

NJCU
EDTC 809
Fall 2018
Dr. Carnahan
Project 4

The utilization of the online advising tool and the in-person advising

By Emily Vandalovsky

Chapter 1

Introduction

As more students enter American colleges and universities for the first time, their educational experience is influenced by many factors, one of which is establishing and ongoing support of the academic advisors. The role of academic advising is critical to the student retention, as it gets frequently rated as one of the top predictors of the students' success and satisfaction during their educational careers (Anderson, Motto, & Boudreaux, 2014; Drake, 2011; Feghali, Zbib, & Hallal, 2011).

The quality of student-advisor relationship further intensifies the quality of overall student educational experience in both positive and negative ways. Satisfactory encounters with academic advisors promote student success, while unsatisfactory experiences negatively impact the overall effectiveness of the college education (Vianden, 2016).

Statement of the Problem

The effectiveness of advising is associated with fulfilling students' expectations and the overall satisfaction of the process. With the utilization of the blended format and incorporation of the newer technologies into the area of advising, the effectiveness of the implemented solutions and the alignment of student expectations with advising services remain the main evaluative factors for efficiency and success of the collegial experience (Anderson, Motto & Boudreaux, 2014).

This explanatory sequential mixed-methods study examines the effectiveness and the satisfaction with the online advising tool among the student body at the Northern Suburban Community College (the pseudonym). It starts with a quantitative portion to investigate the

effectiveness and the satisfaction with the online advising tool at the NSCC. The study further proceeds with a qualitative component of the exploratory inquiry on the advising encounters experienced by several students in-person or using online advising tool.

The aim of this explanatory sequential mixed methods study is to investigate the impact of the experiences with the online advising tool among student body at the Northern Suburban Community College. As determined the study design, it will begin with a quantitative component by conducting a survey to 2,500 students currently enrolled at the institution. The second component will consist of selecting 20 purposely sampled individuals to explore their personal experiences through pragmatic qualitative inquiry. Mixing the survey-based quantitative method with a pragmatic qualitative inquiry in an explanatory sequential approach provides a thorough mechanism for investigating and studying the phenomena from multiple perspectives and allows for the two parts of data analysis to complement each other (Patton, 2015). The pragmatic qualitative inquiry is the perfect fit into a mixed methods study design, based on the philosophical system of pragmatism (Morgan, 2014).

To investigate the effectiveness of the online advising system and to further explore the student experiences with advising (face-to-face or online), the following research questions will be attributed:

RQ1: To what extent, if any, do the face-to-face advising sessions contribute to the satisfactory college experience for degree-seeking students at Northern Suburban Community College?

RQ2: To what extent, if any, does the use of the online advising tool contribute to the satisfactory college experience for the degree-seeking students at Northern Suburban Community College?

RQ3: How do interviews with students help to explain any quantitative differences in perceived satisfaction of face-to-face and online advising tool for the community college students?

Significance of the study

The study is designed to benefit the student body of the NS Community College by analyzing their overall satisfaction level with collegial academic advising services, and more particularly with in-person sessions and online tool. The results will allow to draw conclusions on which formats of advising do students find more advantageous and what areas need the most improvement. Due to the direct connection between the satisfaction from the advising process and the success of the overall educational experience, the college will be able to provide more sought after advising services, and therefore better cater to the student needs.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Satisfactory academic advising is considered one of the influence factors of the student academic success and overall satisfaction with their educational experience. Some researchers believe that it is the most important factor. In his book *Making the most of college*, Richard Light stresses the importance of advising based on his 10-year long qualitative research that incorporated 1,600 recent graduates from 90 colleges and universities. He states, “good advising may be the single most underestimated characteristic of a successful college experience” (2004, p.81).

To understand the importance and to measure the effectiveness of the advising model at the given institution, it is necessary to provide the historic perspective and the fundamentals of the existing models. The theoretical framework for conceptualizing academic advising is based on the exhibited advisor’s behavioral styles, described in the literature by the following three traditional models: prescriptive model, developmental model, and integrated model (Chando, 1997; Crookston, 1972; Feghali, Zbib & Hallal, 2011; Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Pardee, 1994).

