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My presentation is composed of two very different parts.

The **first** part is very **systematic**, quite **text-heavy**, and perhaps a bit **dry**, but it is essential to my ability to answer the question, which is the title of my presentation: **Can academic advisors engage in scholarly activities?**
The second part of my presentation will be much more applied and, I hope, a little more inspiring and, perhaps, even a bit entertaining. This is the part where I get to share some of my scholarly advising activities and products and to offer you the opportunity to put my scholarship to good use with your own advisees.

So let’s begin with part #1 . . .
The first step in our investigation of the question, **Can academic advisors engage in scholarly activities?**, is to acknowledge its complexity. This **not** a simple question and a complex, logical strategy is required to answer it.

So let’s begin this first step by breaking down this strategy into four manageable tasks.
1. First, we must validate NACADA’s guiding principle (“Advising is teaching.”) by establishing that many of the activities that academic advisors engage in are, in fact, teaching activities.

2. Once we have established that advising is a teaching activity, then we must understand how scholarship is defined in higher education.

3. Then, we must identify categories of teaching activities that fit higher education’s definition of scholarship.

4. And finally—to close this logical loop—we must identify advising activities that also fit these categories.
My presentation will be organized around the following four questions derived from these tasks.

1. Are academic advisors teachers?

2. How does higher education define scholarship?

3. What teaching activities are examples of scholarship?

4. Can academic advisors engage in these activities?

So let’s begin this four-step process with . . .
20 years ago, Carol Ryan established the parallels between teaching and advising in her NACADA presidential address by listing 20 pairs of characteristics shared by effective teachers and effective advisors.

16 years later, I added 7 more pairs to Ryan’s list in my chapter titled “Advising as Teaching and Learning” in the 2nd edition of NACADA’s *Academic Advising: A Comprehensive Handbook*.

The following slides provide 8 compelling examples of these 27 parallels.

**Question #1**

Are academic advisors teachers?
Effective **teachers** master their subject matter.

Effective **advisors** possess accurate information about their institutions’ policies, procedures, resources, and programs.
Effective teachers deliver information clearly and effectively.

Effective advisors communicate in a clear and unambiguous manner.
Effective **teachers** use syllabi to make their courses clear to their students.

Effective **advisors** can utilize advising syllabi to help their advisees understand the nature, purpose, chronology, and benefits of the advising process.
Effective teachers exhibit positive regard, concern, and respect for their students.

Effective advisors provide a caring and personal relationship by exhibiting a positive attitude toward advisees, their goals, and their ability to learn.
Effective **teachers** teach students how to evaluate information.

Effective **advisors** help advisees evaluate and re-evaluate their progress toward personal, educational, and career goals.
Effective **teachers** serve as resources for their students.

Effective **advisors** provide materials to advisees and refer them to others when referral is the appropriate response.
Effective **teachers** use assessment to make data-based suggestions for improving teaching and learning.

Effective **advisors** make changes or add to advising knowledge by assessing the advising process.
... and finally ...

Effective **teachers** engage in the lifelong learning they espouse for their students.

Effective **advisors** participate in ongoing professional activities to learn about the students they serve and the educational issues that influence their work as academic advisors.
Mark Lowenstein captured the essence of these similarities in an article titled “A Learning-Centered View of Advising as Teaching,” and went a step further when he said, “the advisor is arguably the most important person in the student’s educational world” because “an excellent advisor does for students’ entire educations what the excellent teacher does for a course: helps them order the pieces, put them together to make a coherent whole, so that a student experiences the curriculum not as a checklist of discrete, isolated pieces but instead as a unity, a composition of interrelated parts with multiple connections and relationships.”
Buddy Ramos provided perhaps the most compelling advising-as-teaching analogy when he said, “Think of academic advising as a course offered to your advisees. You are the instructor or facilitator, the student is the learner, your office is the classroom, [and] facilitating growth along several dimensions is the curriculum.”
We’ve now answered my first question by laying the logical foundation that academic advisors are teachers because they possess the same kinds of skills and engage in the same activities as teachers do. So now it is time for us to turn our attention to next question, which is . . .
21 years ago, Earnest Boyer urged the academy to redefine its narrow and outdated definition of scholarship to include “the full range of methods that teachers use to educate their students and the public at large.”
As Boyer said in his book, *Scholarship Reconsidered*,

"Almost all colleges pay lip service to the trilogy of teaching, research, and service, but when it comes to making judgments about professional performance, the three are rarely assigned equal merit."
Boyer also stated that the academy must abandon its tired old teaching versus research debate by reviving, refreshing, redefining, and expanding the concept of scholarship to include the following four tasks that competent teachers engage in when they educate their students and the public at large.

