

Shifting the Campus Culture: Moving From Transactional Academic Advising to Transformational Holistic Student Success Coaching

Jared Tippetts, Ph.D.

Vice President for Student Affairs
Southern Utah University
jaredtippetts@suu.edu

Eric Kirby, Ph.D., J.D.

Assistant Vice Pres for Completion & Student Success
Southern Utah University
erickirby@suu.edu

Abstract: In recent years there has been a movement in higher education to shift the role and responsibilities of academic advisors (McClellan and Moser, 2011). Gone are the days of a singular focus of serving as course schedulers. Advisors are now being asked to serve as academic experts, life coaches, career counselors, and so much more. But how does a campus go about shifting the culture of advising on their campus? Attempting to shift the organizational culture can feel like an insurmountable task. This paper, grounded in the theory of organizational change, as written about by Kotter (1996), highlights how one public, regional campus successfully shifted their campus culture from a transactional academic advising approach to a transformational holistic student success coaching model. As a result of this change, the number of advising appointments grew 100%, student satisfaction improved significantly, and the number of students who visited other campus support services doubled. All these efforts were made with the overarching goal of reversing a five-year slide in first-to-second year retention rates. The result? The campus successfully stopped the slide in student persistence, reversed the trend, and ended up with a 5% bump in retention rates.

Introduction and Background

The research is quite clear: academic advisors play a very important role in retaining and graduating students (Drake, 2011; Nutt, 2003; Metzner, 1989; Tinto, 1987). With this knowledge and understanding, administrators on many college and university campuses are now calling on these advisors to do even more; to do much more than help students schedule their courses. But, how do campuses go about shifting the culture of a group of staff that are not collectively always open to change? How do administrators help their advisors shift from a culture of transactional academic advising to a transformational holistic student success coaching model?

Prior to the 2015 cohort, our campus experienced five successive years of declining or stagnant retention rates. Therefore, it was clear that it was time to make some changes in order to turn things around. After a review of the literature, it was determined that working with our academic advisors would be an ideal place to start. The first task? Shifting the culture of advising from a model of course scheduling to holistic student success coaching. This paper will review the literature on advising, coaching, and organizational change, will discuss the theoretical perspective that was used to guide our efforts, and will conclude with an overview of how we shifted the advising organization and changed the culture on our campus. As a result of this change, the number of advising appointments grew 100%, student satisfaction improved significantly, and the number of students who visited other campus support services doubled. And most importantly, the campus successfully stopped the slide in declining persistence rates, reversed the trend, and ended up with a 5% bump in retention rates.

Literature Review

This section provides a review of the literature on the history of academic advising, advising as coaching model, organizational change theory, and organizational culture. Each of these topics are

essential to understanding how to shift the culture of academic advising on our campuses. In preparing a review of the literature, the authors examined journals, books, web-based materials, and other sources to ensure that each topic was thoroughly explored. The following is an abbreviated review of the literature pertinent to this paper.

History of Academic Advising

The concept of academic advising, while not necessarily known by this name, has been an integral part of higher education for centuries. In the early colonial colleges presidents would fulfill the role of advising students regarding their courses, extracurricular activities, and spiritual lives. In the mid to late 1800's, the first formal advising models began to emerge on college campuses as faculty were officially assigned students to advise in regards to course sequencing. Around the turn of the twentieth century, Harvard created a special counseling group called The Board of Freshmen Advisors to advise first-year students (Cook, 2001; Gillispie, 2003).

As the number of academic majors increased and the curricula became more complex in the early 1900's, colleges and universities found it harder and harder for faculty to "inform themselves in all matters pertaining to complicated problems of educational and vocational advisement . . ." (Doermann, 1926, p. 83). Colleges were also beginning to find it harder for the average faculty member to find enough time to effectively advise students when this task was added to a full teaching load. As a result, some colleges and universities began hiring staff members to focus on student counseling matters to relieve faculty members of this duty. However, on many campuses, faculty continued with counseling students, and in some cases, continue to do so even up until today.

Two other significant events, namely the GI Bill and the Civil Rights Bill, also played a major role in the need for more academic advising on campuses. These two important pieces of legislation opened the doors of higher education for populations of students who historically did not always have access. These first-generation, low-income, underrepresented, re-entry, disabled, and international students required more individualized attention and support, giving rise to a larger need for academic advising (Cook, 2001).

