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Abstract

African American and Latino males are not only underrepresented in graduate schools, but demonstrate a lower rate of completion than their female and White counterparts nationally. This sequential explanatory study was undertaken to positively impact the academic achievement of African American and Latino males enrolled in a graduate school of education in the northeastern United States. A culturally responsive academic advisement model was implemented with the intended goal of 85% - 90% of African American and Latino males perceiving the advisement positively and meeting academic achievement benchmarks. The study resulted in both Latino and African American males meeting academic benchmarks and benchmarks that were set for positive perception of culturally responsive academic advisement. The results of the study positions colleges and universities to use cultural responsive academic advisement to support the achievement of African American and Latino males at institutions of higher education. Helping African American and Latino males earn post baccalaureate degrees can significantly impact their future earning potential and overall quality of life.
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Executive Summary

Data available from The National Center for Educational Statistics (2012) indicated that an achievement gap existed between African American and Latino males and their female and white counterparts at institutions of higher education. While existing research speculated that the achievement gap could be correlated to several factors, there was limited available research which provided a concrete and implementable academic advisement approach, for faculty members who directly service this population of students. As such, this study evaluated a culturally responsive advisement framework that aimed to reduce and possibly eliminate the aforementioned gap that currently exists between African American, Latino males and other populations. The advisement model was predicated on Geneva Gay’s (2013) proposition that to discuss the under achievement of some students of color, without focusing on constructive reform efforts, is incomplete. Gay (2013) argued that addressing the cultural gaps that exist between a student’s home and school culture and the culture of instructors, could reduce the stress, anxiety and feelings of alienation experienced by students of color; thereby increasing academic achievement.

The study was conducted at a graduate school of education in the North Eastern United States, whose primary student population consists of in-service teachers who serve K-12 students in urban settings. Academic reports from academic years 2012-13 to 2014-15 revealed that African American and Latino male enrollment at the institution demonstrated a gap in academic achievement, that mirrored national data. As a result, administrators at the North East campus sought to identify the potential causes of the disparity in achievement and created interventions to increase the achievement of African American and Latino males. The goal of the study was to
increase the percentage of African American and Latino males who met academic benchmarks, based upon the implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement.

An interdisciplinary review of the literature revealed several contributing factors including (a) relationships with faculty, (b) culturally responsive teaching, (c) race related bias, (d) stereotype threat, (e) lowered expectations of student athletes, and (f) non-academic competing interests on the academic achievement. A needs assessment was conducted that investigated the correlation between student perceptions of the climate, culture of the campus and student achievement. The study revealed that while African American and Latino male students generally had a positive perception of the campus culture, students reported that academic advisement did not include consideration of a student’s life circumstance and that there were some concerns with feeling undervalued and not respected at the institution. Spradlin and Parsons (2008) posited that we sometimes fail to notice the impact of culture on our lives, understanding that all human life is influenced by culture, more specifically our personalities, our patterns of thought, the ways we confront problems, as well as methods we use to organize ourselves. All of which are given shape, in large part, by cultural experiences. (p. 4, italics in original).

To respond to the identified needs of the African American and Latino male students, while supporting the majority of the student population (which is comprised of novice teachers who are transitioning to teaching while balancing the demands of graduate school), the intervention implemented a broad conceptualization of culturally responsive academic advisement. Culturally responsive academic advisement was defined as building warm, welcoming relationships to increase knowledge of individual students’ backgrounds, strengths and needs, as well as leveraging that knowledge to support them in meeting high academic
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expectations. Additionally, supporting the successful navigation of complex systems at institutions of higher education. Since the institution did not actively select or train faculty to provide academic advisement at the time of the study, culturally responsive academic advisement was specifically designed to improve faculty advisors’ ability to build relationships with students that would better help the student to acclimate to the school environment, while simultaneously helping the advisor make the environment more welcoming to students. Part of that growth process includes listening with empathy when student’s express challenges or concerns, helping students to set and meet short and long-term goals, as well as assisting students in identifying and managing nonacademic competing interests. Ultimately the goal is to help students become fluent with program requirements and meeting the expectations of the institution (Bowes, 2015). More specifically, the intervention focused on:

1. Intentionally training advisors to better serve students by (a) cultivating warm and welcoming relationships with students to gain comprehensive knowledge of students’ expression of culture, needs, responsibilities, and goals; (b) remaining abreast of all requirements students would need to satisfactorily complete their program of study, including State Department of Education (SDOE) certification process; (c) incorporating best practices of mentorship that empower students to achieve long and short term professional goals and; (d) collaborating with and referring to appropriate community support services and implementation and monitoring of best practices by advisors (Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2001; Kolenovic, Linderman & Karp, 2013; Gary, Kling & Dodd, 2004).

