A Faculty Guide to Advising and Supervising Graduate Students

This practical guide provides college and university faculty with resources for supervising and advising graduate assistants, guiding doctoral students through the dissertation process, and preparing the next generation of scholars. Exploring common situations that faculty and their graduate students encounter, this book provides the theoretical foundation and best practices for faculty to improve their advising and supervising practices.

Coverage includes:

- Working with part-time, online, doctoral, and master’s students
- Supervising assistantships, fellowships, internships, practicums, and residencies
- Chairing dissertations and theses
- Preparing students for conferences and presentations.

Darla J. Twale has coordinated higher education leadership programs, taught for over twenty-five years, advised graduate students, and chaired numerous dissertations. She is an Adjunct Professor at the University of Pittsburgh, USA.
This page intentionally left blank
To all my doctoral students whose dissertations I chaired, with whom I presented at professional conferences and co-authored scholarly articles and book chapters—

Thank you for enhancing my career in immeasurable ways.

And for His glory
Contents

Preface ix

1 Retaining Graduate Students: The Critical Role of Faculty Advising 1

2 Finding the Perfect Fit: Recruiting and Admitting Graduate Students 14

3 Laying the Foundation: Forming Strong Faculty/Student Relationships 29

4 Working Together: Faculty Advisor and Graduate Advisee 42

5 Accounting for Differences: Advising Diverse Groups 57

6 Supervising the Future: Assistantships, Clinicals, Internships, and Practicums 74

7 Conquering the Academic Wild West: Advising Virtually Using Social Media 93

8 Chaperoning the Dance: Chairing Thesis and Dissertation Research 107

9 Preparing to Launch: Advising the Professional Rites of Passage 124

10 Summarizing Best Practices 140

Index 147
This page intentionally left blank
Barely out of graduate school, I accepted a first tenure track position at Auburn University in Alabama in their Educational Leadership program. While I had been prepared to teach through pedagogical training during my undergraduate years and learned to conduct research through my master’s and doctoral programs, neither place offered a whisper as to what to expect with regard to advising or supervising the graduate students assigned to me. The only entre I had to advising came through observations of my faculty advisors or TA supervisors. Unfortunately, I neglected to take copious notes as to how I was being advised or supervised and failed to tuck that information away for future use.

Winston Churchill’s statement, “a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma” sums up graduate advising. It became one of the many on-the-job training opportunities faculty assumes once in a tenure track position. Faculty also inherits graduate students from colleagues, which poses an additional set of challenges. While previous generations of faculty advised a rather homogeneous population of graduate students, the current applicant pool overflows with students representing both genders, all races, age cohorts, and ethnicities, alternative lifestyles, and foreign countries who attend full or part time, in person and/or online, and plan to be teachers, researchers, and/or practitioners. These changes pose myriad challenges to effective faculty advising. What’s worse, little or no help exists to aid graduate faculty advisors/supervisors in the process.

Faculty must want to become effective advisors. Good advising does not just happen and it does not happen overnight. The learning curve is steep. Unfortunately, trial and error prevail in advising/supervising until the faculty advisor/supervisor muddles through the administrative process and its obligations and becomes acquainted with the student and his/her specific goals.

Knowledge of the heterogeneous makeup of our incoming graduate student body seems paramount to effective advising. However, faculty and administration must first acknowledge the advising role as a significant aspect of the faculty position. Furthermore, they should endeavor to draw the best possible outcomes
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from it, that is, produce subsequent generations of effective teachers, productive scholars, and able practitioners.

At the graduate level, students should be treated as individuals rather than subjected to cookie cutter approaches. Mutual respect and trust should be evident between faculty advisor/supervisor and advisee/supervisee. As such, the advising process while becoming more time consuming for the faculty member can also develop and mature into something more than just a faculty/student advising relationship. The fruits of these types of connections can result in mentoring, collaborative research opportunities, co-presentations at conferences, co-authorships on scholarly publications, and lasting friendships.