- Discovery
- Integration
- Application
- Teaching
The American Psychological Association created a task force chaired by my good friend Diane Halpern to define scholarship in psychology, and Diane summarized the goal of this group by saying . . .

"The stakeholders in higher education--students and their parents, faculty, taxpayers, regents/trustees, legislators, and prospective employers--want college graduates with the skills, abilities, ethics, and attitudes needed to participate in and lead our nation in a rapidly changing global context."
Building upon Boyer’s model, Halpern concluded that college faculty can accomplish this lofty goal in a number of ways, including . . .

“the creation, organization, dissemination, and application of knowledge and that any and all of these activities can and should be considered scholarly in nature and name.”
The American Psychological Association synthesized Boyer’s and Halpern’s definitions of scholarship by creating a five-criterion model of the scholarship of teaching in which any activity that meets one or more of these criteria can and should be considered scholarly in nature.

This multi-category model provides the foundational information I will use to answer Question #3, which is . . .
Question #3
What categories of teaching activities are examples of scholarship?

The five categories APA used to construct its model of scholarship in teaching are . . .

1. The creation of knowledge
2. The integration of knowledge
3. The application of knowledge
4. The scholarship of pedagogy
5. The scholarship of teaching and learning
Allow me to elaborate on these categories by identifying the nature and purpose of the activities that define each one of them.

Please note that I have combined categories #3 and #4 (i.e., the Application of Knowledge and the Scholarship of Pedagogy) into one category--which I will call The Application of Knowledge to Improve Teaching and Learning--because of the similarity of these two categories within the context of academic advising.
Category #1 → The **creation of knowledge**, which involves the performance of original research.

The purpose of this type of scholarly inquiry is to contribute not only to the stock of human knowledge, but also to the intellectual capital and climate of an institution of higher education.
Category #2 → The integration of knowledge, which involves the synthesis of individual facts and ideas into larger and more organized bodies of knowledge, such as theories and models.

The purpose of theories and models is to enable teachers to describe, understand, explain, and predict complex, teaching-related phenomena such as:

- the nature and purpose of critical thinking,
- the use of technology to enhance learning, and
- the ways in which students develop during their undergraduate years.
Category #3 ➔ The **application of knowledge to improve teaching and learning**, which involves the use of both empirically- and theoretically-derived knowledge to enhance the educational process.

The purpose of activities within this category is to use research-based and theoretical knowledge to improve how teachers teach and how students learn.
Category #4 → The scholarship of teaching and learning, which involves the dissemination of knowledge to colleagues, students, public audiences, and the larger community of scholars.

We are engaging in this category at this conference as we share knowledge about teaching and advising with each other.
Now that . . .

1. we have established that advising is, indeed, a teaching activity,
2. we know how scholarship is defined in higher education, and
3. we have identified four categories of scholarly teaching activities

. . . we can turn our attention to my fourth and most important question, which is . . .
Question #4
Can academic advisors engage in scholarly activities?

The remainder of my presentation will consist of examples of the work I have performed in my capacity as an academic advisor that have both benefited my advisees and have been recognized as scholarly by my institutions when I have used them to support my applications for professional advancement, such as:

- promotions,
- tenure,
- salary increases, and
- awards.
I hope what I have said during the first part of my presentation has provided you with a sufficiently strong and logical argument that can empower you to convince those on your campuses that many of your advising activities can and should be considered scholarly in both name and nature.

What I plan to do in the remainder of my presentation is to inspire you to engage in scholarly advising activities by presenting information that will cause you to experience what I call the V8 Effect, which is . . .
... that feeling you experience when you realize you would have been perfectly capable of doing something that someone else has done before, but that they just beat you to the punch.

My products and activities I’m going to share with you now are not rocket science and every person in this room is perfectly capable of producing the same types of products and engaging in the same types of activities.