2. Facilitating opportunities for advisors to build and strengthen relationships with students by increasing informal interactions with students, (e.g. advisory sessions with students, socials, etc.) and use those trusting relationships to provide social support, facilitate proactive academic monitoring, and respond with timely and effective interventions (Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2001; Kolenovic, Linderman & Karp, 2013).
3. Helping students overcome identified barriers to success, such as time management, stress, and self-advocacy, by designing and delivering instructional sessions that provide students with concrete skills in the identified areas (Addus & Khan, 2007; George et al., 2008).

The intervention was designed to investigate the extent to which, and in what ways, culturally responsive academic advisement contributed to African American and Latino males meeting and exceeding benchmarks. The study also investigated similarities between students’ perception of the advisement received and faulty members’ self-reports of fidelity of implementation. A sequential explanatory design was used in the study. Expected academic achievement goals were defined as 85% - 90% of African American and Latino males ending the Spring term in good standing, and 85% - 90% of African American and Latino males selecting agree or strongly agree to advisement related questions on the institutional survey.

Pragmatism was the worldview for this study as pragmatism places a premium on actionable experiences that improve educational practices and values the usefulness of the research. It also defines research as useful when it helps people to function better and to improve organizations. In this research, it was proposed that the evaluation of culturally responsive academic advising helped African American and Latino males to function better at institutions of higher education and could improve institutions of higher education’s ability to serve a diverse student body. Furthermore, pragmatism is characterized by a fusion of approaches and provides a basis for using a mixed methods approach (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007b; Johnson et al., 2007). A sequential explanatory design was used to gather data. Specifically, quantitative data was gathered from students in the form of an anonymous online self-administered institutional survey. Qualitative data was then gathered from students via a focus group and from faculty via a group interview to explain and interpret the quantitative data (Creswell, 2009).

The collected data indicated that 93% of African American and 100% of Latino male students consistently selected somewhat agree or strongly agree on advisement related
institutional survey questions by the end of the academic year. Further, African American and Latino male students indicated during focus groups that faculty advisors work to get to know them and use that knowledge to help them be successful with coursework. Student academic progress data indicated that 93% of African Americans males ended the academic year in good standing, a 22% increase from the Spring 2016 term. Similarly, 88% of Latino males ended the academic year in good standing, an 8% increase from the Spring 2016 term. Although the increases were numerical and not statistically significant, African American and Latino male students who participated in focus groups, indicated that they felt empowered and supported to succeed in the academic environment of the institution. Furthermore, though the practices were designed to specifically benefit African American and Latino male students, all respondents to the institutional survey rated the four aspects of advisement favorably (see Table 1).

As such, culturally responsive academic advisement was refined to include seven tenets: relationship building, empathy, advocacy, cultural awareness, high expectations, empowerment, and support which can be abbreviated with the acronym REACHES. The tenets work together to facilitate advisors building and leveraging warm, welcoming, and trusting relationships with students with the goal of increasing their knowledge of an individual student’s needs.
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Consequently, the knowledge gained and the trust built enable the advisors to effectively support students, especially members of groups who have been historically underserved or marginalized, in meeting academic expectations and navigating the complex systems at Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). Of course, achieving that while managing non-academic competing interests. At the conclusion of the study, the institution planned to continue to implement and evaluate culturally responsive academic advisement to identify specific best practices. To that end, administrators decided to implement culturally responsive academic advisement across all campuses. All faculty were scheduled to be trained in the implementation of the framework, and data will be gathered to determine advisor efficacy and the impact on student achievement.

According to a report from the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, a master’s degree provides lifetime earnings of $457,000 more than a bachelor’s degree. Additionally, the report proposed that jobs requiring a master’s degree will increase faster than those requiring other levels of educational attainment through 2020. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated the weekly earnings for holders of master’s degrees to be $1329, approximately $200 more than the weekly earnings of the holders of bachelor’s degrees. Additionally, the National Center for Education Statistics (2012) reported that men earned 36% of all master’s degrees and 45% of all doctoral degrees awarded to Hispanics. Similarly, African American men earned 29% of all master’s degrees and 35% of all doctoral degrees awarded to African Americans (2012). These findings suggested that African American and Latino males would be less qualified to participate in the national predicted job growth and less likely to earn top wages when compared to their White and female counterparts.
Chapter 1: Understanding the Problem of Practice

