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2013 Environmental Scan

- Some discontentment from grads
- SIGN support system overloaded
- Minimal advisor development
- Few structured interactions
- Random advisor matching
2014 Changes

- Bolstered faculty advisor development
  - Advisor guidebook, case studies, 1-on-1 trainings

- Established structured advisor interactions
  - House mixer, egg drop, faculty chat, trivia nights

- Developed advisor matching study
  - Match Survey
    - Gender, advising style, interests, faith, children, specialty
  - Satisfaction Survey
    - Meet expectations, pick advisor again, change advisors, like most/least about advisor
Matching Study

- Hypothesis: Students who are intentionally matched with advisors based on common interests and advising style are more satisfied with their advising relationship than are students who are randomly matched with a faculty advisor.

- Experimental & Control Groups

- Double-Blind

- Each Advisor – 2 matched & 2 not matched
Matching Algorithm

- Same survey: faculty (f) and students (s)
- Students weight question (q) blocks
- \(50f \times 100s = 5,000 \text{ pairs}\) possible
Matching Algorithm

- Create all pairs (fs)

- Assign scores:
  - If q1f = q1s, then 1, else 0
  - If q2f = q2s, then 1, else 0
  - ...do for all question blocks
  - Then multiply weight per question block
  - Add together = fs score
Matching Algorithm

- Sort fs pairs by highest to lowest scores
  - (Use random sorting where fs pair scores are equal)

- Delete and Match:
  - If f match > 2, then delete
  - If s match > 1, then delete
  - Else, keep fs pair
    - Takes Excel about 20 minutes
      - 5,000 fs pairs to 100 matches
### 2015 Satisfaction Survey Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intentionally Matched</th>
<th>Randomly Matched</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well did your current advisor meet your advising expectations?</td>
<td>3.98/5.00</td>
<td>3.51/5.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given a choice, would you have picked this advisor for yourself?</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>E–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you request a new faculty advisor this year?</td>
<td>.09%</td>
<td>.02%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match Score</th>
<th>GPA Pre-Clinical</th>
<th>COMLEX 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>r</strong></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p</strong></td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant correlation.
Curious Case of Gender Matching, DO 2021

- Same: 93%
- Different: 7%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Style</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Style</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Graduate Survey
  - Graduates who were intentionally matched are more likely to give back to the college (time/$).
  - Graduates who were intentionally matched are more likely to recommend us to a friend.
  - Graduates who were intentionally matched are more likely to believe they got ‘bang for their buck’.

- Revise algorithm & surveys for class of 2022
Discussion
Thank You!

Michelle Park, EdD: michellepark@westernu.edu

Scott Helf, DO, MSIT: shelf@westernu.edu