So please allow me to do a little scholarly show-and-tell as I share how I have engaged in each of the four categories of scholarly activities during my four decades of academic advising.
Category #1 → The creation of knowledge, which involves the performance of original research.

It's important to note that research on advising needs to be neither methodologically elaborate nor statistically sophisticated.

If research is defined as a systematic and organized method of asking questions and finding answers to these questions, then any advisor can perform research to discover the answers to questions that can inform and improve the advising process.
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A survey of psychology graduate admissions committee chairs revealed 5 categories of mistakes applicants make that diminish their probability of acceptance. We discuss 3 strategies that psychology departments can use to decrease the likelihood that students will commit these mistakes in their graduate school applications and provide suggestions that will help students avoid these mistakes.

The ideal student, seen through the eyes of graduate faculty, is gifted and creative, very bright and extremely motivated to learn, perfectly suited to the program, eager to actively pursue the lines of inquiry valued by the faculty, pleasant, responsible, and devoid of serious personal problems.

—Keith-Spigel & Wiederman (2000, p. 32)

This statement indicates that applicants must convey these impressions to graduate school admissions committees throughout the application process to gain acceptance into graduate programs. Numerous authors have offered advice to undergraduate psychology majors about gaining admission to graduate programs during the past decade (Appleby, 2003a; Bankart & Shearburne, 1996; Keith-Spigel & Wiederman, 2000; Kinder & Wallish, 2001; Kurth, 2003, 2004; Landrum & Davis, 2003; Lloyd, 2003; Morgan & Korschigen, 2005; Peterson's, 2001; Sayette, Mayne, & Nortons, 2004; Taylor-Cooker & Appleby, 2002). Despite this wealth of valuable information, few authors advise students about what they should not do when applying to graduate school. When authors do offer this advice, few support it with data.

We surveyed chairs of graduate school admissions committees in psychology about the characteristics of graduate school candidates that decrease their chances for acceptance (i.e., "kisses of death [KODs]"). Our data provide faculty who mentor, advise, and teach psychology majors with strategies to enable their students to avoid KODs when they apply to graduate school.

Method

We mailed a letter addressed to the Chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee to each of the 457 psychology graduate programs listed in the American Psychological Association's (2001) Graduate Study in Psychology 2001. The letter explained the purpose of the study and asked participants to provide "one or two examples of kisses of death you have encountered during your career." We defined KODs in the letter as "aberrant types of information that cause graduate admissions committees to reject otherwise strong applicants.”

Data Analysis

Eighty-eight of the 457 chairs (19%) returned their surveys, and these responses yielded 156 examples of KODs. This relatively low response rate is common in qualitative research that uses open-ended questions because, although this type of question gives respondents freedom to "expound on ideas," it often "requires more time to answer than closed questions" (Thomas & Nelson, 2001, p. 263). We qualitatively analyzed the 156 examples of KODs according to the following procedures (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 1990). First, we independently inductively analyzed each example (McCracken, 1988). This approach required us to consider each response individually and to identify its central theme (poorly written application, harmful letter of recommendation, or lack of interest in research). Second, we independently grouped these inductive findings into categories, or "words, phrases, sentences, or whole paragraphs, connected ... to a specific setting" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 56), that described broad situations in which several similar KODs occurred (e.g., we placed an example identified as an inappropriate letter of recommendation author under the major heading for harmful letters of recommendation). Third, we conducted "analytic triangulation" (Patton, 1990, p. 468) by comparing our findings from Step 1 and our categories from Step 2. This procedure yielded a set of themes that were both internally consistent (i.e., all categories contained numerous similar responses) and externally representative of broad examples of KODs (Patton, 1990).

Results

We identified the following five major KOD categories: (a) damaged personal statements, (b) harmful letters of recommendation, (c) lack of program information, (d) poor writing skills, and (e) misfit attempts to impress. We subsequently describe these categories in descending order of frequency accompanied by illuminating examples.

Damaging Personal Statements

The personal statement section of a graduate school application is an opportunity to inform an admissions committee about personal and professional development, academic background and objectives, research and field experiences, and career goals and plans (Keith-Spigel & Wiederman, 2000). We found 53 responses related to damaging personal
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We surveyed chairs of graduate school admissions committees in psychology about the characteristics of graduate school candidates that decrease their chances for acceptance (i.e., "kisses of death" [KODs]). Our data provide faculty who mentor, advise, and teach psychology majors with strategies to enable their students to avoid KODs when they apply to graduate school.