Statement of Problem

Disaggregation of higher education achievement data by the National Center for Educational Statistics (2012) indicated that Black and Latino males are less academically successful than their female counterparts and White males at institutions of higher education. Although researchers have identified the disparity in achievement and a variety of factors and solutions have been suggested, limited research existed that identified concrete solutions to increasing the academic achievement of African American and Latino male graduate students. Additionally, an advisement framework, intentionally designed for faculty members who directly service this population of students, with the goal of increasing academic achievement at the graduate level not been identified. Identification of potential action steps that could ameliorate the achievement gap amongst African American and Latino males in higher education could lead to higher rates of completion amongst African American and Latino males, and potentially increase the earning potential of this population. To that end, this study evaluated a culturally responsive academic advisement framework for use by faculty members at a small North Eastern graduate institution with the goal of increasing the academic achievement (as measured by attainment of RSA=2.7) of the enrolled African American and Latino males. The study aimed to increase the perceptions of academic advisement as a means of increasing the academic achievement of the students. Also, the outcomes of this research can be used by faculty at graduate schools to increase the academic achievement of enrolled African American and Latino males.
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**Context**

The institution, New Graduate School of Education (NGSE), is a graduate school which was established to train in-service teachers, in urban settings, the practical teaching skills that will result in their K-12 students demonstrating a minimum of one year’s achievement in one school year. NGSE created partnerships with school districts and charter schools to enroll in-service teachers seeking teaching certification, as well as students who were seeking to earn a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT). Approximately 60% of enrollees in academic year 2015-16 were seeking certification and 40% were MAT candidates. As a result of the partnerships created with schools, NGSE had an open admissions policy which resulted in a student population with a diverse range of prior academic achievement.

Since NGSE’s mission is to prepare teachers who will develop their K-12 students’ academic skills, strength of character and success in college and life, faculty at NGSE are selected based on the following criteria: (a) K-12 classroom instruction for a minimum of three years that has resulted in their K-12 students’ success on state and school based assessments, (b) demonstrated ability to teach and/or coach adult learners as measured by a demonstration lesson during the selection process, (c) satisfactory completion of a graduate program, and (d) alignment to NGSE’s mission determined through a rigorous interview process. The organization’s leaders engendered a culture of high expectations and promoted teaching as an act of love for both staff members and students at NGSE (NGSE, 2016). This philosophical approach to education underpins all functions at NGSE, including the selection and development of faculty. In addition to alignment with NGSE’s mission, this philosophy is aligned with Robert Greenleaf’s concept of servant leadership, which describes the servant leader as one who seeks
to develop outer and inner characteristics that focus on “serving the highest needs of individuals” (Greenleaf, 1977, p.27).

In alignment with the school’s mission, philosophy and orientation towards student success, high expectations were manifested in the assessment of students at NGSE. Instructors assess students’ implementation of teaching strategies and techniques via video submissions. Each assessment was evaluated using a rubric designed specifically for the assessment. Rubric scores range from zero to four (see sample in Appendix A). Additionally, teaching as an act of love was manifested in the institution’s academic support practices. One such support practice was evident in the institution’s policy on resubmissions. Administrators observed that graduate students who are proficient K-12 instructors did not always demonstrate the same level of proficiency on their assessments at NGSE. As such, if a graduate student did not earn a proficient score on an assessment, faculty members were granted the latitude to allow students to resubmit the assessment until mastery was achieved, prior to the end of the term, to improve the score. This practice pushed the students towards mastery and prevented a permanent negative score on students’ transcripts, which aligned with Greenleaf et al., (2002) the principles of stewardship, foresight and conceptualization principles of servant leadership.

At the end of each term, student academic progress was determined by the average of all rubric scores earned per term. To successfully complete teacher certification or the Master of Arts program at NGSE, students were required to maintain a rubric score average (RSA) of 2.7 each term. Students who earned an RSA below 2.7 were placed on probation at the end of the term of first occurrence. Any subsequent instances of an end of term RSA below 2.7 resulted in dismissal from the institution.

The institution implemented an achievement goal of 90% of students earning a minimum RSA of 2.7. An institution-wide review of the NGSE student academic reports from academic
years 2012-13 to 2014-15 revealed that in comparison to other demographics with enrolled populations of 5 or more, African American and Latino male students demonstrated the lowest academic achievement across all campuses (see Table 2). As a result, administrators at the North East campus wanted to identify the potential causes of this disparity in achievement and create interventions that would improve the achievement of African American and Latino males.