If one were to ask graduate students from various professions and disciplines about the quality of graduate advising, student responses would span the continuum from very helpful and attentive to terribly unapproachable and intimidating. In fact, advisor/advisor relationships have been linked to student disengagement and eventual departure, so it makes sense to find ways to improve faculty advising. But academics in general have done little in this regard. Advising should not remain a mystery that we each have to solve on our own, without sharing the clues with our colleagues.

One way to assist faculty with graduate student advising tasks can be through advising guides like this one designed to cover all aspects of the graduate student process from student admission to dissertation/thesis defense and into the professional arena. Each chapter focuses on a different aspect of that process offering short vignettes of advising situations, suggestions from the scholarly literature, best practices, and resources potentially helpful to the advisor. The book opens with a chapter on the high graduate student departure rate and links it to poor faculty advising as one of the causes. In this first chapter I distinguish between mentoring and advising and focus on the latter as there are many texts on the market that deal with mentoring.

Chapter 2 follows with the graduate admissions process where the advising relationship begins. Chapter 3 focuses on the faculty/student relationship and the critical need for laying a strong and supportive foundation for advising. I devote Chapter 4 to aspects of master’s and doctoral advising from entry through candidacy. Within Chapter 5, I highlight the advising needs of numerous heterogeneous student groups that now make up the graduate student body. Faculty supervision of teaching, research, or graduate student assistantships, fellowships, internships, practicums, or residencies is addressed in Chapter 6. With the rise in online graduate programs, the advisor role becomes more critical as advising from a distance poses challenges that are included in Chapter 7.

Issues related to chairing master’s theses and doctoral dissertations can be found in Chapter 8. Faculty advisors are responsible for guiding students through degree and professional rites of passage. Preparing students for comprehensive written and oral examinations and defenses, co-presentation of research or scholarly work
at professional conferences, and co-authorships on published works can be found in Chapter 9. In the closing chapter, I summarize the best practices covered in the previous chapters to offer suggestions to faculty advising and supervising graduate students that reflect changes in the instructional delivery of graduate education as well as changes in the student body.

Preparing the next generation of scholars and practitioners at the graduate level has largely been an individualized process. Faculty advisor meets one-on-one with his/her student in closed sessions. Little monitoring or evaluating of the content or outcome of those sessions takes place formally or informally. Consequently, the outcomes can be as productive as they are confusing. Perhaps with some assistance, more advising sessions will be constructive and establish a strong working rapport between advisor and advisee that not only spans the time in the program but also continues after graduation.

Numerous changes in higher education, student demographics, and the persistent high student departure rate necessitate guidance for faculty. These continue to challenge and confound advisors especially new ones. Texts like this one should encourage a demystification of graduate student advising. Faculty should see the possibilities in establishing strong professional relationships with their graduate students by viewing the advising, supervising, and chairing role as a significant feature of their career. Preparing our future scholars and practitioners in their field should be reason enough to provide the best advising and supervision possible.

Darla J. Twale
August 2014

What advice you have offered to one without wisdom!
And what great insight you have displayed!

Job 26: 3
Chapter 1

Retaining Graduate Students
The Critical Role of Faculty Advising

Historically, graduate education began with little organization or clear guidelines causing 1920s graduate student drop-out rates to be high. Competitive universities established processes to ensure quality graduate student entrants as early as the 1940s and also addressed the need for quality faculty to mentor them (Geiger, 2007). However, Robert Hutchins argued that quality faculty presence does not guarantee that quality students emerge “educated or advised well in the process” (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 933). Hutchins explained that professors “are bringing up their successors in the way they were brought up, so that the next crop will have the habits they have had themselves” (Hofstadter & Smith, 1961, p. 939). Some of those habits will be exemplary. Unfortunately, other habits may contribute to persistently high graduate student attrition rates (Main, 2014).

The attrition rate among doctoral students continues to be high in the 21st century (Smith, Maroney, Nelson, Abel, & Abel, 2006). Retention rates for those studying for academic and professional doctoral degrees struggle to surpass 50% (Ampaw & Jaeger, 2012; Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Nettles & Millett, 2006). Bowen and Rudenstine also noted the length of time to degree completion has lengthened. Proportionately, smaller PhD programs graduate more students than the larger programs, because often in larger programs, students may not benefit from individual faculty attention as is typical of the smaller programs.