Method

We mailed a letter addressed to the Chair of the Graduate Admissions Committee to each of the 457 psychology graduate program listed in the American Psychological Association's (2001) Graduate Study in Psychology. The letter explained the purpose of the study and asked participants to provide "one or two examples of kisses of death you have encountered during your career." We defined KODs in the letter as "aberrant types of information that cause graduate admissions committees to reject otherwise strong applicants."

Data Analysis

Eighty-eight of the 457 chairs (19%) returned their surveys, and those responses yielded 156 examples of KODs. This relatively low response rate is common in qualitative research that uses open-ended questions because, although this type of question gives respondents freedom to "expand on ideas," it often "requires more time to answer than closed questions" (Thomas & Nelson, 2001, p. 263). We qualitatively analyzed the 156 examples of KODs according to the following procedures (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Patton, 1990). First, we independently inductively analyzed each example (McCracken, 1988). This approach required us to consider each response individually and to identify its central theme (poorly written application, harmful letter of recommendation, or lack of interest in research). Second, we independently grouped these inductive findings into categories, or "words, phrases, sentences, or whole paragraphs, connected ... to a specific setting" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 56a), that described broad situations in which several similar KODs occurred (e.g., we placed an example identified as an inappropriate letter of recommendation author under the major heading for harmful letters of recommendation). Third, we conducted "analyse triangulation" (Patton, 1990, p. 660) by comparing our findings from Step 1 and our categories from Step 2. This procedure yielded a set of themes that were both internally consistent (i.e., all categories contained numerous similar responses) and externally representative of broad examples of KODs (Patton, 1990).

Results

We identified the following five major KOD categories:
(a) damaging personal statements, (b) harmful letters of recommendation, (c) lack of program information, (d) poor writing skills, and (e) misleading attempts to impress. We subsequently describe these categories in descending order of frequency accompanied by illustrating examples.

Damaging Personal Statements

The personal statement section of a graduate school application is an opportunity to inform an admissions committee about personal and professional development, academic background and objectives, research and field experiences, and career goals and plans (Keith-Spiegel & Wiederman, 2002). We found 53 responses related to damaging personal
Karen and I used a qualitative approach to this project by performing a content analysis of our participants’ responses, which produced the following five categories.

1. Faulty personal statements
2. Inappropriate letter-of-recommendation authors
3. Lack of information about the program being applied to
4. Poor writing skills
5. Misfired attempts to impress

Examples of responses that fit each of these categories appear on the following slides.
Personal Statements Containing Non-Specific Research Goals

“Statements like ‘I’m open to any area of research’ or ‘I love all of psychology’ are statements that show no focus on a specific area.”
Inappropriate Letter-of-Recommendation Authors

- “The biggest KOD is having your therapist write a letter about you . . . no matter how positive the letter is.”

- “A letter of recommendation written by the applicant’s mother.”
Not Doing Your Homework About the Program to Which You Are Applying

“Failure to read program information—sometimes students note that they wish to work in an area we don’t offer or with a faculty member who has relocated, retired, or died.”
Poor Writing Skills

- “Applications that are poorly written, have misspellings, or other careless mistakes take an applicant out of the running.”

- “Poor grammar, misspellings, lack of structure...People getting their doctorate should already know how to write.”
Misfired Attempts to Impress

“A student wrote a six or seven page biographical statement when the application form clearly requested a one or two page statement.”
A summary of the Kisses of Death you can give students who seek your advice about how to apply to graduate school.
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The Seven Crucial Differences Between High School and College I Discovered Were:

1. Academic expectations are much higher.
2. Student-teacher contact is less frequent and more formal.
3. The syllabus replaces teachers’ daily reminders.
4. Homework is done after, not during school.
5. Students must be more independent and responsible.
6. Students are treated more like adults than children.
7. Students must learn to prioritize and manage their time.