The Academic Advising profession formally took root in 1979 with the creation of the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and continues to evolve. Today NACADA defines Academic Advising as, "situations in which an institutional representative gives insight or direction to a college student about an academic, social, or personal matter. The nature of this direction might be to inform, suggest, counsel, discipline, coach, mentor, or even teach" (Kuhn, 2008, p. 3).

Advising as Coaching Model

There has been much written on coaching in the past decade or two. But, most researchers agree that the process of coaching essentially includes the following stages, "Relationship building, assessment, feedback, planning, implementation, and evaluation and follow-up" (Cocivera & Cronshaw, 2004; Kampa-Kokesch & Anderson, 2001; Stern, 2004). Coaching also assumes regular interaction between the advisor and the student.

While advising and coaching have many similarities, the research does make some distinctions. McClellan and Moser (2011) describe a coaching process that not only encompasses advising and course scheduling, but also includes the care of the whole student. This practice-oriented model begins with (1) preparation for the advising session, and proceeds with (2) welcoming the student, (3) building rapport, (4) exploring and clarifying the student needs, (5) advising the students, (6) wrapping up the session, and (7) following up. McClellan and Moser then go on to further explain that step five, advising the students, entails an additional five-stage 'ADVISE' as coaching process: (A) Active listening, (D) Determining the desire, dream, or problem, (V) eValuating what has been done so far, (I) Identifying options, (S) Selecting options, and (E) Engaging in and evaluating the plan.

At the risk of oversimplifying this concept, the reality is that moving from a course scheduling model to a holistic student success coaching model simply entails getting to know the students on a more personal level and showing them we care about their success. By simply asking about (and following up

on) personal matters, levels of social integration, financial challenges, etc. we begin to move beyond the role of an advisor to that of a coach.

The question, however, is how does one go about shifting the organization and culture of advising to become more holistic? To better understand how to do this, it is important to understand organizational change and organizational culture.

Organizational Change

Organizational change is constant and is typically driven by any combination of the following factors: crisis in the organization, strong leadership, or environmental or market forces (Chaffee, 1984; Kezar, 2001). Change, for many, can be a very emotional event and it is not uncommon for members of an organization to be resistant to change.

Organizational change theory comes out of the field of organizational development and has been influenced by other disciplines such as anthropology, social psychology, sociology, education, and philosophy. Over time, the discussions around change theory focused on organizations as living entities (Fullan, 1999; Weick & Quinn, 1999).

One of the first theories on organizational change was Kurt Lewin's change theory (1947). Lewin's model of change is the classic three step model of (1) unfreeze the current state; (2) move toward the new state; and (3) refreeze the new state. His research was the foundation for organizational change for a number of years and can still be seen in most change theories.

Similarly, Fullan researched organizational change for several decades and stated that substantive change is both time-consuming and energy-intensive. He wrote that "the total time frame from initiation to institutionalization is lengthy, and even moderately complex changes take from three to five years, while major restructuring efforts take five to ten years" (1991, p. 49).

For purposes of this paper, we will focus on Kotter's (1996) organizational change theory from his book, *Leading Change*. We will discuss his theory in much more detail later in the paper.

Organizational Culture

For the past several decades, scholars have been researching and examining organizational culture (Schein, 2004; Kuh & Whitt, 1998; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985), doing their best to define this complex phenomenon. Although each definition differs slightly, each has a similar flavor. Pascale and Athos (1981) define culture as the glue that holds an organization together. Schein (2004) explains culture as:

a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 17)

Kuh and Whitt (1998) define culture as:

persistent patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that shape the behavior of individuals and groups in a college or university and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of events and actions on and off the campus. (p. IV)

Finally, Deal and Kennedy (1982) plainly define culture as "the way we do things around here" (p. 4).

Both Lewin (1947) and Schein (2004) have found that culture is a powerful force that influences everything within the institution. In an article that Schein (1996) wrote, he drew a powerful analogy about culture and change. He wrote that an individual would not build a bridge without understanding structural mechanics or perform a heart transplant without practice, yet many in management positions take on major change initiatives without understanding organizational change strategies and their institution's culture. "By understanding culture, leadership can help set the stage for change, thereby improving the quality of experience and performance of the current change initiative" (King, 2001). Therefore, it is important that administrators who are trying to create change understand organizational culture. "One could argue that

the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture, and that the unique talent of leaders is their ability to understand and work with culture” (Schein, 2004, p. 11).