Lovitts (2001) found that among the top academic reasons for student departure is student dissatisfaction with the academic programs, the faculty in general, and their advisor in particular (see also Adams, 1986, 1993). Not all students acquire the guidance they need from faculty supervisors (Perna & Hudgins, 1996). Ampaw and Jaeger (2012) noted that part-time students have less frequent access to faculty. Teaching assistantships often provided that interface with faculty that students needed, but ironically, it did not guarantee speedy graduations (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Nettles & Millett, 2006). To complicate matters further, persistence and retention statistics fluctuate when considering gender, race, discipline/field, and citizenship (Ampaw & Jaeger, 2012; Nettles & Millett, 2006).
Retention makes reference to institutional efforts to decrease disengagement and departure rates of enrolled students. Research on institutional retention efforts over the last several decades abounds but it offers multiple reasons and conflicting results as to why master’s and especially doctoral students fail to complete their degrees in a timely fashion. Institutional efforts to increase retention abound also, and vary from graduate program to graduate program. Some retention efforts work well while other efforts produce few positive results over time.

Persistence refers to students’ decisions to continue to enroll beyond their matriculating semester. Persistence and non-persistence varies as the diversity among the student population increases. Looking at either side of the retention/persistence coin raises myriad issues as to why students decide to stop or drop out of their programs and what universities in general and individual programs and their faculty in particular do or neglect to do to maintain or increase student enrollment.

RETENTION IN ONLINE PROGRAMS

Changes in traditional instructional delivery to include online learning in blended, synchronous, or asynchronous formats add more variables to the retention/persistence puzzle. Increases in online enrollments resulted in equally high departure rates in these programs (Poellhuber, Roy, & Anderson, 2011). Additional issues may exist at competitive for-profit institutions versus traditional not-for-profit universities. Carroll, Ng, and Birch (2013) noted situational, organizational, and dispositional factors for non-persistence, particularly, the lack of campus-wide student support systems.

While student departure rates in online programs tend to exceed that of traditional programs, reasons fueling departure tend to be similar to traditional programs with the obvious addition of student isolation from regular human contact (Meyer, Bruwelheide, & Poulin, 2009). Meyer et al (2009) explained the unusually high student persistence rate in their online library media certificate program could be attributed to quick response time from faculty beginning at the recruitment phase and continuing throughout the program. Students attributed persistence to very timely response rates from faculty and their informal contact with their peers. The researchers concluded that “the nature of relationships with faculty, the quality of the educational experience, and [students’] own personal and individual reasons and motivations [kept] them enrolled” (Meyer et al, 2009, p. 136). Furthermore, students appreciated faculty authenticity in their communications. Students recognized the significance of the care and concern faculty had for their well-being (see also Lovitts, 1996, 2001; Lovitts & Nelson, 2000).
EFFECT OF THE FACULTY ADVISOR ON STUDENT PERSISTENCE

Myriad reasons explain student non-persistence. Ineffective institutional retention programs and student services fail to combat attrition. However, there may be one area that affects graduate student persistence more than any other and that is students’ relationship with the faculty in their program. One common denominator among master’s and doctoral students is their interaction with faculty in general, and their assigned or self-selected faculty advisor in particular. The faculty teaching in classrooms or online may serve as worthy role models to students, but the advising role extends beyond that. For instance, when students pursue application to a graduate program, they come into contact with faculty perhaps on the phone or via email prior to admission, and especially in person, if an interview is requested or required. Furthermore, a student’s plan of study can only be done in conjunction with a faculty advisor. Assistantships and other apprenticeships require faculty supervision and guidance. Comprehensive examinations, written or oral, necessitate faculty input. Thesis and dissertation chairs and committee members come from among the faculty and guide the student’s progress. Final defenses require these faculty members to sign off before the student can graduate.

