STRATEGIC ADVISORY SERVICES

Prepare to Meet Student Readiness Gaps with Just-in-Time Advising

Eight Imperatives for Academic Leaders

Strategic Advisory Services

Alexa Silverman

Senior Director

asilverman@eab.com

Liz Rothenberg, PhD

Managing Director

erothenberg@eab.com

Table of Contents

Essay **4**

How Can Advising Respond to the Student Readiness Challenge? 4

Section 1: Advising Model Design **8**

Imperative #1: Assign Students to Professional Staff Advisors for All Four Years 8

Imperative #2: Develop a Differentiated Care Strategy to Triage Support Levels by Student Need 9

Imperative #3: Standardize Advising Career Pathways and Advancement Criteria 10

Section 2: Change Management **12**

Imperative #4: Codify and Communicate the Responsibilities of Advisors, Faculty, and Academic Units through Memoranda of Understanding 12

Imperative #5: Address Faculty Concerns About Transitioning to Professional and Standardized Advising 12

Section 3: Extending Advising's Reach **14**

Imperative #6: Transition Basic Advising Transactions to Self-Service Tools and Automation 14

Imperative #7: Scale 1:1 Guidance Through Structured Peer Support 15

Imperative #8: Streamline Referral Networks 16

Advisors on the Front Lines of Widening Student Readiness Gaps

After 2020's rapid pivot to remote instruction amid Covid-19, college campuses are now multiple years into resuming face-to-face operations. Students are reaccustomed to attending in-person classes and large campus gatherings.

But inside and outside the classroom, the faculty and staff who work most closely with students know that colleges are not back to normal. Students show serious gaps in their academic, socioemotional, financial, and career readiness. They struggle with basic reading requirements and staying engaged in the classroom. Employers report they have neither the skills nor the behaviors to succeed in the workplace after college. These gaps will only widen as students with middle school unfinished learning graduate high school.

Advisors are on the front lines of these student readiness gaps. In EAB's conversations with academic and advising leaders at over 50 colleges and universities, public and private, domestic and international, we heard stories of:

- Students who arrive at advising appointments silent and disengaged, contributing little and expecting advisors to plan out their college experience for them
- Students who won't even show up to advising or answer their phone or email, often because they don't think advising will help them
- Students who are anxious and overwhelmed by stress and the stigma of reaching out for help or admitting they're struggling in college
- Parents and family members reaching out to advisors directly, leaving students out of the conversation

Whichever of these challenges they were experiencing, every research contact we spoke to said that advisors are burnt out. Their workloads are increasing, and staff turnover is high. It feels like they can't make a difference with their students.

When higher ed institutions are already having to make painful budget cuts and do "less with less", it's clear that leaders can't just hire more advisors to solve readiness gaps. Nonetheless, the current model of advising is unsustainable. It's no wonder that many leaders have turned to the org chart as the possible solution.

Institutions Revisiting the Advising Org Chart

Alongside new challenges like widespread disengagement and burnout, institutions are also hearing the same, evergreen complaints around advising, mostly centered on overly transactional advising and inconsistent student experiences from one advisor to the next.

It is likely these challenges that have led leaders to focus on an age-old set of questions in approaching the advising org chart (and more broadly, addressing student readiness gaps):

- Should advising be housed in a central unit or in decentralized academic colleges?
- Should advising report to the provost, an AVP, or a VP of Student Success?

- What is the best ratio of advisors to students?
- When should students switch from a staff advisor to a faculty mentor?
- What's the right length for an advising appointment?

In most cases, these are actually the wrong questions. In this research report, we will address the root-cause problems driving institutions to seek organizational solutions and focus recommendations on standards, processes, infrastructure, role definitions, and assessment. In almost every advising structure debate, there is ample middle ground.

Finding Middle Ground in the Centralization Debate

The question of centralization vs. decentralization looms particularly large in discussions of advising organization, with leaders arguing persuasively for the benefits of both options.

Perceived Benefits of Centralization	Perceived Benefits of Decentralization
Evenly distributed advisor caseloads	Deeper understanding of curriculum, student experience, and career paths in each program
Cost savings from consolidating roles and procurement	Stronger relationships with faculty, chairs, and deans, increasing academic buy-in
All advisors receive the same communication, standards, and training	
More options for advisors to advance in their careers	

While the list of benefits to centralization seems longer, it is possible to achieve these benefits through **standardization of advising roles, communication, technology, training, and career paths** that does not require disruptive changes to reporting lines.