A review of the literature on organizational culture seems to highlight that many leaders do not spend enough time managing the culture of their organizations. It appears as though many leaders simply go through the motions of managing or leading their organization without ever giving much thought to the underlying cultural practices.

Theoretical Perspective

As the authors began the monumental task of shifting the advising culture on our campus, we leaned heavily on John Kotter’s (1996) change theory which suggests that organizational change is an eight-step process. Therefore, it is prudent for the reader to understand his theory in more detail.

John Kotter published his theory about organizational change in his book, *Leading Change* (1996). His theory suggests that if organizations want to effectively achieve change, they can follow an eight step process. Those steps are: (1) establishing a sense of urgency, (2) creating a guiding coalition, (3) developing a vision and strategy, (4) communicating the change vision, (5) empowering broad-based action, (6) generating short-term wins, (7) consolidating gains and producing more change, and (8) anchoring new approaches in the culture. Each will be discussed in more detail below.

The first step in Kotter’s organizational change theory is *establishing a sense of urgency*. It is important for organizations to examine who they are and what expectations are held by those they serve. It is also vital for organizations to understand their competition, the environment within which they operate, and how they can turn crisis into opportunities. It is so important to instill within an organization the understanding that if it stands still, they will lose their competitive advantage.

Establishing a need for change is an important step in the change process (Kotter, 1996). Cameron and Quinn (1999) call this step, “creating readiness” (p. 88). There must be a sense of urgency within the organization that change is needed. If the leader is able to create this sense of urgency, then the participants within the organization are typically able and willing to give extra effort. If urgency is not established, it becomes easy for complacency to creep in, which will ultimately kill all momentum toward change. Complacency can be caused by past success, no visible crisis, low performance standards, or insufficient feedback (Kotter, 1996). Once complacency has set in, it can be nearly impossible to drive people from their comfort zones.

Without a clearly articulated purpose for change, nothing is ever going to happen. Individuals and organizations always seem to be striving for a homeostatic state, a place where they are comfortable. Many people will even admit that they do not like change and do not do well with it. Therefore, it is vital that leaders establish a need for change and educate their followers on why the need exists.

Step two of Kotter’s organizational change theory is *creating a guiding coalition*. This is the process of organizing a group of individuals who have enough respect, power, and leadership to lead the change. These are the people that the rest of the members of the organization will follow as the change is implemented.

Coalition building is very much a part of leadership and change and can be used to garner support for a cause, gain resources, or increase power (Cameron & Quinn, 1999; Kotter, 1996). Effective leaders will be able to achieve their institutional goals if they are able to balance the demands and interests of their varied stakeholders and build strong coalitions. Successful changes happen when many people are committed to the change. Getting people to buy-in is often a challenging task as the demands of the stakeholders are often in conflict. “A good leader is one who has been able to balance the conflicting demands” of the major campus constituencies (Birnbaum, 1992, p. 57).

Unfortunately, many leaders create committees or task forces to achieve buy-in, thinking they are forming coalitions. However, these rarely work and hardly ever influence real change. Committees and task forces are often slow, political, and frustrating. Most of the work is done by a small dedicated portion of the committee and rarely are key decision makers even a part of the task force, so eventually the groups

fade away over time (Kotter, 1996). Building strong coalitions is different. It is the process of finding the right people who can help push through changes. It is a mechanism for leaders to build a stronger power base.

Step three of Kotter's organizational change theory is *developing a vision and a strategy*. It is crucial that the vision be shared among all the participants, and the leader must be the one to get others to buy into the vision for change and outline a strategy for how the organization will get there. Getting people to buy into the vision for change is one of the most important strategies for creating change. "Without vision, there can be no direction, no improvement" (Fisher & Tack, 1988, p. 103).

A proper vision helps direct, align, and inspire others. It helps guide the decision making process, avoid conflict, and ultimately save time. Effective leaders are able to communicate their visions in just a few minutes and should be able to create a reaction of interest and understanding. Appropriate visions should rally people together and inspire change (Kotter, 1996).

