be thought of as a “transfer” institution. Many students get their start here and go on to finish elsewhere. Many others come here to finish up after having begun elsewhere. (See Appendix G)

Specifically, the University has identified segments of our undergraduate population that require especially effective academic advising and mentoring. Along with a campus population dominated by commuter students, we have numerous students in various stages of life or educational transition, stop-outs, and a large population of transfer students (many transferring in with a large number of hours). These students present some obvious advising challenges.

A majority of our first-time students represent first-generation college students, who may or may not be prepared for the transition to college. For example, of the 4,200 students who applied for financial aid this year, 50.7% indicated that neither parent had any college experience. Furthermore, this year’s group of 641 freshmen reported that 54% of their fathers and 43% of their mothers had only a high school diploma or less. These freshmen include a significant number who express no preference for a major. Presently, these students are distributed to each College for advising, and so pose an additional challenge to effective advising

.

In response to this diversity, the university offers programs that enable students to earn bachelor degrees without majoring in a traditional subject. The College of Liberal Arts has a General Studies program, and the College of Business Administration offers a program in General Business. In both programs, students take courses from multiple concentrations in a flexible, interdisciplinary course of study. However, because of this flexibility, effective advising is crucial and, in some ways, more challenging to deliver.

Our plan is based on the following premises:

1. All teaching faculty advise; being a professor means being an advisor.
2. All advisors will receive training; not everyone is a natural-born advisor.
3. Each College will determine how majors are assigned to advisors and how advising impacts faculty evaluations.
4. Advising will be evaluated, with results impacting faculty evaluations and rewards.
5. Consistent measures will be applied to regularly assess the effectiveness of the advising, with results being used to make improvements.

THE TIMELINE

Timelines, of course, are projections based on honest intentions and hopefulness. Once we finish setting the groundwork this spring, we see next year (2005-2006) as the period during which the pieces of the plan are assembled, a “ramping up” period. We feel this is realistic, and therefore look at the fall of 2006 as the point in time when our revised undergraduate advising program will be engaged full force.

Spring 2005

- QEP submitted, SACS On-Site Review Team visits
- Advisor training developed (See Appendix G)
- Baseline data on our assessment measures gathered

Summer 2005

- Colleges develop plans for assigning advisees, and for advisor/advisee meetings
- Colleges develop plan for incorporating advising into faculty evaluations
- Department chairs attend Advisor Training as a pilot group

Fall 2005

- Faculty training implemented, with goal of completing it by end of academic year
- First-time freshmen assigned to advisors according to plan of each college

Spring 2006

- Faculty training continued and completed
- Training evaluated and appropriately modified
- Colleges review and adjust plans
- Faculty evaluations include performance at advising

Summer 2006

- Colleges review and adjust performance evaluation aspect
- Assessments conducted of the 2005—2006 academic year and reviewed

Fall 2006

The full plan should be in place, and should manifest a consistent pattern of activities. In summer, first-time freshmen will be assigned to advisors whom they will meet according to some schedule of both group and individual meetings. Continuing students will stay with the same advisor. Students who change majors will at that time be reassigned. The amount and kind of contact will be determined by each college. Each semester, performance measures will be taken, with results reviewed in summer in time for adjustments to be made by fall semester. Each Fall, further training will be available for experienced faculty. Each Spring, regular training will be conducted for new faculty (new faculty will need their first year to adjust to the university and so will not be

assigned advisees). This pattern will continue through Spring 2010, at which time our Impact Report will be compiled for submission to SACS.

ASSESSMENT OF THE QEP

Our plan will not succeed without active participation, and so one set of measures will be based on levels of participation:

Objective One: All current teaching faculty will be trained by May 2006.

Objective Two: All first-time freshmen will be assigned to advisors within the first week of the semester.

Objective Three: All students will attend all scheduled meetings each semester.

In addition, our plan cannot succeed if the participants do not believe the advising program has been effective in helping students succeed. Therefore, a second set of measures will concern satisfaction with the various components of the process:

Objective Four: Each semester all students will be satisfied with their advising.

Objective Five: Each semester all advisors will be satisfied with the advising process.

While we recognize that learning is a complex, multi-dimensional activity that involves the whole person, we want to track the following measures that would indicate enhanced learning:

Objective Six: Outcomes achievement scores (e.g., MFAT, PRAXIS) will show an upward trend by the time of our Impact Report.

Objective Seven: Second-year retention rates of first-time freshmen will increase annually from baseline year.

Objective Eight: Program completers will increase annually from baseline year.

Objective Nine: Levels of student engagement will increase annually from baseline year.