The following slides contain direct quotations from the members of my freshman learning community that provide examples of these differences.
“Even though you may not be in class as long as in high school, the amount of time you have to put in to complete the assigned work is doubled, even tripled.”
“College teachers don’t tell you what you’re supposed to do. They just expect you to do it. High school teachers tell you about five times what you’re supposed to do.”
“You didn’t have to do reading assignments in high school because your teachers taught you everything you had to know for tests.”
“Even if I didn’t pass the tests in high school, I could still pass the class as long as I did my homework.”
“In high school, things were over at 4:00 p.m. At IUPUI, things like studying are just starting by that time.”
“The most important thing I’ve learned since I have been in college is that it’s time for me to step out of the purgatory between my teenage years and adulthood and to take some responsibility for my life.”
Handout #2

A summary of the perceived differences between high school and college that you can give students who seek advice about how to adjust to their first year in college.
Category #2 ⇒ The integration of knowledge, which involves the synthesis of individual ideas into larger and more organized bodies of knowledge such as theories and models.

The purpose of theories and models of academic advising is to enable us to describe, understand, explain, and predict complex advising-related phenomena such as

• the ways in which students develop during their undergraduate years,
• the differences between advising approaches, such as prescriptive and developmental advising, and
• the rationale for the contention that academic advising is a teaching activity.
Academic Advising
A Comprehensive Handbook
SECOND EDITION
“Advancing is teaching” is the guiding principle of the National Academic Advising Association. The source of this compelling axiom was a pioneering article by Crookston (originally published in 1972 and reprinted in 1994) titled A Developmental View of Academic Advising as Teaching. Since then many theories and approaches to academic advising have evolved, as described by Hagen and Jordan in Chapter Two.

Crookston’s (1972) approach established the groundwork for examining this principle of “advising as teaching.” He introduced the term developmental advising by contrasting it with prescriptive advising with the following medical analogy. Patients (advisees) seek the advice of doctors (advisors) when they realize they have medical (academic) problems, and doctors are the authorities who prescribe treatments to cure patients’ problems. According to Crookston (1994), a prescriptive advisor assumes that “once advice is given, his responsibility is largely fulfilled; now it is up to the student to fulfill his responsibility to do what is prescribed” (p. 6).

The prescriptive style of advising is not without its merits. Research indicates that students whose cultures stress “hierarchical patterns of interaction and deference to authority” prefer its more directive style (Brown & Rivas, 1994, p. 109). Fielstein (1994, p. 78) reminds us that prescriptive advising can provide a successful foundation for advising because students have the right to expect their advisors to provide them with “precise information regarding curriculum choices, major requirements, and graduation requirements.” However, the prescriptive style fails to engage students actively in their education and does not help them develop a sense of responsibility for their academic
Handout #3

Academic Advising Syllabus
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Psychology Department Advising Office
Spring 2010
Location → LD 123
Telephone → 274-6765
Email → psvadv@iupui.edu
Credo → Building your future, not just scheduling next semester’s classes.
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Category #3 ➔ The application of knowledge to improve teaching and learning, which involves the use of knowledge to improve the educational process.

The purpose of advising activities within this category is to use research-based and theoretical knowledge to improve how advisors teach and how advisees learn.
Assessment of the 19 Resources Available from or Associated with the IUPUI Psychology Department Advising Office

The rationale for our study was to discover if IUPUI psychology majors . . .

1. are aware of our advising resources,
2. use the resources they are aware of, and
3. are satisfied with the resources they have used.
19 Resources Available from or Associated with the Advising Office

**Human Resources**
- Faculty Advisors
- Peer Advisors
- Director of Undergraduate Studies
- Director of Student Development
- Psychology Department Office Staff

**Electronic Resources**
- Psychology Department Website
- Psychology Department Listserv
- Assistance with Onestart
- Advising Planner Website

**Printed Resources**
- Advising Handbook and Planner
- Handouts and Brochures
- Lending Library
- Journals and Magazines
- Student Files
- Bulletin Boards

**Events**
- Advising Nights
- Orientation Sessions

**Offices**
- Advising Office
- School of Science Office
Are you aware of the Psychology Advising Office?
  Yes   No

Have you used the services of the Psychology Advising Office?
  Yes   No

How satisfied were you with the services you received in the Psychology Advising Office?
  Very Satisfied
  Satisfied
  Neutral
  Dissatisfied
  Very Dissatisfied
Student Knowledge of Resources