Is Centralized First-Year Advising the Compromise?

Many institutional leaders have found it easier to garner buy-in for centralizing only first-year and transfer student advising. The reasoning is that these students haven't yet declared a major, so they can work with a generalist until they are ready to switch to a specialist in a college or department.

Unfortunately, this model can backfire as it is disruptive to students when they lose the connection to an advisor who has supported them throughout their first year.

Boom-and-Bust Advising Cycles Underlie Caseload Complaints

What is the right number of students in an advisor's caseload? This question has stymied college administrators for decades. Though often cited as a "recommendation", the 296:1 ratio famously published by NACADA in 2011 was actually the national median, and NACADA does not recommend a specific caseload size. Research by Tyton Partners found that the percentage of advisors who were "very likely" to stay in their career for five more years only rose above 50% when caseloads dipped below 300 students per advisor. At many institutions, particularly access-focused institutions with high levels of student need, these ratios are not realistic, and caseloads are in practice much higher.

But underlying high caseloads is the reality that **advising is highly cyclical**. Advising offices see the vast majority of student traffic outside registration and add-drop periods. At one large public institution EAB spoke to, the advising office saw over 1000 appointments during both registration week and add-drop week, and fewer than 200 appointments during almost every other week in the term. If it were possible to decouple advising from registration and distribute these appointments evenly throughout the academic year, advisors could better manage their workloads and avoid burnout and long hours.

Toward a Just-In Time Approach to Advising

With the right data on indicators of student need, institutions can shift from cyclical to **just-in-time** advising. Just-in-time advising allows advisors to balance their workload across the academic year and intervene with students when it has the highest potential to help.

Cyclical Advising	Just-in-Time Advising
Students need to meet with their advisors to register, so most meetings take place during registration periods	Students have the information and tools they need to self-register
Most advising meetings are scheduled when students reach out to advisors	Most advising meetings are scheduled when advisors reach out to students
All students meet with advisors the same number of times	High-need students meet with advisors more frequently, while well-prepared students have occasional check-ins
Advising meetings are first-come, first-served	Advisors use student data and academic and behavioral alerts to prioritize meeting with students at the time when an intervention, recommendation, or referral will be the most timely and helpful

Truly Holistic Advising Requires a Team of Faculty and Staff Across Many Different Offices

Many advising transformation efforts run aground when leaders try to recruit “holistic” advisors. While decades ago holistic advising might have meant academic and career advice; today’s holistic advisor would have to be able to support academic, socioemotional, financial *and* career readiness. As student needs diversify and as the hiring environment remains challenging, it’s impossible to find any one person who could provide all of the support students need on every dimension of readiness.

Rather than a holistic advisor, today’s students need a **holistic team**. The same student might have an advisor, a peer tutor, a faculty mentor, a career advisor, a finance coach, and a mental health counselor. The composition of that team won’t look exactly the same for each student, so holistic team advising requires the advisor to be at the center of that team, directing and coordinating student interactions. It also requires the technology and case note sharing to ensure that students feel like their the whole team is coherent and connected.

To achieve the goal of holistic, just-in-time advising for all students, the advisor's role and expectations must be standardized across units, titles, and reporting lines.

The good news is that these standards can be established regardless of the organizational chart and who has oversight over advising. Rather than investing time and political capital on reorganization, institutions can narrow their focus to standardizing the work advisors do and the incentive structures that drive that work.

Section 1: Advising Model Design

In addition to the question of centralization vs. decentralization, several additional questions or debates characterize discussions of advising models in higher education. These include:

- Should students switch from a professional advisor to a faculty advisor after declaring a major?
- How often should advisors meet with students in their caseloads?
- How do we retain and promote the highest performing advisors?

The first section of this research report will answer these questions and provide three imperatives to direct academic leaders to next steps.

Imperative #1: Assign Students to Professional Staff Advisors for All Four Years

One of the most common debates around advising models is the split of faculty and staff roles in academic advising. For nearly all institutions, EAB recommends a **tandem advising model** where students simultaneously have a staff advisor *and* a faculty mentor. Only the smallest and most resource-strapped should continue with primarily faculty-based advising.

In the decades since it initially emerged as a distinct staff role, advising has become a profession and career path that requires full-time, focused effort. Moreover, today's advisors do work that is well outside the scope of faculty's role. Their focus is no longer only on course selection and career planning, where faculty arguably still have relevant expertise. Now, advisors spend their time helping students navigate a growing range of campus resources and services; monitoring data about students' academic performance, cocurricular engagement, and financial need; and outreaching to students with tips and reminders to help them progress toward graduation.