In the prescriptive advising model, the advisor acts authoritatively on making decisions on course selection, registration, degree requirements on student’s behalf. He or she makes a “diagnosis” and prescribes the course of action to the student, who bears no responsibility and expresses no participation in the decision making on the selection of courses, registering for classes and fulfilling requirements for a degree (Crookston, 1972). While some researchers including Crookston criticized the prescriptive advising for the lack of student involvement, other researchers found it just as advantageous (Fielstein, 1994). It was also found that many

students were preconditioned to the expectation of the prescribed advising since they were not exposed to any other models (Pardee, 1994).

In the developmental advising, the responsibility is shared between the advisor and the student. The advisor facilitates the process allowing the student to develop critical thinking and decision-making skills and become more independent (Chando, 1997; Crookston, 1972). While student preferences and the positive aspects of developmental advising are supported throughout the literature (Chando, 1997; Crookston, 1972; Gordon, 1994; Pardee, 1994), some of the following weaknesses of this model have also been noted. They include: (a) time expense, (b) extensive loads, (c) insufficient amount or the absence of the professional development, (d) the inconsistency in contacts with advising staff; (e) segregated advising areas; (f) limited collaboration between the academic and the student services areas; (g) limited or non-existent training on working with diverse student population, and (h) absence of reliable evaluation methodologies (Gordon, 1994).

Although both models of advising, the prescriptive and the developmental, exhibit shortcomings, their strength are advantageous for maintaining a leveraged process in a higher education institution. Combining the two approaches in the integrated manner provides a solid model for proceeding with both, the directing and the counseling modes of the advising (Fielstein, 1994; Heisserer & Parette, 2002).

Some scholars believe that in addition to the traditionally defined prescriptive, developmental, and integrated models, the engagement model for the academic advising also exists. It promotes a relationship between a student-advisee and a faculty-advisor and focuses on the development of the student efficacy and self-reliance in figuring out the degree requirements (Feghali, Zbib & Hallal, 2011; Yarbrough, 2002). It recognizes the additional effort on the part

of the faculty advisor in employing technological tools as an enhancement to, but not a replacement of face-to-face advising encounters (Feghali, Zbib & Hallal, 2011; Yarbrough, 2002). The historical perspective provides the background for the engagement model, which allows for the emerging formats of advising.

The rapid development of the technological tools used in higher education effected all areas including academic advising. A variety of technologically enhanced solutions became implemented in the area, traditionally based on a face-to-face personal relationship between an advisee and an advisor. The new formats of advising became supported by the technological tools to assist with sophisticated decision making on educational planning and academic service. The emerged technological solutions are aimed to automate the repetitive tasks and enhance the effectiveness of the overall advising process, providing a blended approach to advising rather than fully replacing traditional advisor-student relationship (Fries-Britt, 2008).

Driven by the role of the advising in the overall student success and the role of the educational technology in the advising process, Northern Suburban Community College implements a new online advising tool, aimed to provide effective services, aligned with students' expectations. The alignment or the lack of such between advising services and the students expectations is linked to the overall satisfaction with advising (Anderson, Motto & Boudreaux, 2014).

This explanatory sequential mixed methods study investigates the effectiveness of the online advising tool and hypothesizes about the correlation of the student expectations and the services available with the use of the tool. It further explores student personal experiences with advising sessions in a more detailed manner.

Chapter 3

Methodology

To fully explore the phenomenon and investigate the effectiveness of the academic advising online advising tool at NSCC, the mixed methods research design will be implemented in this study. As defined by Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, the mixed methods design incorporates the both the qualitative and the quantitative data collection to satisfy the purpose of the research and answer the research questions (2007). Other characteristics of the mixed methods research include rigorous methodologies for qualitative and quantitative data collection, analysis and interpretation; merging of data by building the data from one set to another; distinct procedures on how the study will be constructed and supported by the worldview and a theory (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007; Creswell & Creswell, 2017)

The background of this methodology takes its roots from pragmatism, a worldview that originated from the works of Peirce, James, Mead, and Dewey (Cherryholmes, 1992). As the name of the worldview suggests, pragmatism is about establishing practical approach to applications, finding possible solutions to problems and using all available methods to understand the phenomena. It “arises out of actions, situations and consequences other than antecedent conditions” (Creswell & Creswell, 2017, p.10).