Table I below summarizes our assessment plan:

TABLE I: LSUS QEP ASSESSMENT PROCESS	
Measures of Success	Methods of Assessing Success
I. Participation in the Advising Process	Internal data collection system will determine the number of faculty trained, students assigned advisors, and advising sessions. The Director of the Teaching, Leadership, and Technology Center (TLTC) and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness will collect and analyze the data throughout the academic year and produce a summary report at the end of the year.
<i>Objective One:</i> All teaching faculty will be trained in effective advising practices.	
<i>Objective Two:</i> All first-time freshmen will be assigned to advisors in the first week of the semester.	
<i>Objective Three:</i> All students will attend scheduled advising meetings each semester.	
II. Satisfaction with the Advising Process	The <i>NACADA Academic Advising Inventory (AAI)</i> will be used to determine the students' level of satisfaction, and a locally-developed survey will be used to determine the level of advisor satisfaction. Each instrument will be administered each spring term beginning in 2006. Analysis of responses will include reports that present item and area summaries, and overall levels of satisfaction.
<i>Objective Four:</i> All students will be satisfied with the advising process.	
<i>Objective Five:</i> All advisors will be satisfied with the advising process.	
III. Enhanced Learning	The four-year (2000-2004) baseline set of data will be compared to the scores for the 2006-2010 time period. Retention rates are calculated each fall by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. The number of degrees awarded each academic year is calculated at the end of each spring semester. Data are summarized at the program and college levels and distributed by the Director of Institutional Effectiveness. The <i>National Survey of Student Engagement</i> will be administered in Spring 2005 to establish baseline data. Detailed analysis reports include annual and national benchmark reports; and an institutional engagement index.
<i>Objective Six:</i> Undergraduate student performance on end of program assessments (MFAT, PRAXIS, etc.) will increase from baseline four-year (2000-2004) average.	
<i>Objective Seven:</i> Second-year retention rates of first-time freshmen will increase from the baseline year 2005-2006.	
<i>Objective Eight:</i> The number of students completing undergraduate programs of study will increase annually.	
<i>Objective Nine:</i> Levels of student engagement will increase from baseline year 2005-2006.	

Under the direction of the University Planning Committee, all academic, administrative, and support units at LSUS produce Annual Assessment Plans. These plans are composed prior to the start of each academic year, and will include objectives related to the QEP beginning with the 2005-2006 planning cycle. Assessment of the QEP's objectives, overseen by the Office of Academic Affairs, will take place throughout the year with

results reported at the end of each academic year. This process will provide the units and the Office of Academic Affairs with the opportunity to use the results to enhance and improve the activities associated with the implementation of the QEP.

APPENDIX A

LSUS Statistical Summary, Fall 2004

Total Enrollment			
<i>Undergraduate</i>		3,753	85.3%
<i>Graduate</i>		648	14.7%
<i>Total</i>		4,401	100.0%
Male/Female Enrollment			
<i>Undergraduate</i>	Male	1,369	31.1%
	Female	2,384	54.2%
<i>Graduate</i>	Male	183	4.2%
	Female	465	10.6%
Full-Time/Part-Time Enrollment			
<i>Undergraduate</i>	Full-Time	2,655	60.3%
	Part-Time	1,098	24.9%
<i>Graduate</i>	Full-Time	158	3.6%
	Part-Time	484	11.0%
Black, Non Hispanic Enrollment			
<i>Undergraduate</i>		849	19.3%
<i>Graduate</i>		145	3.3%
<i>Total</i>		994	22.6%
White, Non-Hispanic Enrollment			
<i>Undergraduate</i>		2,378	54.0%
<i>Graduate</i>		443	10.1%
<i>Total</i>		2,821	64.1%
Non-Resident Alien Enrollment			
<i>Undergraduate</i>		69	1.6%
<i>Graduate</i>		17	0.4%
<i>Total</i>		86	2.0%
Unknown Race Enrollment			
<i>Undergraduate</i>		294	6.7%
<i>Graduate</i>		25	0.6%
<i>Total</i>		319	7.2%
Other Enrollment (Amer Indian/Asian/Hispanic)			
<i>Undergraduate</i>		163	3.7%
<i>Graduate</i>		18	0.4%
<i>Total</i>		181	4.1%
Residence Status			
<i>Out-of-State</i>		115	2.6%
<i>In-State</i>		4,286	97.4%

APPENDIX B

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of Louisiana State University in Shreveport is to:

- Provide a stimulating and supportive learning environment in which students, faculty, and staff participate freely in the creation, acquisition, and dissemination of knowledge;
- Encourage an atmosphere of intellectual excitement;
- Foster the academic and personal growth of students;
- Produce graduates who possess the intellectual resources and professional and personal skills that will enable them to be effective and productive members of an ever-changing global community; and
- Enhance the cultural, technological, social, and economic development of the region through outstanding teaching, research, and public service.

APPENDIX C

Guiding Principles

- ❖ **Student Success is the focus of all university programs and services.**
- ❖ **Effective advising and support are essential if students are to reach their potential.**
- ❖ **On-going planning and evaluation directed toward the improvement of all programs and services enhances the university's development.**
- ❖ **Innovative use of technology increases the effectiveness and efficiency of university programs and services.**
- ❖ **Good teaching is essential to the intellectual growth of students.**
- ❖ **Commitment to excellence is the foundation for all programs and services.**
- ❖ **Diversity among faculty, staff and students enriches the university environment.**
- ❖ **A student-centered campus enhances the teaching - learning process.**
- ❖ **Research supports teaching excellence, faculty growth and community service.**
- ❖ **Integrity and high ethical standards govern every decision made and every action taken within the university community or on behalf of the university.**
- ❖ **University responsiveness to community needs has a positive impact on the quality of life within the region.**

APPENDIX D

LSUS Strategic Goals 2004-05 to 2008-09

Preamble: Louisiana State University in Shreveport will be the university of first choice for qualified students; provide a superior learning experience for all students; ensure teaching excellence and scholarly achievement; commit to continuous improvement of institutional effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability; and expand its role as a community leader. The mission of Louisiana State University in Shreveport will be accomplished by the pursuit of the following goals:

GOAL I: Recruit and retain a diverse student population.