Table 2

*Student Academic Performance at NGSE North East Fall 2013, 2014 and 2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dean's List</th>
<th>Good Standing</th>
<th>Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American and Latino Females</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American and Latino Males</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2014</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American and Latino Females</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American and Latino Males</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolled</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American and Latino Females</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American and Latino Males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The totals represent all the males enrolled in the program at the specified time.
Theoretical Framework

The tenets of social constructivism, and culturally responsive pedagogy, served as the theoretical foundation used by the researcher to examine factors contributing to and solutions for decreasing the achievement gap. Gee (2008) defined social constructivism as learning that is mediated by language and is dependent on a “relationship between an individual with both a mind and a body and an environment in which the individual thinks, feels, acts, and interacts” (p. 81). Social constructivism is rooted in Vygotsky’s (1978) proposal that children rely on culture and experts, among other things, to acquire knowledge. According to Vygotsky (1978), the experts with whom learners interact are integral to learning. Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development proposed that learners can acquire more knowledge with the aid of tools and experts than they would acquire independently (Vygotsky, 1978). Gee (2008) not only valued the expert as critical to learners, but also valued the interaction between the individual and the environment. He posited that learners must take advantage of both effectivities and affordances for learning to take place. He defined effectivities as the capacity to take advantage of the offerings in the environment, and affordances as the perception that these offerings are accessible.

Additionally, Gee (2008) emphasized that learners’ opportunities to learn are impacted by the learner’s perception of the learning environment. He argued that learners who view the learning environment as welcoming to their personal, social, or ethnic culture, are better able to take advantage of the opportunity to learn. Ladson-Billings’ (1995) cultural responsive pedagogy also underpinned this intervention. Ladson-Billings (1995) posited that effective instructors of African American students possessed belief systems that held high expectations for students’ academic success, were focused on developing and maintaining cultural competence and sought
to develop critical consciousness in their students. Ladson-Billings (1995) further proposed that the race of the teacher was less important to success with students of color than the aforementioned belief systems.

Social constructivism and culturally responsive pedagogy intersect to emphasize the importance of the learner’s immersion in welcoming learning communities. These theories facilitated a multifaceted lens through which an investigation of the lower achievement of African American and Latino males at NGSE could be conducted. As such, this study focused on creating a culturally responsive advisement framework which increased African American and Latino males’ perception of affordances, and empowerment, to take advantage of effectivities at institutions of higher education.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to evaluate the relationship between the implementation of a culturally responsive academic advisement model and the perceptions of academic advisement and achievement of African American and Latino males at a small graduate school of education in the North Eastern United States. Data were obtained using anonymous surveys, focus groups and group interviews. The research may identify significant practices that could inform the study.

**Review of Literature**

**Faculty-Student Interactions**

Clark, Ponjuan, Orrock, Wilson, and Flores (2013) interviewed personnel from a cross section of educational institutions, ranging from K-12 to higher education, to determine the barriers to educational achievement amongst Latino males. The researchers found that several social constructs, including the family, peers and the environment of institutions impacted the
outcomes of Latino male persistence in, and completion of, undergraduate degree programs. Clark et al. (2013) found that Latino males were heavily influenced by the support of family and by the perceived role of the male in the Latino family. Additionally, the study found that the support of peers played a particularly crucial role in the perception of educational settings. Faculty members’ lack of awareness of the importance of family and peer support in many Latino cultures could negatively impact the relationship between faculty members and this population of students.

Clark et al. (2013) also reported that the educational environment impacted the Latino male students in two ways. In this study, a significant barrier to Latino male achievement was school personnel’s lack of knowledge about obstacles faced by the aspiring Latino student and the degree to which the student felt welcome in the environment. Hernandez (2000) also highlighted the importance of school personnel to the persistence of Latino college students. Hernandez’s (2000) qualitative study of recent college graduates revealed positive relationships with faculty, staff and positive relationships with other people on campus as contributing factors to the persistence of Latino college students. All of the participants in Hernandez’s (2000) study indicated that a one-on-one relationship, as well as connections with individual professors, was a key factor in their persistence in college. Santos and Reigadas (2002) further confirmed the finding that positive interactions with faculty and staff positively impacts student achievement.