Due to its pluralistic nature, pragmatism is not restricted to one particular philosophy, but fully supports both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. It provides a researcher with a freedom of choice for inquiry types, method design, study techniques and procedures (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). It offers a supporting mechanism for conducting mixed methods studies.

The reason I selected a mixed methods study is to develop the most comprehensive approach to investigating the topic. I intend to learn whether the students find the online advising system satisfactory and the reasons for being so. The initial phase of the study includes administering a survey to all enrolled students, which will provide quantitative data on how satisfactory or unsatisfactory they find the use of online advising tool as well as in-person encounters. (Appendix B)

The second phase of this mixed-methods sequential exploratory research presents a qualitative study focusing on student personal experiences with academic advising at Northern Suburban Community College. Due to the qualitative nature of the study, it will explore the phenomenon of the academic advising in detail as it is experienced by a group of NSCC students.

It will be beneficial to find out about personal experiences of the students who were mostly satisfied or mostly dissatisfied with face-to-face advising sessions and online advising tool. The responses of the participants in the qualitative study will help to develop in-depth viewpoint and further analyze the details of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction with various formats of academic advising. It will further assist with identifying areas for improvement and cater to the students' needs more focused objectives.

Population and Sample

The quantitative design fits the first phase of this study because I am interested in investigating the satisfaction with the usability of the recently implemented online advising tool. Since the online tool is available to all students in college, I anticipate a larger sample with extensive result set.

Based on the data recorded from the previous Fall semesters, the estimated population size for this study may reach over 2500 students, with approximately 2000 full-time students and 500 part-time students. All enrolled students, regardless of their full-time or part-time status, will be invited to participate in the survey, with their status being noted as one of the data points (Appendix B).

Once the responses to the survey are received and analyzed, 20 participants will be selected from the pool of responders for the qualitative phase of the study using maximum variation purposeful sampling strategy. It allows to capture the most diverse scenarios and identify the common patterns across them (Patton, 2015). The selection criteria for the purposeful sampling strategy will be based on the answers provided to the survey. All data points from the survey will be collected and analyzed prior to selecting a purposeful sample for the qualitative part (Appendix B).

Respondents, consistently scoring the lowest or the highest on the advising satisfaction ratings will be considered for a follow-up interview. Within the 20 purposefully selected individuals, I will strive to identify four groups: five respondents most satisfied with in-person advising, five respondents least satisfied with in-person advising, five respondents most satisfied with the online advising tool, and five respondents least satisfied with the online advising tool. If more than five students equally qualify to be selected for each group, additional criteria contributing to the group diversity will be considered.

Since this study does not focus on the demographics, the demographic-related data will be noted, but not analyzed as a part of the study.

Procedure

All students will be invited to participate in the survey by email using the college's email system. The original email will contain a brief study description and the unique link to the survey site (Appendix B, https://njcu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_d6cyak8r8BOSid7). Students will be given a three-week window to complete the survey. A follow-up email will be sent a week later with a reminder to those students who have not completed it yet while encouraging them to do so within next two weeks. The final reminder will be sent a week later, which will be a week prior to the expiration of the survey link.

In addition, the promotional incentive will be included, encouraging participation and guarantying entry into a raffle for five gift cards valued at \$10 each and five gift cards valued at \$5 each for a fully completed survey. One survey per entry into a raffle is allowed.

I can foresee some issues with the survey-based data collecting due to the following reasons: (1) students with language difficulties may have limited understanding of questions or instructions; (2) students may not find sufficient time to complete it; (3) students may not feel motivated enough to complete it.

Based on the return rate of the survey, the population size may contain fewer than 2,500 students, but should allow for the adequate data analysis of the quantitative phase. Once the survey availability time expires, all received data will be collected and analyzed. The central tendency aggregate statistical tools will be applied to identify patterns and variations.