GOAL II: Assure highly qualified and diverse faculty and staff.

GOAL III: Implement initiatives that connect the university with alumni, community organizations, and businesses.

GOAL IV: Increase institutional effectiveness.

APPENDIX E

SWOT ANALYSIS

<http://www.lsus.edu/sacs/documents/planning/SWOT.pdf>

APPENDIX F

[LSUS Retention Plan 2003](#)

<http://www.lsus.edu/sacs/documents/supporting/Retention%20Plan%205-13-03.pdf>

APPENDIX G

LSUS TRANSFER STUDENT ENROLLMENT FALL 2004		
Classification	Transfer Students	Continuing/Reentry
Freshman	225	948
Sophomore	44	473
Junior	51	540
Senior	16	1132
Other	81	657
Total	417	3750

APPENDIX H

Advising Training Plan

Format

The Director of the Teaching, Leadership, and Technology Center (TLTC) will facilitate training by meeting each academic department during the 2005-2006 school year. There are thirteen academic departments on campus with 10-15 faculty members each. Prior to the training, each department member will identify their specific advising training needs using a pre-training survey. The initial training session will be a three-hour refresher in which the department's needs will be addressed in the context of the following suggested plan:

Session I: 3 hours

Advising as Teaching

Studies conducted by the National Academic Advising Association show that faculty are more likely to provide effective advising when they consciously connect their advising practices to their already-successful teaching practices.

The group will be split in half, each half brainstorming answers to one of the following questions:

- What do you want students to “know, understand and do” from their experiences in the classroom?
- What do you want students to “know, understand and do” from their work with an advisor?

We will then compare/contrast each groups' findings; most faculty find a high correlation between what they want students to accomplish in the classroom and in the advising session, including:

- Learn content (discipline-specific; requirements for graduation)
- Show a high-level of engagement
- Exhibit problem-solving/critical thinking skills
- In group work and group advising sessions, show the ability to share knowledge and work well with others

Distribute both “Advising as teaching” handout and sources about advising as teaching from Scholarship of Teaching and Learning referred journals.

Components of a Successful Advising Session

Using our Advising Mission as a springboard, we will discuss the components of a successful advising session, including:

- Goal-setting/fact finding: career goals/aspirations? Enriching campus activities?
- Information gathering: what curriculum is most appropriate? Creating a graduation timeline
- Strategizing: Learning to prioritize; suggestions for time management

Then, we'll use video case studies from the NACADA Advising Training video to analyze advising sessions and sharing personal vignettes to suggest ways to improve our own advising sessions. Introduce "finding Flow" as one metaphor for a positive advising session; encourage participants to brainstorm their own advising metaphors.

Conveying Expectations/Setting up for Success

Many faculty identify the intricacies of financial aid as a stumbling block in their advising sessions. This hour will focus on the informational needs the department has identified in the pre-training survey. Campus experts from Financial Aid, Admissions and Records, the Career Center, and other Student Affairs departments will fully explain advisors' frequently-asked-questions (such as how to change majors, applying Financial Aid to tuition costs, etc.)

We'll then distribute a heavy card stock help document which includes appropriate deadlines, when to plan for heavy-advising traffic, and important academic unit phone numbers and contact names, so advisors can provide this important information quickly and painlessly.

Post Training:

Each faculty member will receive a post-training evaluation, in which they will assess how well their needs were met and indicate what more they'd like to know about advising via the training. The training will be revised, within reasonable limits, according to these assessments.

Follow-up Sessions: 1.5 hours each

These sessions will be offered multiple times as Brown Bag Forums throughout the school year. Less formal and more collaborative, these sessions will follow-up on the intensive training by focusing on student profiles and what faculty gain from productive advising sessions.

Session I: Freshman Advising Needs

We'll use a recent *Sixty Minutes* segment as a springboard to discuss the special needs, aptitudes, and concerns of "Millennials", who comprise the bulk of our freshman class. We'll also address the special challenges of first-time Freshmen who are uncertain about feasible career paths. The Director of the Career Center will explain how to counsel these students; also we'll discuss the protocol for administering the "Choices Planner" an assessment that ranks student aptitude for specific careers. For those students who continue to be interested in the interdisciplinary majors, we'll conclude with presentations from the Director of General Studies a seasoned (or master) advisor from General Business.

Session II: Transfer Advising Needs/Fostering a Mentor

LSUS has many “master advisors”; faculty who relish the advising experience and whose students reflect their excellence. In this session we’ll feature a panel of successful advisors from across colleges to share their tips and secrets for fostering interdependent relationships with students.