Step four of Kotter's organizational change theory is *communicating the change vision*. This step is certainly related to the step three but with the focus being on effective communication. In fact, Kotter (1996) states that a leader cannot over-communicate the vision enough and that every communication resource and method must be used. Most importantly, the behavior and action of the leader and the coalition must match the message. The members of an organization have a strong need to understand the purpose of the change before they will buy into it and support the effort. Finally, the vision must be "lived" by those at the top. If leaders do not "walk the talk" or "practice what they preach," the chances are good that the proposed change will not go anywhere. The decisions made at the top must be consistent with the communications.

Communication is clearly an important skill in creating change. All members of the organization must be reminded consistently of the need for change as well as the vision for the new direction. If people do not see progress along the way, the motivation will diminish and ultimately the change will not occur. Therefore, it is vital that leaders point out and communicate short-term wins along the way. It is also important for leaders not to declare victory too soon (Kotter, 1996).

Step five of Kotter's organizational change theory is *empowering broad-based action*. In order for change to occur within the organization, the leader must make sure to remove every possible obstacle, such as members of the organization who disagree with the proposed changes or organizational structures that might need to be modified. Once this has occurred, the leader must create an environment where participants feel comfortable implementing new ideas, taking risks, and working toward the change. In order to effectively create change within an organization, it is important to empower colleagues to move forward with the changes (Kotter, 1996). It is also important to "identify the opinion leaders. Involve those affected by the changes. Listen to their perspectives and help them feel understood, valued, and engaged" (Cameron & Quinn, 1999, p. 86).

A common mistake leaders make when trying to create change is that they fail to confront obstacles, allowing small roadblocks to get in the way of the new vision. The result of failing to overcome these obstacles is de-motivation. Members of the organization will always feel disempowered when they do not see their leaders doing everything they can to make sure that the organization is moving forward with the changes prescribed by the new vision.

Step six of Kotter's organizational change theory is *generating short-term wins*. This step is vital to the change process so that participants within the organization can sense that progress is being made. It is the responsibility of the leader to make everyone aware of these short-term wins and to recognize the people who were responsible for the progress. Even though it may take several years for the change to occur, it is important to focus on the short-term successes. Cameron and Quinn (1999) suggest that leaders need to make sure they "find something easy to change, change it, and celebrate it publicly. Then, find a second thing that is easy to change, change it, and publicize it. Small successful steps create momentum in the desired direction and inhibit resistance" (p. 86).

Step seven of Kotter's organizational change theory is *consolidating gains and producing more change*. This is the natural outcome of recognizing the short-term wins. As members of the organization

recognize progress with the change plan, they will continue to work toward additional change to help with the overall implementation of the transformation.

Creating change in higher education is a complex process. Change needs to be seen and understood as a process, not an event (Bennis, 1969). Unfortunately at this point no research has been able to discover shortcuts for creating and carrying out a successful change process.

Everyone involved with strategic change on a college and university campus must give a significant amount of time and effort to the process. They must do their homework and be committed to the process. They must take on the harder and more time-consuming projects in order to assure that the process will succeed. (Rowley & Sherman, 2001, p. 274)

Step eight of Kotter's organizational change theory is *anchoring new approaches in the culture*. This final step in the process is vital to the lasting success of the change. If the change is not anchored into the culture, then it will just revert back to the way it was previously.

To anchor the changes into the culture, leaders need to demonstrate how the changes have improved the organization. Leaders need to make sure to point out the changes within the culture to the people within their organization. Often they are unable to make these connections and see the real changes themselves. In addition, it is important for leaders to make sure that the changes last through the next generation of leaders. Kotter (1996) warns that one bad hiring decision can reverse a whole decade of good work.

Putting Theory to Practice

The authors of this paper were hired near the same time at the same institution in 2015 and were explicitly tasked by the president to reverse a five-year slide in the first-to-second year retention rates. Upon our arrival on campus, we encountered a culture where student affairs staff (and related academic affairs colleagues) were working hard, were trying to implement High Impact Practices (Kuh, 2008) and other best practices outlined in the literature, and also felt overwhelmed and over-worked. The campus "Executive Retention Team" (ERT) had many great ideas but very little institutional support and no designated leader with available time and bandwidth to drive their ideas forward. As a result, the campus was not enjoying the results we had hoped for.