Special attention will be paid to the extreme cases, scoring to the either side of the spectrum for the most satisfied and the least satisfied with in-person advising and the online

advising tool. Based on the most extreme performance in the four respective areas of most satisfied with in-person advising, least satisfied with in-person advising, most satisfied with the online advising tool, and least satisfied with the online advising tool, a group of twenty individuals (five from each category) will be identified.

The survey of each selected individual will be carefully checked for the given consent for the follow-up interview. If no such consent was given during the survey, this individual will not be called for an interview.

Once twenty individuals who satisfy the above selection criteria and have a recorded consent are identified, they will be invited for an individual 30-minute in-person interview. An email with the invitation to the interview will be sent, where the courtesy of response will be requested. In no response is received from a potential interviewee, a follow-up email with a phone call will take place. If agreed to setup an interview, the appointment will be set for a date, time and place mutually convenient to the interviewer and the interviewee. A written confirmation will be emailed, signed and returned to finalize the interview setup process.

If the individual is not interested or unavailable for an interview, their candidacy will be dismissed and another equally qualifying candidate with the similar result set will be approached. The process of the interviews setup will continue until all 20 appointments are made. The interviews will be conducted using the questions listed in the interview protocol (Appendix A).

References:

- Anderson, W., Motto, J. S., & Boudreaux, R. (2014). Getting what they want: Aligning student expectations of advising with perceived advisor behaviors. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 26(1), 27-51. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Renee_Bourdeaux/publication/282850598_Getting_What_They_Want_Aligning_Student_Expectations_of_Advising_with_Perceived_Advisor_Behaviors/links/561e704808ae50795afef9e4.pdf
- Crookston, B. B. (1972). A Developmental view of academic advising as teaching. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 13(1), 12-17. doi: 10.12930/0271-9517-29.1.78
- Chando, C. M. (1997). Predicting advising style preference from student characteristics (doctoral dissertation University of Memphis, 1997). *University Dissertation Services*, 930635.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1992). Notes on pragmatism and scientific realism. *Educational researcher*, 21(6), 13-17.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Drake, J. K. (2011). The role of academic advising in student retention and persistence. *About Campus*, 16(3), 8-12. Retrieved from <http://advising.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/jaynearticle%20%283%29.pdf>
- Feghali, T., Zbib, I., & Hallal, S. (2011). A Web-based Decision Support Tool for Academic Advising. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 14(1). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tuulikki_Keskitalo/publication/220374992_Explori

[ng the Meaningful Learning of Students in Second Life/links/574d3ffe08ae8bc5d15a6397.pdf#page=87](http://www.nacadajournal.org/doi/pdf/10.12930/0271-9517-14.2.76)

Fielstein, L. L. (1994). Developmental versus prescriptive advising: Must it be one or the other?. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 76-79. Retrieved from <http://www.nacadajournal.org/doi/pdf/10.12930/0271-9517-14.2.76>

Fries-Britt, S. (2008). Advising through a wave of change. *NACADA Journal*, 28(1), 3-7. Retrieved from <http://www.nacadajournal.org/doi/pdf/10.12930/0271-9517-28.1.3>

Gordon, V. N. (1994). Developmental advising: The elusive ideal. *NACADA Journal*, 14(2), 71-75. Retrieved from <http://www.nacadajournal.org/doi/pdf/10.12930/0271-9517-14.2.71>

Heisserer, D. L., & Parette, P. (2002). Advising At-Risk Students in College and University Settings. *College Student Journal*, 36(1), 69. Retrieved from <http://draweb.njcu.edu:2048/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=6539430&site=ehost-live>

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, 1(2), 112-133. Retrieved from http://eshare.edgehill.ac.uk/14104/1/Toward_a_Definition_of_Mixed_Methods_Research_Jour.pdf

Light, R. J. (2004). *Making the most of college*. Harvard University Press.

Morgan, D. L. (2013). *Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: A pragmatic approach*. Sage publications.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. 4th ed. Sage publications.