Therefore, the importance of the faculty advisor in a student’s graduate career cannot be underestimated. Herzig (2004) found that supportive advisors contribute to student persistence. Varying levels of support for students particularly female and minority students hindered their progress, especially when there were few female faculty members in the program. As a result, Herzig found guidance and advising to be inadequate and/or inconsistent.

For the purposes of this book, I assume that the most significant ingredient in the student’s program is the faculty members who serve in these roles. Given that faculty advisors stand as gatekeepers to a student’s future career in their profession, faculty skills and abilities, dedication and commitment to quality, and interface with the student can affect the eventual outcome (Herzig, 2004; Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). Because the graduate experience tends to be more individualistic than the undergraduate experience, graduate faculty advisors while maintaining a certain style or level of quality may interact with each of their students in slightly different ways and their style may evolve over time. Meeting student needs and supervising research interests will vary by student. Therefore, graduate advising/supervising has not been a one-size-fits-all, quantifiable proposition, thus rendering it difficult to study and understand. Furthermore, supervising graduate assistants requires a different approach than student advising or overseeing thesis/dissertation research. Multiple faculty advising and supervising skill sets will be needed.
Richardson, Becker, Frank, and Sokol (1997) attributed student departure to neglect, mistreatment, or unwillingness of faculty to assist students. Damrosch (1995) attributed departure to either poor students unable to thrive or good students dissatisfied with their program. Lovitts (1996) regarded attrition as a necessary gatekeeping function. While these studies explain in part why the attrition still hovers at 50% among doctoral programs, some students with less effective advisors finish in spite of poor advising and some students assigned to good advisors drop out nonetheless. Graduate education may suffer as a result of a structure that favors a close relationship with only one or two faculty scholars. In the absence of more definitive data on specific advisors, the effects of various retention efforts on student persistence cannot be fully explicated (Lovitts, 1996). This explains further why the role of faculty advisor remains clouded and complicated.

**ADVISING AND ATTRITION**

Golde (1994) noticed a negative, though common, albeit political graduate practice: “vigorously sorting out students once they have begun their doctoral studies” (p. 21). As such, this may result in the better students getting the seasoned, more accomplished faculty advisors and the other students assigned to newer faculty or less effective advisors placing some students at a decided disadvantage.

Attrition usually follows a student’s inability to connect socially and academically to their program. In Golde’s (2000) study of doctoral students, she examined each student’s integration into their program and their candid departure from it. Despite some degree of a collegial relationship, problems with the advisor at some point colored the relationships with the advisee. Inability to recover and find a better fit devastated these students. Disagreements with dissertation topic choices, lack of communication, direction, and support from an advisor, lack of intervention or support from department faculty or administrators signaled student need to reassess continuation in the program. Without a strong department connection, especially with the faculty advisor, the student seemed more likely to disconnect for what he/she would consider greener pastures.

Lovitts’ (2001) students recounted bad experiences with faculty. They chronicled instances of misinformation, counterproductive advice, and poor TA experiences. Students noted, however, that assigned advisors were more detrimental than the self-selection of advisors, particularly when students based it on similar faculty and student research interests. Continued contact with the advisors after self-identification led to a greater chance of program completion.

Furthermore, those advisors who expressed interest in and gave of their time, students regarded as better advisors. Providing students with intellectual support, offering genuine interest in their research topic, and directing an original piece
of scholarly work aligned with each other’s mutual interests contributed to subsequent degree completion. In addition, to be involved with faculty outside the classroom in a professional, scholarly collaboration also portends student success in their program and enhances student professionalization (Lovitts, 2001; see also Cahn, 1994). Nyquist (2002) acknowledged that inconsistent and inappropriate supervision within the PhD program affected retention.