Around the same time we arrived on campus, our academic advising model moved from a decentralized, shared model to a centralized, self-contained model (Pardee, 2004). More full-time professional academic advisors were hired to relieve faculty of their advising duties and all advisors began reporting to a central Director of Academic Advising. The advising unit also moved organizationally from reporting to the Dean of the University College to reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs, who was assigned by the President to be the chief retention officer on campus.

We knew from the literature that academic advising, if done right, would be key to our ability to begin moving the needle on retention. We spent hours meeting with our advising team, both one-on-one and in groups, to learn everything we could about our advising model on campus. In meetings with advisors we were told they were busy all day long and were meeting with lots of students. Advisors reported that they enjoyed their jobs and liked working with their students. Their current scheduling approach was to wait for students to come to them. If they weren't meeting with students, they filled their time catching up on email, working on other projects, attending meetings, or connecting with colleagues. Their caseloads averaged around 1:700, but only students with less than 30 earned credits were required to meet with advisors prior to registering for the next semester.

When we asked advisors what a typical meeting with a student consisted of, we learned that the focus of their meetings was to help students figure out which courses they needed for the next semester or which classes they would need to take if they changed to a new major. We learned that very little time was spent getting to know students on an individual level.

As we began to capture data and assess the work of our advisors we learned that advisors were meeting with an average of 3.4 students per day. Assuming 30 minute appointments, our advisors (on

average) were spending approximately two hours a day in advising meetings with students. We also learned that students were not seeking help at the rate we had hoped. Still, things seemed to be going okay, but we also knew there had to be a way for advisors to have a greater influence in the lives of our students. It was time to shift the advising model from a transactional advising model to a transformational holistic student success coaching relationship.

So, using Kotter's (1996) organizational change model, we set out to partner with advisors to shift the culture of advising and achieve our institutional goals. Just as Kotter warned, this shift in culture proved to be quite challenging. Below is a description of how we put Kotter's theory to practice.

Campus advising model

According to Kotter, step one is to *establish a sense of urgency*. To do this, we brought all the academic advisors together for an important daylong meeting to introduce the shift in advising models from course scheduling to holistic student success coaching. This daylong meeting was used to create a sense of urgency around the presidential edict to move the needle on retention. During this meeting we shared lots of research on the power and influence that student success coaching can have on student success. In fact, we symbolically changed the title of their positions from "Academic Advisor" to "Student Success Coach" (SSC) to further cement the shift in approach. We also established a set of goals, metrics, and expectations (see Appendix A) and made it clear that SSCs were required to meet or exceed these measures. While we had no desire or hope of terminating any SSCs from their positions, they all left the meeting with a very clear understanding of what was expected of them and a strong sense of urgency that we collectively had to do our part to stop the retention slide and begin to reverse the trend.

Step two from Kotter's model suggests that we *create a guiding coalition*. Knowing that not all SSCs would be equally excited about the proposed changes and new expectations, we identified a few SSCs who are seen as leaders and influencers among their colleagues and introduced our proposed model to this small group prior to the big kick-off meeting. This smaller coalition received the changes very well and were excited about the shift in approach. Knowing we now had allies in place, it made things much easier as we spent the day (and succeeding months) outlining the changes we wanted to see with all the SSCs. This coalition was very helpful in the kick-off meeting and especially in private conversations around the office, where they spoke in favor of the new changes and brought reason and sound judgement to the greater team.

Step three of Kotter's theory called for *developing a vision and strategy*. The vision, was simply this: increase retention and graduation rates. The strategy of how we achieve the vision, however, was not as easy. But, after much reading, talking, and assessment, we knew we were only going to achieve our vision by implementing our strategy to move our advising model from a class scheduling approach to a more holistic, relational, and comprehensive approach. We attempted, as best we could, to include the guiding coalition described above in conversations related to building our vision.

Step four in Kotter's theory highlights the importance of *communicating the change vision*. In addition to our daylong kick-off meeting, we regularly attended Advising Team Meetings for several months to answer questions, re-communicate the vision, and train on strategies for accomplishing the goals and expectations. We also sent many emails, met in small groups, and had countless personal meetings with SSCs to address concerns and provide support. Even now, a couple years removed from the original kick-off meeting, we are still re-communicating the vision and reinforcing the benefits of the new advising culture.