- Faculty Advisors
- Peer Advisors
- Department Website
- Peer Advising Office
- Listserv
- Reference Materials
- Bulletin Boards
- Department Office Staff
- Director of Undergraduate Studies
- Director of Student Development
- Planner
- Lending Library
- Advising Night
- Journals/Magazines
- Onestart
- Student Files
- SOS Office
- Orientation
- Planner Website
Student Use of Resources

- Department Website
- Faculty Advisors
- Listserv
- Director of Undergrad Studies
- Reference Materials
- Peer Advising Office
- Peer Advisors
- SOS Office
- Planner Website
- Bulletin Boards
- Department Office Staff
- Advising Night
- Lending Library
- Orientation
- Student Files
- Onestart
- Journals/Magazines
Student Satisfaction with Resources

- Lending Library
- Journals/Magazines
- Director of Undergraduate Studies
- Reference Materials
- Bulletin Boards
- Advising Night
- SOS Office
- Planner Website
- Listserv
- Faculty Advisors
- Planner
- Orientation
- Department Office Staff
- Peer Advising Office
- Peer Advisors
- Department Website
- Student Files
The IUPUI Psychology Department’s Developmental Advising Website

http://www.psych.iupui.edu/Undergraduate/
If your advisees are like mine, they are anxious about the future, and they often seek your advice about how to develop strategies to be hired or accepted into graduate school.

Some advisees try to control their anxiety about the future by denying it for as long as possible, like one of my seniors who posted the sign that appears on the following slide on my classroom wall the week before graduation.
Fellow Seniors

Life, as we have always tried to avoid it, is about to happen.

Andy Kosegi
But other students are more proactive, such as the young man in my very first psychology class . . .
Who asked me the question…

“What can I do with a Bachelor’s Degree in Psychology, and what do I need to do to become a psychologist?”

This question launched my career as an academic advisor.
I’ve always considered myself to be an “educational idealist,” who believes that the true value of an education is not the simple receipt of a diploma after the accumulation of a specified number credit hours with a required GPA, but rather the positive intellectual, social, and personal changes that students can experience as they progress through a college curriculum.
My educationally idealistic beliefs stand in stark contrast to the disturbing, but often true, messages conveyed by the Doonesbury cartoons on the next two slides.
DOONESBURY
by G.B. Trudeau

ARE YOU KIDDING ME?
OH, MY GOD!
GET OUT!
WHAT'S GOING ON?
CAN'T BE GOOD...
DAMN!

SO SOME OF YOU MAY BE A LITTLE SURPRISED BY YOUR GRADES...
WHAT THE...?

YOU MAY NOT HAVE BEEN WARNED THAT THIS CLASSROOM IS ONE OF THE FEW AT WALDEN NEVER INFECTED BY THE SELF-ESTEEM CRAZE...

HERE STUDENTS GAIN CONFIDENCE THROUGH ACTUAL ACHIEVEMENT, NOT THROUGH GRADE INFLATION AND EMPTY PRAISE...

THE REAL WORLD DEMANDS RESULTS, IT DOESN'T MUCH CARE WHETHER YOU HOLD YOURSELF IN HIGH REGARD, THAT ERA IS OVER!

SEE YOU TOMORROW.

"MOST IMPROVED CAMPER"?
I GOT NINE OF 'EM. I'M PRETTY SURE THAT'S REAL GOLD.
WHAT AM I LOOKING AT?
A REPORT ON WHAT COLLEGE STUDENTS ARE LEARNING TODAY.

IT'S BASED ON TESTING THAT MEASURES CRITICAL THINKING, COMPLEX REASONING AND WRITING SKILLS.

SHOCKING. C'MON, DEAN, THAT'S WHY THEY COME! AND AS LONG AS WE GIVE THEM GOOD GRADES AND A DEGREE, THEIR PARENTS ARE HAPPY TOO! WHO CARES IF THEY CAN'T REASON?

Uh... EMPLOYERS?

ALMOST HALF THE KIDS TESTED MADE NO GAINS AFTER TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE. IT TURNS OUT THEY SPEND THREE TIMES AS MANY HOURS SOCIALIZING AS STUDYING!

ANY SPECIAL REASON YOU'RE LATE, SON?