Amid today's academic, socioemotional, financial, and career readiness gaps, advisors' role will only expand. Not only will more students need hands-on support, student needs will become more complex and acute, requiring more frequent visits to advising and other support offices. In many cases, students need ongoing case management and coaching. Faculty are already burnt out executing their core roles as educators, researchers, and stewards of the university's mission. To add coaching or case management would make faculty roles completely unsustainable. It is possible for leaders to standardize and streamline faculty-only advising roles somewhat, but not enough to meet student needs at most institutions.

However, the unsustainability of faculty advising does not mean that students cannot benefit from faculty mentorship. At most institutions, students benefit from having both a professional staff advisor *and* a faculty mentor.

To best serve the needs of today's students, both the roles of professional advisors and faculty mentors need to be standardized and given structures and goals. The first area institutions must standardize is the strategy for managing advisors' caseloads.

Imperative #2: Develop a Differentiated Care Strategy to Triage Support Levels by Student Need

After decades of study, it is now widely accepted that to create consistency and build strong advisor-student relationships, advisors must have defined caseloads so that students have the same advisor throughout their entire college journey. However, within that caseload, the right advising looks different for each student.

EAB has long advised that institutions adopt the differentiated care model from the health care industry. In a differentiated care model, advisors spend different amounts of time with each student and focus on different types of support depending on that student's level of need. For most students, advisors provide occasional check-ins supported by ongoing use of technology and self-service tools. Students in higher tiers of need receive additional resources and support on top of those provided for the lowest-need students. Differentiated care standardizes this practice to ensure that all students are getting the right level of care.

A tiered support strategy is now more important than ever as student readiness gaps widen and advisors must prioritize their time. The criteria for sorting students into support tiers depend on your students and the capacities of your team. Teams with more support specialists can place more students into middle and high support tiers. The tiers themselves are often defined by GPAs, predictive models, or academic alerts, and sized to match the corresponding capacity for support:

All Students: Appreciative Advising

Advisors should have high-level progress check-ins with all their students, including the most highly prepared, at least yearly and typically once per term. These check-ins should employ the appreciative advising framework. In this framework, students and advisors have interactive, holistic conversations focused on exploring students' motivations and interests and creating a flexible plan to achieve their educational and career goals. Appreciative advising helped students form personal connections with their advisors rather than advising feeling transactional.

Outside of advising appointments, many students can be enabled to support their own success with self-service technologies including generative AI. Building out these automated resources helps shift human advising capacity to students with higher levels of need.

Middle-Need Students: Caseload Monitoring and Just-in-Time Intervention

The next tier of students are what has been dubbed the "murky middle." This group is 'murky' because their college outcomes are uncertain, yet can improve with the right advisor interventions delivered at the right time. To best support students in the murky middle, advisors should set up processes to regularly check in on indicators like academic performance, classroom attendance, cocurricular engagement, and any alerts or flags raised by faculty or other support offices. Student success technology such as EAB's Navigate360 and Starfish can bring together the sources of data behind these indicators and make it easy for advisors to prioritize students for outreach.

When a trend in a student's behavior or performance changes, advisors should proactively reach out to schedule appointments, direct students toward services, or congratulate students on a positive change. The vast majority of advising appointments should be scheduled like this: 'just-in-time', based on students' immediate needs, not the academic calendar.

High-Need Students: Case Management

A small share of students needs much more in-depth support from advisors. These students typically have compound needs: for example, the same student might struggle with math and English skills, staying on top of deadlines, and making a plan to pay for college.

For these students, advisors look almost like social workers, and indeed some are. They help students create a schedule of regular appointments with multiple campus offices (e.g., academic tutoring, time management coaching, financial aid, work study, and career services). They keep in contact to make sure students attend these appointments. After each appointment, they compile and compare case notes from each office to identify themes and emergent needs.

At most institutions, this type of intensive case management is conducted by a small, dedicated group of senior advisors. To create a pipeline for these roles and prepare advisors to advance, institutions must define a standard advising career pathway and hierarchy and identify criteria for promotion.

Imperative #3: Standardize Advising Career Pathways and Advancement Criteria

Career advancement opportunities are critical to retaining and incentivizing high performing advisors. Institutional leaders should develop career pathways for advisors with explicit, objective criteria for advancement and opportunities to train and develop their skills.

Most institutions typically have two career tracks for advisors, one focused on specialized advising to handle complex student cases and one focused on management.