Smart (1987) concluded that “faculty encouragement and support to the personal and professional growth of graduate students” (p. 221) were necessary. Golde (2005) revealed that peer isolation and lack of faculty support hastened student departure. Pearson, Cowan, and Liston (2009) indicated that faculty advising remains out of touch with reality. While faculty strives to professionalize their advisees in the discipline/field, they may be overlooking the need to apprise students of the demands of the field into which they will soon enter. Faculty should encourage students to undertake cutting-edge research and make a scholarly contribution to their field/discipline not simply reinvent the wheel. Pearson et al (2009) found that faculty who allowed advisees to carry out a research project of minor significance left their programs unfulfilled.

**ADMINISTRATIVE AND INSTITUTIONAL RETENTION STRATEGIES**

Departing students often fail to air their concerns to their faculty advisor or the department chair before they leave. Even with better administrative criteria and screening, Lovitts (1996) hypothesized that departure could also result from institutional reasons even though university administrations tend to attribute departure to student maladaptation, financial issues, and academic concerns. Juniper, Walsh, Richardson, and Morley (2012) concluded that underlying conflicts with one’s advisor/supervisor masked other critical problems. Consequently, administrators failed to explore if issues related to faculty advising/supervising might actually be why students depart. It would not be out of the question for attrition victims to ascribe their departure decision to personal reasons. Unfortunately, those reasons might indirectly result from institutionally rooted issues that never seek remedy.

Self-blame typical of attribution theory often prevents students from considering other factors or from expressing concerns to their faculty advisors or supervisors before departing (Lovitts, 2001). Golde (1994) concluded that students avoid verbalizing their problems with faculty advisors and academic administrators and choose instead to depart silently. Golde’s (2000) study participants failed to truthfully disclose their reasons for leaving.

Failure to balance the academic and social aspects of doctoral study, integrate into the department’s academic community, and internalize the normative standards of the profession often hastens student dissatisfaction that could lead to
departure (Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 2001). To ensure success at navigating the social and academic aspects of their program, graduate students need multiple navigation maps: one of the local departmental terrain, one of the larger professional landscape, and one outlining the role of the faculty advisor/supervisor.

**ADVISING AS A RETENTION STRATEGY**

Graduate schools prepare students formally for important roles they will face in their careers. Unfortunately, advising future graduate students is not one of them. Unfortunately graduate students preparing for the academic role in particular receive formal information on researching, somewhat less information on teaching, and little or no formal information on advising students (Austin, 2002). As a result, institutions can expect both good and ineffective information on advising to be transmitted.

Effective faculty advising/supervising socializes graduate students into the department and university organizational culture. Unfortunately, faculty receives little or no formal training to fulfill these advisement or supervisory roles. Faculty may be advising students in ways not aligned with demographic changes, technological advances, or entrepreneurial realities (Tierney, 1997; Weidman et al, 2001). The addition of diverse student populations, increasing information and new technologies, declining resources, accountability, and changes within academic units affects advising (Hyatt & Williams, 2011). Consequently, faculty mirror the qualities of their advisors and supervisors irrespective of how those particular attributes relate to the needs of entering students; the characteristics of the technologically evolving classroom or laboratory; or the dynamics of the university organizational, online, or corporate culture. Advances in communication designed to keep people connected can be adapted for faculty/student use such as social media and online interaction but generational differences between faculty and advisees/supervisees may hinder new uses of technology in forming stronger advisor/advisee or supervisor/supervisee relationships.

Sweitzer (2009) raised the issue of how closely graduate programs and departments prioritize faculty advising and its relationship to retention. Ultimately, teaching and research take priority among faculty time commitments and institutional reward structures in research universities. This offers little time for faculty advising let alone exemplary faculty advising. One explanation is that at the graduate level, students possess savvy. Faculty may believe students can maneuver through their program with minimal guidance. Sanford (1962) discussed two schools of thought: (a) applicants for graduate level work are mature and prepared for graduate study at matriculation and thus would not need to be under the constant purview of the professor; and (b) no matter what the student’s developmental level at entry, he/she would eventually reach where he/she needs to be by the end of the program as a result of all the experiences provided in the program.
In other words, students would eventually catch on and if they did not, then their departure was probably for the best. It seemed to be a natural aspect of the gatekeeping and sorting and selecting processes needed prior to entry into the profession (Herzig, 2004; Weidman et al., 2001).