- Vianden, J. (2016). Ties that bind: Academic advisors as agents of student relationship management. *NACADA Journal*, 36(1), 19-29. Retrieved from <http://www.nacadajournal.org/doi/pdf/10.12930/NACADA-15-026a>
- Winston, R. B., & Sandor, J. A. (2002). Evaluating academic advising: Manual for the academic advising inventory. Retrieved from <https://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Portals/0/Clearinghouse/links/documents/AAI-Manual-02.pdf>
- Yarbrough, D. (2002). The engagement model for effective academic advising with undergraduate college students and student organizations. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*, 41(1), 61–68. Retrieved from <http://draweb.njcu.edu:2048/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=6766258&site=ehost-live>

Appendix A. Interview Protocol

Interview Code:

Date:

Time:

Location:

Participants number of completed semesters:

Participant student status (part-time / full-time):

1. Think of your most recent advising experience in-person or online. Please describe that experience.
2. Now, think back to that experience, and describe what did you like the most? The least? Please try to recall as much detail as possible.
3. On your survey, you scored (the highest/the lowest) for the satisfaction with the advising process. Please explain why.
4. On your survey, you scored (the highest/the lowest) on the impact of the (in-person advising / the online advising tool). Please explain why and share your experiences.
5. What were your expectations for advising before you came to college? Were they met? Why or Why not?
6. What are your advising needs? Please write down a few keywords describing them. The words don't need to be in a phrase or a sentence. Feel free to draw quick pictures or symbols if needed.
7. Is there anything that you would like to add about your advising needs or expectations?
8. What advice would you give to incoming first-year students regarding the academic

Appendix B. Satisfaction with Advising Survey

Link to the survey: https://njcu.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_d6cyak8r8BOSid7

Welcome to the survey on evaluating your level of satisfaction with college advising. Please note that you participate voluntarily and all the required details on the conduct of this survey have been submitted to the IRB. Thank you for taking your time as your input is highly appreciated.

Question 1. Do you consent to the survey?

- Yes
- No

Question 2. Enter your name if you consent:

Please provide the answers below to the best of your knowledge. Make sure to answer ALL QUESTIONS to be considered for the raffle drawing.

Question 3. Choose your preferred academic advising method (check all that apply):

- in-person advising in the Advising Center
- using online advising tool
- none

Question 4. How many times did you see the academic advisor this semester?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

Question 5. How many times did you use the online advising tool this semester?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more

Question 6. How many times did you see the academic advisor LAST semester? If you weren't a student last semester, select n/a.

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more
- n/a

Question 7. How many times did you use the online advising tool LAST semester? If you weren't a student last semester, select n/a.

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more
- n/a

Question 8. Please rank how satisfied you are with the online advising tool. If you don't use the online advising tool or it does not apply to you, select n/a.

	n/a	Deeply unsatisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Extremely satisfied
Dropping and/or adding courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exploring possible majors and/or academic programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Viewing content of courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Selecting courses for the next term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Planning a class schedule for the next term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identifying transfer credits and policies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identifying advanced placements (such as Honors) courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reviewing career pathways	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Researching financial aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Identifying degree or major requirements	<input type="radio"/>				
Researching study abroad or other special programs	<input type="radio"/>				
Researching internships or co-op education opportunities	<input type="radio"/>				
Evaluating academic progress	<input type="radio"/>				
Researching job placement opportunities	<input type="radio"/>				
Declaring or changing a major	<input type="radio"/>				
Identifying differences in courses	<input type="radio"/>				

Question 9. Please rank how satisfied you are with the in-person academic advising. If you use don't see the academic advisor or it does not apply to you, select n/a.

	n/a	Deeply unsatisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Extremely satisfied
Dropping and/or adding courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exploring possible majors and/or academic programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Viewing content of courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Selecting courses for the next term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Planning a class schedule for the next term	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identifying transfer credits and policies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Identifying advanced placements (such as Honors) courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reviewing career pathways	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Researching financial aid	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Identifying degree or major requirements	<input type="radio"/>				
Researching study abroad or other special programs	<input type="radio"/>				
Researching internships or co-op education opportunities	<input type="radio"/>				
Evaluating academic progress	<input type="radio"/>				
Researching job placement opportunities	<input type="radio"/>				
Declaring or changing a major	<input type="radio"/>				
Identifying differences in courses	<input type="radio"/>				