Step five in Kotter's model calls for *empowering broad-based action*. As we implemented this stage in the change process, we did our best to remove obstacles that got in the way of culture adoption. One large obstacle came in the form of a couple SSCs who disagreed with the proposed changes. In response, we candidly addressed the group and let all the SSCs know that we didn't expect this change would be for everyone and offered to support people in their job search if they felt like a change in jobs may be appropriate. We had a couple advisors take us up on the offer and it worked out great for both the SSC and our organization. We also tried to remove barriers in the environment by eliminating other "duties as assigned" so they could focus on the core task at hand and empowered the SSCs to tackle their

work creatively and gave them permission to take risks. It was fun to see all the unique ways the SSCs went about influencing the lives of their students.

Step six in Kotter's theory highlights the importance of *generating short-term wins* in order to keep moving toward the desired organizational change. In order to keep progressing with our shift from course scheduling to holistic student success coaching, we looked for every opportunity to celebrate short-term wins. For example, we created scorecards for our SSCs where we tracked their progress on the key metrics for success. Rather than waiting for annual retention numbers to be reported, we regularly updated the SSCs on how they were tracking with their number of visits per day, hours of coaching each day, etc. We also celebrated along the way with lunches, dessert socials, and very public comments at campus meetings and emails to the President's Cabinet. We found that recognizing short-term wins went a long way in keeping morale up and the team motivated about the direction we were heading as a campus.

Step seven is *consolidating gains and producing more change*. As a result of the cumulated short-term wins, we finally began to see the shift in culture. It took more than a year, but eventually, the SSCs began to see significant progress, which motivated them to keep working toward more change. The culture of the advising office continued to improve and the number of challenges began to subside. It was clear that we were finally starting to arrive at our desired vision.

Step eight of Kotter's organizational change theory is *anchoring new approaches in the culture*. This is the step that we are still working on, and probably will be for many more years. The most exciting recent development was a request from the SSCs to revisit their goals, metrics, and expectations to again "raise the bar." This time, however, they didn't want "the administration" to dictate the details, but instead, wanted to develop goals that they feel will best help us achieve our retention goals.

Results

Now that we are almost two years removed from the shift in advising models, we are pleased with the positive results that have occurred on campus. Our SSCs are now quick to explain their new role to faculty, staff, and students, which always includes a description of their holistic approach to helping students succeed. They fully understand that they still must help students register for the right courses, but they now know a lot more about the students in their cohort and regularly reach out to them to follow-up on things they discussed in their meetings.

As a result of the shift in advising, we also saw the culture change trickle into other areas on campus, such as our multicultural center, veteran's center, career services, and non-traditional student services. The staff members in these areas adopted the same holistic approach and have seen a significant increase in the number of students visiting their offices. Most recently, we were asked to facilitate a session at our Dean's Council retreat where we introduced this model to the academic leaders on our campus. They left the retreat eager to go back to their colleges with an invitation to their faculty to be more holistic in their interactions with students.

Here is a short sampling of statistics that outline the impact this shift in advising culture had on the broader campus community:

- Increased the average number of students our SSCs met with on a daily basis by 166%.
- Decreased the percentage of students not showing up to their appointments from 19.77% to 14.76%.
- Increased the in-person contact our SSCs had with their students by 45.7%.
- Increased the number of all students (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors) who came back the following year by 5.03% in 2015 and 6.08% in 2016. (Prior to shifting the advising model, we saw a -2.37% decrease in 2014, a -2.88% decrease in 2013, and -4.0% decrease in 2012).
- Had a 100% increase in the number of multicultural students seeking one-on-one appointments.
- Had a 160% increase in the number of veteran students going to our Veteran's Center to seek support services.

In the end, the metric that we were most concerned with improving was our first-to-second year retention rate. In our most recent reporting cycle, we not only stopped the attrition slide, but also reversed the trend and ended up with a 5% bump in retention rates to a historic institutional high.