Santos and Reigadas (2002) found that most of the 32 students who participated in a faculty mentoring program at California State University, designed to decrease the dropout rate, reported an increase in their ability to adjust both socially and personally to college due to the emotional support received from the mentors. These findings were similar to those of Robertson and Mason (2010), who found that one of the contributing factors to the academic success of African
American males, at a predominantly White university in the South, was collegial faculty/student relations. Reid (2013) additionally reported that African American male students who reported greater satisfaction with informal faculty interactions, demonstrated greater academic achievement. Gay (2004) punctuated the importance of a welcoming environment when she argued that the academic environments in which graduate students of color are made to function are often both alien and hostile, staffed by culturally insensitive and uncaring instructors.

**Culturally Responsive Teaching**

Gay (2000) defines culturally responsive teaching as leveraging the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relatable, relevant and effective for them. For the purpose of this study, it is important that culturally responsive teaching be defined prior to discussing the practices associated with culturally responsive teaching. She proposes that validating students’ cultural heritages and bridging the prior experience and culture of students with the formal curriculum increases the meaningfulness of students’ experiences in school. Gay (2000) further argues that culturally responsive teaching necessarily employs a variety of instructional strategies, which address different learning styles, facilitate curiosity and praise for other cultures. It is intentionally inclusive of multicultural materials and resources across the curriculum.

In a three-year study of teachers who worked successfully with African American students in K-12 settings, Ladson-Billings (1995) identified several factors that influence culturally responsive pedagogy. Ladson-Billings (1995) noted that the practices she observed and codified as culturally responsive teaching, were not dependent upon the race of the teacher, but upon the teacher’s belief systems. She identified three critical components of culturally
responsive teaching: (a) academic success, (b) the development and maintenance of cultural competence and (c) the development of critical consciousness (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Brown (2009) studied nine male African American teachers working in an urban school that specifically recruited African American male students. The school was designed to maximize the positive interaction of African American male students and teachers. Brown (2009) identified three styles of teaching demonstrated by the teachers in the study who executed culturally responsive pedagogy: (a) the enforcer, (b) the negotiator, and (c) the playful styles. The enforcer style is marked by the teacher’s high standards and expectations and immediate enforcement of those defined expectations. The negotiator style is marked by the teacher’s use of probing questions to gain insight into student perspectives. The playful style is used in informal settings to build relationships with students through the exchange of jokes, personal experiences and debatable ideas. Brown (2009) concluded that each of these styles was successful with students because the teachers’ enactment of a particular style was based on the ideologies they held about their students and their needs. He further argued that “the African American males in this study had to work through a variety of beliefs, practices and pedagogies to address the needs of the African American male students” (p. 433). As such Brown (2009) posited that the shared experience of the African American male teacher and student, while beneficial, did not negate the importance of the teachers’ need to build relationships with the students. Additionally, the teachers all maintained high expectations for students and demonstrated a belief in their students’ ability to succeed in both the short and long term. The styles identified by Brown (2009) punctuate Ladson-Billings (1995) findings that the ideological beliefs teachers bring to the classroom have a greater impact on successful interactions with African American males in the classroom than the teacher’s race. The research findings highlight the importance of faculty beliefs about and
types of interactions with African American males, which could impact student achievement. The articles highlight that faculty members’ failure to communicate beliefs and expectations that students can and will achieve, could impact interactions with students and potentially become a barrier to their students’ success.

**Race Related Bias**

Smith, Allen, and Danley (2007) investigated the impact of subtle, but persistent, acts of racial discrimination on African American males who attended historically White institutions. They termed these acts of racial discrimination racial microaggressions. Racial microaggressions are characterized by anti-Black stereotyping and marginality, especially by members of the law enforcement community. The African American male students in Smith et al.’s (2007) study reported feeling marginalized, objectified, targeted and unwelcome on the campuses and surrounding communities. The researchers identified the psychological and physiological effects of the constant exposure to microaggressions as racial battle fatigue. Mack et al. (1997) found that African American students’ perceptions of on-campus racism were more likely to exceed that of other racial-ethnic groups. African American students agreed with the description of their campus as racially hostile and were likely to perceive White students as uncomfortable in the presence of Blacks. This is in keeping with Thomas’ (1997) findings that students of most minority racial-ethnic groups believe that the prevalence of prejudice and devaluation are common experiences at institutions of higher education.