- **Case manager advisors:** These specialized senior advisors provide the case management required to support high-need students. Their role is outlined in the section above.

- **Advising managers:** Advising managers, the most senior role in the advising career path, typically report to a VP or AVP overseeing student success. They typically have a small student caseload but are primarily responsible for managing frontline advisors. Their responsibilities are like those of any manager: holding advisors accountable for their responsibilities and goals, providing coaching and development opportunities, liaising across units to scale best practices, and making personnel decisions.

As advisors advance along these career tracks, their responsibilities and the complexities of their work scale up with their seniority and pay.

With dedicated advising managers, it becomes possible to recognize and reward high performers with potential for promotion or create development plans for low performing advisors.

Identifying high and low performers is also an area that has sparked significant debate in higher education, because it raises the question of how advising performance should be measured. Institutions have experimented with many different types of metrics to measure the success of advisors, from student satisfaction survey results to student outcomes assessment.

The most progressive institutions hold advisors accountable for **caseload metrics** directly tied to higher-order student success goals. Advisors agree to monitor and work toward metrics that are leading indicators of retention and persistence, such as the share of students in a caseload who have registered for the next term or filed an academic plan. Advisors are given reasonable goals for their caseloads that they can easily inflect across term. Buy-in among advisors goes up when they have a way to track their progress through the term on a dashboard or in advising software, often sparking friendly competition among team members.

These caseload outcomes metrics have advantages over student surveys, which have low response rates and are subject to bias, or student learning outcomes, which are influenced by many factors outside of advisors' control. Caseload metrics can be rolled up to program-level metrics so that the advising model on a whole can be assessed.

Understanding what to track and measure also enables institutions to develop training and professional development programs focused on the competencies necessary to improve caseload outcomes. Centralizing and standardizing professional development curricula allows all advisors to benefit, and to gain additional value by attending training sessions with peers across units to share best practices and brainstorm solutions to problems.

Though not as significant a change as fully centralizing advising, standardizing advising assignments, advising methods, and advisor career development are still meaningful changes that require the buy-in of academic unit leadership and faculty.

Featured Resources:

- Advising Career Ladder Compendium
- Example Advising Metrics

Section 2: Change Management

As institutions transition to new advising models, central leadership must collaborate with unit leaders and faculty to garner buy-in and support for shared standards and role definitions. The below section of this research report outlines two imperatives for your change management strategy.

Imperative #4: Codify and Communicate the Responsibilities of Advisors, Faculty, and Academic Units through Memoranda of Understanding

Standardizing advising across units allows institutions to create consistency in advisor responsibilities and caseload sizes, invest centrally in technology that saves advisors time, and develop a universal professional development and career pathway that allows advisors to advance within the institution. To do so, however, leaders must build trust and transparency with academic leaders in college, departments, and other units across campus.

The **University of South Carolina** developed memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between central advising leadership and college-level leadership to outline the detail of its advising model in writing and ensure that all units on campus agree on their responsibilities and ownership.

The MOUs state the goals and purpose of advising design and codify pay scales, caseloads, and funding splits between central and distributed units. They also set a cadence for ongoing discussion and revision to the advising model.

When executed successfully, MOUs foster strong buy-in and agreement between central and distributed *leadership* on the standardization, purpose, and goals of advising. However, leaders are not the only stakeholders in advising transformation; institutions must do additional work to foster buy-in among faculty.

Featured Resources:

- Example MOU template from the University of South Carolina
- Advising MOU Template Builder

Imperative #5: Address Faculty Concerns About Transitioning to Professional and Standardized Advising

Many academic leaders face initial skepticism and pushback from faculty and academic units leaders around professionalizing and standardizing advising roles. This pushback typically centers around two core concerns.

First, concerns about *quality:* faculty, chairs, and deans worry that in standardizing advising, students will lose the specialized, disciplinary knowledge and guidance that advisors trained and developed within units can provide.

To alleviate these concerns, **Mercy University** developed a faculty-led training program for newly hired professional academic advisors. Leaders at Mercy University used three training design elements to directly address faculty concerns:

- **Trainings are in-person**, allowing faculty and advisors to get to know each other
- **Faculty train advisors on curricular pathways**, positioning faculty as experts in curriculum and offering an opportunity for faculty to share "outside the catalog" pointers (e.g., desirable and undesirable combinations of courses for students to take in the same term)
- **Advisors bring real-world scenarios to faculty to troubleshoot**, again positioning faculty as experts but also giving them the opportunity to see firsthand the depth of advising knowledge and the complexity of advisor roles

Second, concerns about *resources:* faculty, chairs, and deans rely on advisors to support a wide variety of unit-level work. Institutional leaders should already audit advising roles and responsibilities in each unit to understand the advising resources they already have and develop shared standards that accurately reflect what advisors currently do. Auditing unit roles also helps alleviate resource concerns.