Conclusion

Our campus attributes much of our recent successes to the shift in advising model on campus, and deservedly so. While it took considerable time and effort to move through Kotter's (1996) eight step process to change the culture of the organization, in the end, the outcomes have been extremely positive. Our SSCs have adjusted their methods, are much more holistic in their approach, and now fully understand their role in helping our campus retain and graduate more students.

References

- Bennis, W. G. (1969). *Organization development: Its nature, origin and prospects*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Birnbaum, R. (1992). *How academic leadership works. Understanding success and failure in the college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Chaffee, E. E. (1984). *After decline, what? Survival strategies at eight private colleges*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Cocivera, T., & Cronshaw, S. (2004). Action frame theory as a practical framework for executive coaching process. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 56(4), 234-245.
- Cook, S. (2001). *A chronology of academic advising in America*. Retrieved from <https://dus.psu.edu/mentor/old/articles/011015sc.htm>
- Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). *Corporate cultures*. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.
- Doermann, H. J. (1926). *The orientation of college freshman*. Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company.
- Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus*, 16(3), 8-12.
- Fisher, J. L., & Tack, M. W. (1988). *Leaders on leadership: The college presidency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel*. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Gillispie, B. (2003). *History of academic advising*. Retrieved from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources Web site: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/History-of-academic-advising.aspx>
- Kampa-Kokesch, S., & Anderson, M. Z. (2001). Executive coaching: A comprehensive review of the literature. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 53(4), 205-228.
- Kezar, A. (2001). *Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualization*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- King, J. A. (2001). *A study on the relationship between an institution's culture and the change process*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Massachusetts Lowell, Lowell.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: AAC&U.
- Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1998). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities*. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No. 1). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Kuhn, T. (2008). Historical foundations of academic advising. In V. Gordon, W. Habley, & T. Grites (Eds.), *Academic advising: A comprehensive handbook, 2nd edition* (pp. 3-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. In T. Newcomb & E. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 197-211). Troy, MO: Rinehart & Winston.
- McClellan J., & Moser C. (2011). *A practical approach to advising as coaching*. Retrieved from the NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources website: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Advising-as-coaching.aspx>
- Metzner, B. S. (1989). Perceived quality of academic advising: The effect on freshman attrition. *American Educational Research Journal*, 26(3), 422-442.

- Nutt, C. L. (2003). *Academic advising and student retention and persistence*. Retrieved from the NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources website:
<http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/tabid/3318/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/636/article.aspx>
- Ouchi, W. G., & Wilkins, A. L. (1985). Organizational culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *11*, 457- 483.
- Pardee, C. F. (2004). *Organizational structures for advising*. Retrieved from the NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources website:
<http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Organizational-Models-for-Advising.aspx>
- Pascale, R. T., & Athos, A. G. (1981). *The art of Japanese management: Applications for American executives*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Rowley, D. J., & Sherman, H. (2001). *From strategy to change: Implementing the plan in higher education*. New York, MI: Wiley Publishers.
- Schein, E. H. (1996). Leadership and organizational culture. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The leader of the future* (pp. 59-69). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. (3rd Edition). New York: Wiley Publishers.
- Stern, L. R. (2004). Executive coaching: A working definition. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *56*(3), 154-162.
- Tinto, V. (1987). *Increasing student retention*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *50*, 361-386.

Appendix A

Student Success Coach (SSC) Goals, Metrics, and Expectations

By College/Cohort:

1. Percentage of students who meet with SSC each semester (or ACES, as appropriate)
 - a. Make meaningful connection with 100% of undergraduate students (SSCs and ACES; via phone, in person, e-mail, etc.)
2. Percentage of students retained at SUU (fall to fall)
 - a. Long term overall goal: 85% retention for freshmen to sophomore
 - b. Intermediate goals:
 - i. 72% retention freshmen to sophomore (currently at 65%)
 - ii. 57% retention sophomore to junior (currently at 50%)
3. Percentage of students graduated within 6 years
 - a. Long term overall goal: 65% graduation
 - b. Intermediate goal: 55% graduation (currently at 50%)
4. Percentage of students registered at deadline (Monday before Thanksgiving for spring registration and Study Day in April for fall registration)
 - a. 80% of students registered by deadline

By Advisor:

1. Meet with a minimum of 7 students per day (average) over the course of the semester.
2. Spend an average of 5+ hours per day coaching students over the course of the semester.