Question 10. I am currently enrolled in (check all that apply):

- Developmental Math
- Developmental English

Question 11. I already declared my major:

Yes

No

Question 12. I am a _____ student?

full-time

part-time

Question 13. Please add any comments about your experience with advising:

Question 14. Please provide your email below if you are willing to participate in the follow-up interview.

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. Your assistance is greatly appreciated, and your name will be added to the raffle drawing.

Appendix C. IRB Protocol Summary (to complement IRB Application)

The following research questions will be explored in this study:

- (1) To what extent, if any, do the face-to-face advising sessions contribute to the satisfactory college experience for degree-seeking students at Northern Suburban Community College?
- (2) To what extent, if any, does the use of the online advising tool contribute to the satisfactory college experience for the degree-seeking students at Northern Suburban Community College?
- (3) How do interviews with students help to explain any quantitative differences in perceived satisfaction of face-to-face and online advising tool for the community college students?

The study employs this explanatory sequential mixed methods study with 2,500 participants in the survey and 20 participants in the interview. The survey participants will be recruited from all currently enrolled students by the invitational email. The 20 interviewees will be recruited using maximum variation purposeful sampling strategy based on their answers to the survey questions. The survey will offer all participants a choice to be invited to a follow-up interview. Only those survey responders who agreed to be invited to the follow-up interview will be considered for it.

Appendix D. IRB Application

NJCU Institutional Review Board Application for
Review of Research Proposal

Email: IRB@njcu.edu

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	
File Number	
Review Type	Exempt <input type="checkbox"/> Expedited <input type="checkbox"/> Full <input type="checkbox"/>
PI	

Date of Submission

Proposal type: Original Revised*

*If this is a revised application, there is no need to complete the remainder of this form. However, please describe in detail the changes that you have made in response to the IRB's concerns.

Principal Investigator	Emily Vandalovsky
Proposal title	The utilization of the online advising tool and the in-person advising
Proposed start date	February 2, 2019
Anticipated duration of research	6 months

Type of Research

- Student/Classroom project
- Faculty project
- Staff project
- External researcher project (All external researchers must have an NJCU sponsor.)

NJCU Investigators (Please list additional investigators as necessary.)

Principal Investigator (For all student research, the faculty advisor is the PI.)

Name
 Department
 Telephone
 Email

Co-Investigator (including student researchers)

Name
 Department

Telephone _____
Email _____

Co-Investigator(including student researchers)

Name _____
Department _____
Telephone _____
Email _____

Co-Investigator(including student researchers)

Name _____
Department _____
Telephone _____
Email _____

*Any NJCU investigator who plans to work on this project either with or for a Principal Investigator or a Co-Investigator at another institution must identify those investigators and their institutions.

External Investigators

Name _____
Title _____
Institution _____

NJCU Sponsor (if the researcher is not affiliated with NJCU)

Name _____
Department _____
Telephone _____
Email _____

Data Sources

Number of participants 2500

How was this number determined (e.g., power analysis) enrollment trend

Does this project require the collection of new data? Yes No

If Yes: How will participants be selected or recruited? all students will be invited by email

Will subjects participate on a fully voluntary basis? Yes No

Will subjects be compensated for their participation? Yes No

If yes: Please briefly describe the compensation.

A raffle of 10 gift cards \$5-\$10 each will be conducted for all complete entries

Does this project make use of human tissue or cell lines? Yes No

Briefly describe the research methodology(ies) to be used in this study (e.g., focus group, participant observation, survey, experiment).

survey sent to 2500 college students, interviews with 20 selected individuals

Does this project use data that have already been collected for a non-research purpose or by another researcher?

Yes No

If yes: What is the source of the data?

Are the data accessible in the public domain? Yes No

If no: Are fields included that would allow identification of individuals, either directly or indirectly?