When **The New School** shifted to central management and standardization of college-level advisors, academic affairs staff met with leaders in each college to inventory the tasks advisors performed. Where these tasks fell outside of advising roles—and did not duplicate the work of other units (e.g., career services) or technology (e.g., degree mapping)—administrators diverted a small portion of funds from hiring advisors to hiring departmental administration staff to continue this work.

Even when institutions follow the New School's example and standardize advisor tasks across units, demands on advisors will still increase due to the demands of closing today's student readiness gaps. Institutions must also invest in other types of supports, including self-service tools and automation.

Section 3: Extending Advising's Reach

As student readiness challenges accelerate, a larger number of students will require frequent intervention and even case management from advising. Institutions must invest centrally in supports beyond advising and faculty mentorship so that advisors have time to work with all the students in their caseloads.

This final section details three imperatives for how student-facing self-service tools, support from peers, and faculty/staff-facing resource repositories can bolster the work of advising and ensure that advisors' time stays focused on meaningful and individualized work with students.

These practices are often enabled by student success technologies, such as EAB's Navigate360, that support alerts, appointments, communications, case management, and data analytics all in one platform. Students use these technologies to make appointments and interact with support through apps, while advisors can quickly view which students need outreach, use AI-supported writing tools to quickly draft a student-friendly message, and refer cases to other offices.

Imperative #6: Transition Basic Advising Transactions to Self-Service Tools and Automation

Shift Basic Student Support to Online Self-Serve Tools

In order to close student readiness gaps, advisors today must divert time away from transactional tasks like registering for courses, running a degree audit, or submitting a transcript request. Instead, students should be able to perform these tasks online, ideally via a single-stream web portal or "one-stop-shop". Advancements in generative AI mean that chatbots can help students navigate the portal and find the specific type of task they want.

If a student task or request is concerning (e.g., dropping all courses), it should raise a flag or require an approval in a campus system. Systems can also be designed to 'nudge' students away from choices that are not aligned with their success. In most cases, students will not need to meet with an advisor one-on-one to solve their problems.

Featured Resource: Online One-Stop Shops

- University of Minnesota Rochester: https://onestop.r.umn.edu/
- Middle Tennessee State University: https://www.mtsu.edu/one-stop/services/
- Wiregrass Georgia Technical College: https://www.wiregrass.edu/one-stop

Prewire Students for Advising Appointments with Conversation Guides

Advisors also do not need to cover basic information in a didactic format during appointments. Flipped advising can help students and advisors focus on meaningful, interactive discussion. In this approach, students review basic information prior to the appointment and prepare questions for their advisors. **The Ohio State University's** Preparing for an Advising Appointment webpage lists questions and conversation prompts to simplify preparation and reduce students' anxiety and uncertainty about what will happen in their appointments.

If these resources are only provided at orientation or during a first-year experience course, students are unlikely to remember to review them prior to the advising appointment. Instead, automate an email, text, or push notification to students 1-2 days prior to their advising check-ins to remind them to review the resources.

Help Students Navigate Course Registration Through Short Videos and Infographic Maps

Course registration is a transactional task that students can complete on their own; however, institutions need a way to ensure that students choose courses that keep them on track to graduation. Degree planning software with 'what-if' functionality is now commonplace and works well for students with prior credit and/or those who already know their intended major.

After pandemic-based remote instruction, many advising leaders report large numbers of students with more foundational needs. They struggle to understand the purpose of completing course requirements or exploring majors. They may even ask advisors to pick their courses or choose a 'good' major *for* them.

To help students understand general education requirements, **Minnesota State University-Mankato** condensed a longer, in-person orientation session into a 5-minute video that outlines the purpose and goals of gen ed as well as how to register. This is also an important opportunity for institutions to revisit experiential course and major maps, introducing them even earlier in the student lifecycle as a self-service tool to encourage students to explore majors on their own.

Some tasks and types of support remain that are too time-intensive for frontline advising staff but too complex for self-service resources and automation. For example, walking a student through what to expect when living away from home for the first time or providing ongoing coaching to a student who needs help in a first-year math course. For these supports, institutions can turn to a group who has experienced and overcome these challenges firsthand: student peer mentors.