Poor or ineffective advising may stem from the faculty’s lack of information on the advising role. While much has been offered to undergraduate faculty advisors to assist them with advising duties as well as help them to be better mentors to students, the graduate faculty member, with a decidedly more difficult task, has few if any how-to or advising-for-dummies manuals to illuminate their way. Ironically those who teach in graduate level only programs tend to be assigned graduate students. New assistant professors still recalling their own dissertation defenses are now asked to advise graduate students in programs they simultaneously have to learn about and acclimate to often on their own. Faculty is also asked to supervise graduate assistants. Assistant professors who receive graduate faculty status before tenure are tasked with overseeing thesis and dissertation research. Few if any new faculty has experience beyond their own dissertation committee experience. Administration thrusts them into an advisory/supervisory role with little regard to their own preparation or the effects this may have on the master’s or doctoral student, the program retention rate, or their own tenure quest.

Much graduate faculty effort goes into graduate student recruitment and admission especially at the doctoral level. The repercussions of low graduate student persistence rates and why they may occur, affect programs and faculty efforts. High graduate student attrition rates also affect recruitment efforts, admission numbers, faculty advising and teaching loads, and faculty research efforts. Because of the time students spend in the program, whether the student has a teaching or research assistantship affects faculty time and research productivity. Ultimately, poor return on investment as a result of student attrition will be felt not only by the faculty and the department, but also by the profession (Ampaw & Jaeger, 2012). Departure harbors an implicit need for better retention strategies at the program, department, school, and university level.

**RITES OF PASSAGE AND FACULTY ADVISING**

The faculty/student relationship is critically related to degree completion. Lovitts (2001) determined, however, that students interact all too infrequently with faculty. Some students expected faculty to initiate contact with them. The inability of faculty to comply indicated to students that professors must be unsupportive, intimidating, and/or uncaring. Busy with their own research and teaching, faculty expected students to contact them at key junctures in their graduate program. The inability of students to comply indicated to faculty that students may not be serious about completing the program. As a result, interaction occurred less often
than academic contact. Overcoming misunderstandings between faculty and students may go hand in hand with knowledge of the advising and advisee roles. The more positive the faculty/student relationship, the greater the chance students would complete their program.

Because graduate education occurs in distinct stages such as coursework, comprehensives, research proposal development, and thesis/dissertation defense, retention rates can differ at each stage. Most student departures tended to occur before the ABD (all but dissertation) status while additional opportunity for departure occurs after students reached ABD or candidacy (Bair & Haworth, 1999). What happens at these various stages can be linked to faculty advising workload and time for student interface. In fact, the student choice process to stay occurs three distinct times for thesis/dissertation students. Ampaw and Jaeger (2012) postulated that from a human capital and cost/benefit perspective, students assess the benefits they accrue at each juncture as well as the financial and emotional costs they anticipate before deciding to move forward with the next stage in their program or depart. How faculty advising links these statistics needs further research.

Ampaw and Jaeger (2012) found that student/faculty advising ratios negatively affected persistence in terms of the transition from coursework completion to candidacy. Faculty advising workload and committee chair assignment limits may need to be adjusted as a retention strategy to facilitate greater faculty/student interaction at this critical point. Opportunities for interaction increase for research and teaching assistants who spend more time with faculty as well as having more opportunities to increase networking and conference exposure. Graduate students without these opportunities may be less advantaged but these opportunities should not be considered a substitute for good faculty advising in the graduate program.

To complicate our understanding further, Ampaw and Jaeger (2012) learned that students of color attributed persistence to developing a more meaningful faculty advisor/advisee relationship. However, when these students formulated their research topics and proposals prior to achieving candidacy, they experienced difficulties. The researchers speculated that students of color may experience dissonance, feeling an obligation to align their research topic with their cultural identity. Faculty advisors may not be in a position to assist them effectively and thus jeopardize the students’ continuance in the degree program.