Yes No

If yes: Please explain briefly how participant confidentiality will be safeguarded

The names will not be used in any reported materials

Participant Risks

Will participants be exposed to any stresses (e.g., anxiety, pain, etc.) or physical harm (e.g., injury, infection, etc.) in connection with this research?

Yes No

If yes: Please briefly explain what risks may be involved in the research, what specific steps will be taken to minimize and monitor the risk, and what will be done to compensate and/or treat participants who are harmed by the research.

Does the research design require that participants be deceived? Yes No

If yes: Please briefly explain why deception is necessary and what steps will be taken to reduce potential harm from this deception.

Potentially Vulnerable

Populations Will this research involve:

Physically/Mentally Challenged Individuals

Young children (ages 0-13)

 Yes No

Older children (ages 14-17)

 Yes No

Senior Citizens (over age 65)

 Yes No

Pregnant Women

 Yes No

Prisoners

 Yes No

If yes to any of the above: Please briefly explain how the rights of this (these) population(s) will be protected.

If any senior citizens are attending college, they may be invited to participate in a survey

Informed Consent

Will participants be fully informed about:

The voluntary nature of their participation and the freedom to withdraw without penalty at any time

 Yes No

The purposes and procedures of the research

 Yes No

Any reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts

 Yes No

Any benefits to them or to others from the research

 Yes No

The extent to which confidentiality will be maintained

 Yes No

The compensation and/or treatments available if injury occurs

 Yes No

(This question need only be answered for research that involves risks.)

Whom to contact for information about the research participants' rights and any research-related injury

 Yes No

If the answer to any of the above is no, please briefly explain why the research requires an alteration of the standard elements of informed consent.

How will participants' informed consent be documented? Please check all that apply.

- Signature on written consent document
- Signature on document to be read to the participants and witnessed by another party
- Written documentation of informed consent will not be obtained because one or more of the following criteria is satisfied (check all that apply):

- The only link between the subject and the research would be the informed consent documentation and the primary risk is loss of confidentiality.
- The risks to participants, including risks associated with the loss of privacy, are no greater than those ordinary encountered in daily life and the research involves no procedure for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

Who will obtain the informed consent from the participants?

- Principal Investigator
- Co-Investigator
- Sponsor (in cases where PI is not affiliated with NJCU)
- Other
- Not applicable

Please include your protocol summary (5 pages maximum) and your recruitment materials (as applicable).

External Reviews and Funding

Has this protocol been reviewed by an Institutional Review Board or Human Subjects Review Committee at another institution(s)? Yes No

If yes: At what institutions(s)?

What is its status? Approved Rejected Pending (or provisionally approved)

Has this protocol been submitted for Federal Funding? Yes No

If yes: Agency or Organization:

Submission Date:

Funding Start Date:

Anticipated

Actual

Contact Person:

Contact's Telephone:

Has this protocol been submitted for any other types of funding? Yes No

If yes: Agency or Organization:

Submission Date:

Funding Start Date: Anticipated Actual

Contact Person:

Contact's Telephone:

Proof of NIH or CITI Certification

Please provide documentation of current CITI and/or NIH certification in human subjects research for all researchers involved in this project.

Certificate of Agreement

The signatures of all researchers involved in this project must be provided.

I certify that I agree to comply with the requirements of both NJCU and the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP) of the United States Department of Health and Human Services as described in 45 CFR §46.

<u>Emily Vandalovsky</u> PI Signature	Digitally signed by Emily Vandalovsky Date: 2018.12.02 11:08:38 -05'00'	<u>12/02/2018</u> Date
 Co-PI Signature		<input type="text"/> Date
 Co-PI Signature		<input type="text"/> Date
 Co-PI Signature		<input type="text"/> Date
 Co-PI Signature		<input type="text"/> Date

Please submit the completed application and accompanying documents as one document or pdf to IRB@njcu.edu and kresch@njcu.edu.

All applications must be submitted by the NJCU faculty or staff member who is serving as the Principal Investigator (PI). Neither students nor external researchers may submit an application.