Imperative #7: Scale 1:1 Guidance Through Structured Peer Support

Peer Support Extends Advisors' Limited Capacity to Meet with Students

Even with the best efforts toward advising triage and efficiency, the student readiness challenge will strain advisor workloads. With the right training, structure, and resources, peer mentors can extend the capacity of advising. Trained peers can support new student onboarding and transitions to college campus; coach students with preparedness gaps in high-DFW gateway courses; tutor students on study skills;

and create safe spaces to discuss mental health. By sharing their own experiences of how advising and other staff helped them, peer mentors can also reduce students' feelings of anxiety and stigma around asking a staff member for help.

Student-Staffed Text Hotlines Offer Round-the-Clock, Anonymous Support

Another way to address help-seeking stigma is through text-based platforms. **LeanOnMe** is a student-staffed, text message-based hotline (no app download required). Students can ask a peer for advice on academics or other issues. The hotline anonymizes students' names, to further reduce their anxiety around reaching out for help. LeanOnMe extends not only the number of students who can get advice, but also the times of day when they can find help: the majority of messages are sent between 10pm and midnight.

LeanOnMe is structured as a national student organization, with chapters on campuses, and provides training to hotline volunteers. So when students text the hotline, they get advice from peers at their own institution (in fact, many hotline volunteers use the service themselves).

Across advising, faculty, and peer mentoring, students and staff have an ever-increasing number of supports to navigate. To make sure students are using supports efficiently and effectively, institutions need to invest in ways to coordinate and simplify the connections between support units.

Featured Resource:

- EAB Peer-to-Peer Support Toolkit

Imperative #8: Streamline Referral Networks

Closed-Loop Case Referral Systems Improve Student Follow-Through, Increase Buy-in

Students often experience a frustrating 'shuffle' between support units as they try to resolve complex issues. To eliminate confusion and duplicate work, student support offices should be integrated into a tech-enabled **coordinated care network**. Student success technologies form the backbone of coordinated care by making it easier for staff in one unit to refer a student to another and share appointment notes. Case notes help advisors understand the full details of a student's issue and make the right recommendations. They also assure anyone who submitted a referral or alert that students received help.

Faculty are the most frequent and perhaps the most important users of referral systems. Students spend more time interacting with their instructors than campus staff, so classroom early alerts on course attendance, behavior, and grades are often the first opportunity for advisors to spot a challenge—or recognize a success. To increase faculty utilization, flexible design features like a movable midterm grade submission date make it easier and more appealing for faculty to submit alerts.

Streamline Referral Systems and Create Single-Source-of-Truth Resource Repositories

As campuses grow and add new support offices, students and faculty should not be responsible for identifying which office should respond to a student issue. Three types of resources help streamline campus referrals:

- **Integrated referral portals:** Institutions like **Northern Kentucky University** have integrated all referral submissions into a single portal. NKU's "Help a Norse" page is linked on every faculty-staff intranet page and accepts academic, financial, and behavioral (mental health) alerts.
- **Students-in-distress resource folders:** To guide faculty and staff in supporting students, many institutions have created a "Red Folder" to distribute in classrooms or online. These folders contain information on how to recognize signs of behavioral distress and make appropriate referrals. Institutions can also include information about how to recognize and respond to signs of food or housing insecurity.
- **Financial aid cheat sheets:** Rather than relying on advisors or other staff to interpret highly technical financial aid policies, EAB recommends creating a **financial aid FAQ sheet**. Ask advisors about the most common questions they get from students on financial aid, then source vetted answers from offices including financial aid, the registrar, the bursar, and the international student office. Compile answers into a one-pager that advisors can reference when they meet with students.

Featured Resource: Red Folders

- University of Alabama Birmingham (incorporates basic needs): https://www.uab.edu/redfolder/
- Penn State: https://redfolder.psu.edu/
- Stonehill College: https://www.stonehill.edu/red-folder/
- University of Colorado Denver: https://www.ucdenver.edu/redfolder

The years ahead will be more than challenging for higher education as institutions grapple with readiness gaps and strong financial headwinds. But with the right advising structures, standards, processes, and evaluation and with the collaboration of units across campus, it will be possible for institutions to direct their efforts towards the support that matters most for students. Only then can institutions begin to close readiness gaps and deliver on the promise of a college degree.

Assess Your Institution's Advising Model

Use EAB's advising self-audit to measure your institution's approach against best practices for just-in-time, team-based, standardized, and professionalized academic advising.