Gardner’s (2008) research highlighted the importance of the faculty advisor. Sufficient interaction with faculty, especially the advisor, she deemed crucial to success. Overwhelmed by new found isolation and independence during the candidacy phase, PhD students often reassess their relationship with faculty, contemplating a change in faculty advisor or topic. The isolation following coursework often decreases chances for sustained interaction with faculty as well as peers even though advances in technology can address this shortcoming. At this
point in their program, students must balance their need for advisor support with their desire to move toward independent scholar. Often students are ill prepared to do this and faculty thesis/dissertation chairs may not possess the skills to help them adjust to the change.

DISTINGUISHING ADVISING FROM MENTORING

According to a study by Titus and Ballou (2013), graduate faculty advising activities differ from mentoring activities in subtle ways. Advising includes chairing student dissertations, choosing classes, co-authoring and presenting papers to gain field visibility, monitoring student progress, deciding upon research topics, and providing feedback to measure student progress. While mentors may perform some of these duties, they do not perform all of them, therefore the terms advisor and mentor should not be used interchangeably or cavalierly. Not surprisingly, faculty respondents in the Titus and Ballou study recognized blurred lines between the two roles. As a result, students and faculty experienced different expectations in meeting their desired outcomes when these roles were perceived by either party to be one in the same. This may prove more problematic depending upon the degree program in terms of where faculty places emphasis and contrary wise, what students expect from the advisor versus the mentor. For example, Nettles and Millett (2006) found that students who had mentors reported strong positive faculty/student academic and social interaction and greater satisfaction with their doctoral program. While this situation was seen specifically by future academics, doctoral students preparing for careers in other non-academic roles or professional fields failed to witness it.

As distinguished from advising, mentoring tends to be a more dynamic, positive, informal role that extends beyond the prescribed role of faculty advisor and encompasses a more psychosocial and emotional dimension. While the advisor may be assigned at entry, the mentor is sought after and self-selected during the program (Schlosser, Knox, Moskowitz, & Hill, 2003; Schlosser, Lyons, Talleyrand, Kim, & Johnson, 2011).

Administratively, advising is considered obligatory and part of the faculty workload. Mentoring tends to be more voluntary and decided upon by the potential mentor and mentee, not an obligatory function of the faculty advising role or compensated workload. Not all students will have a mentor and not all faculty attempts to mentor to any or all their graduate students. A faculty/student relationship that begins as an assigned advising situation may naturally blossom into a mutually productive mentoring relationship. In addition, students may purposively seek out an advisor whom they hope will become a mentor (Schlosser et al, 2003; Schlosser et al, 2011).

Among medical residents for instance, advisors and mentors differ considerably. Advisors are residency planners/organizers, evaluators, time managers, and...
problem-solvers who tend to display a more administrative role set. By contrast, mentors served as career guides, advocates, and collaborators. Because the advisor role is more administrative in nature, faculty advisors needed guidelines and policies, administrative support, virtual tools, and program checklists to manage students more effectively (Woods, Burgess, Kaminetzky, McNeill, Pinheiro, & Heflin, 2010).

Volumes of scholarly literature exist on mentoring but fewer exist on advising. By contrast, little exists to address the obligations associated with the graduate faculty advising role given its potential connection to graduate program retention/attrition (Braxton, Proper, & Bayer, 2011). If faculty/student relationships remain part of the graduate student departure puzzle, examining facets of the faculty role and expectations for the advising relationship signal hope for a solution (Golde, 2000).

This faculty guide is designed to decrease the mystery of graduate student advising. The focus of the rest of this book revolves around enhancing the faculty advisor role beginning with student admission, through the first stage of the graduate program, including supervision of graduate assistants. Chapters focus on chairing of the thesis/dissertation, continuing interaction through the candidacy stage and defense to facilitating student exposure to the profession. Space specifically addressing ways for faculty to connect with a diverse population of graduate students in traditional and online formats may increase retention efforts. While each chapter suggests ways faculty can advise or supervise graduate students, the final chapter offers a summary. Perhaps the place to initiate good faculty advising begins at the beginning with the recruitment and admission of graduate students.
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