YES, SIR. I GOT TRAPPED IN A PAPER BAG.
These two cartoons reflect the chilling effect that pressures from students, parents, and politicians can have on faculty and administrators. Simply enabling more students to graduate faster by “giving” them high grades, “streamlining” curricula (i.e., decreasing requirements) or removing “bottleneck” (i.e., challenging) classes will practically guarantee that we will graduate students who are less-well-prepared for their post-baccalaureate roles as members of the workforce, graduate students, and/or citizens.
My educational idealism is based on my understanding of the Latin word *educare*, from which the word education is derived.

*Educare* is a Latin infinitive that means *to lead out of*. The *ducare* means *to lead* and the *e* is a prefix, which means *out of*. 
Thus, an education to me is an experience that leads a person out of one place to another in areas such as

- **knowledge** (ignorance → wisdom),

- **skills** (from inability → ability), and

- **personal characteristics** (stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination → tolerance, acceptance, and the valuing of human differences).
Some examples of career-related advising questions whose answers can lead students from a clueless to a savvy state of knowledge about their occupational futures are . . .

1. **What occupations can I enter if I major in psychology?**

2. **What specific sets of knowledge, skills, and characteristics must I possess to enter and succeed in these occupations?**

3. **What strategies can I use to convince employers or graduate school admissions committees to hire me or admit me into their programs?**

I created the remaining handouts in your packet to help my advisees answer these questions.
Handout #4

The first page of an online publication two of my students and I created that provides psychology majors with 172 potential careers and the sets of knowledge, skills, and characteristics needed to enter and succeed in these careers.
A research article I wrote on the characteristics that employers value when they interview psychology majors.
Online Resource #2

A research article that two of my students and I wrote on the characteristics that graduate school admission committees instruct letter of recommendation authors to address and evaluate in their letters.
The strategy that I have created to help students request and receive strong letters of recommendation for jobs and graduate school that is based on the contents of the two previous online resources.
A letter of recommendation I wrote for a student who used the strategy described in the previous handout.
Category #4 \(\rightarrow\) The **scholarship of teaching and learning**, which involves the dissemination of knowledge to colleagues, students, public audiences, and the larger community of scholars.

I engaged in this category of the scholarship of **advising and learning** when I created the following two publications and made them available to my students, my colleagues, and to the general public.
PROFESSIONAL PLANNING PORTFOLIO FOR PSYCHOLOGY MAJORS

Drew Appleby
Marian College
3200 Cold Spring Road
Indianapolis, IN 46222-1997
317-955-6076
appleby@marian.edu
So, in conclusion, I hope I have presented you with information of sufficient quality and quantity to accomplish the two goals of my presentation.

My first goal was to provide you with a logically sound argument for the contention that many of the actions of academic advisors can be accurately described as scholarly.

I did my best to accomplish this goal by creating and then presenting the four-step, logically sequential argument that appears on the following slide.

Let’s review that argument . . .
1. **If ➔** Academic advising can be considered to be a teaching activity because advisors engage in many of the same activities that are performed by teachers…

2. **If ➔** Higher education has created a definition of scholarship that contains a number of specific categories of scholarly activities…

3. **If ➔** Teaching can be considered to be a scholarly endeavor because teachers engage in many of the activities contained in the categories of higher education’s definition of scholarship…

4. **Then ➔** Academic advisors do, indeed, engage in scholarship because they perform many of the same teaching activities included in higher education’s categories of scholarship.
The second goal of my presentation was to share with you, as fellow academic advising colleagues, some of the scholarly activities that I have created and used to both benefit my advisees and to support my applications for professional advancement.

I did my level best to accomplish this goal by describing these activities in a manner that I hope will affect you in six positive ways.

That is, I hope my presentation today has . . .
Convinced you that academic advisors can, indeed, engage in scholarly activities.

Inspired you to engage in these scholarly activities.

Encouraged you to use the products of this scholarship in ways that will benefit you, your advisees, your institution, and the advising process.

Empowered you to assess the effectiveness of these scholarly products and to use your results to improve these products even more.

Motivated you to serve as advocates on your campuses for the belief that academic advising is a scholarly activity.

Renewed and reinforced the pride you experience when you reflect upon the invaluable services you provide in your role as academic advisors.