**Stereotype Threat**

In addition to race related bias, stereotype threat has been documented as a barrier to success at institutions of higher education. Steele and Aronson (1995) found that stereotype threat or the risk of confirming widely known negative stereotypes, negatively impacted student
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performance of African American students at an Ivy League university on standardized tests. Johnson-Ahorlu’s (2013) study revealed that student participants believed that faculty and classmates stereotyped African Americans as intellectually incapable and undeserving of university admission. Woodcock, Hernandez, Estrada and Schulz (2012) found that stereotype threat could be compounded when students of shared ethnicity represent a numerical minority. Martin, Harrison, Stone and Lawrence (2010) concluded that stereotype threat was not limited to race, but could exist in groups about which negative stereotypes are prevalent, such as student athletes. In fact, Stone, Harrison and Mottley (2012) found that African American student athletes were more likely to perform poorly on academic tasks when identified as athletes than those African American student athletes who were simply identified as scholars. Further, African American male student athletes reported feeling they had to work harder to counter negative stereotypes (Martin et al., 2010). While stereotype threat is a potential contributing factor to the lower achievement of African American and Latino males at institutions of higher education, Woodcock et al. (2012) concluded that stereotype threat may be mitigated by the presence of a numerical majority of students of a shared ethnicity. Additionally, Martin et al. (2010) found that stereotype threat could also result in students prioritizing academic achievement instead of devaluing academic outcomes or disassociating with schools.

**Lowered Expectations of Student Athletes**

According to Harper, Williams and Blackman (2013), Black males represented 2.8% of full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate students, between 2007 and 2010, but comprised 57.1% of football teams and 64.3% of basketball teams. In this same time span 66.9% of student athletes, 72.8% of undergraduate students overall, and 55.5% of Black undergraduate men overall graduated within six years, while only 50% of Black male student-athletes graduated
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within six years. Similarly, 96% - 97% of institutions graduated Black male student-athletes at lower rates than both the undergraduate and student-athlete populations.

Benson’s (2000) ethnographic study of African American male football players at a large predominantly White institution in the southeast identified the perception of low academic support amongst African American student athletes as a contributing factor to the aforementioned statistics. Benson (2000) revealed a correlation between disinterest and disengagement toward academic progress, and the perception of a lack of academic support and accountability by faculty and athletic staff amongst African American collegiate football players. Students in Benson’s (2000) study reported that their academic success was not prioritized from as early as the recruitment process. The athletes in the study reported being placed in less challenging classes, based on advisors’ assumptions about their abilities. Faculty’s lack of investment in the student athletes’ success was evidenced by failure to make themselves available. When students reported not understanding the material, they were given extra opportunities to make up assignments with little accountability to the initial assignment and assigning them grades that they did not earn. Benson (2000) asserted in his reporting, that the athletes lacked the encouragement to succeed academically, typically expected at an institution of higher education.

Carodine, Almond and Gratto (2001) reviewed available literature to identify best practices for supporting student athletes. The authors highlighted a multi-faceted and comprehensive approach that would include life skills training, mediation services between faculty and students, academic advisement and career counseling. Comeaux’s (2011) study confirmed the prevalence of faculty bias towards student athletes amongst non-Black faculty members. Comeaux’s (2011) research revealed that faculty of the humanities, the areas of study
selected by most athletes, demonstrated the greatest bias. Martin, Harrison, Stone and Lawrence (2010) conducted a phenomenological study with 27 African American male student athletes at four Research 1 universities, to investigate student athletes’ feelings about their academic experience and confidence in their academics. Students in this study also reported feeling that they had to work harder to counteract negative stereotypes, based on their combination of race and athletic status. Harrison (2008) found that perceptions of African American football and basketball players were also negative amongst their non-athlete peers. Peers perceived players as less academically qualified to attend the school, and expressed discontent with the perceived privileges afforded the athletes.

**Non-Academic Competing Interests**

Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, and Terenzini (2004) and Harper (2006) propose that participation in out-of-classroom experiences increases students’ ability to participate meaningfully in the campus culture, build supportive relationships with others and promote success in higher education. However, Pascarella et al. (2004) found that first generation college students had greater work responsibilities than their peers, were more likely to live off campus, and were less likely to interact with peers and participate in extracurricular activities. The researchers propose that the non-academic competing interests, such as work or maintenance of athletic scholarships, negatively impact the college experience. This longitudinal study found that first generation college students maintained lower GPAs through the third year of the study, and lower engagement in non-academic activities that would most benefit them, such as studying and reading for self-understanding. Appiah’s (2013) study on the private rates of returns (PROR) of higher education, the cost and benefits to individuals and their families, demonstrates that the rates of returns were highest for graduates of the commerce and engineering fields, but lowest for
students in liberal arts studies. The research also revealed that African American males were less likely to choose those areas of study. Appiah (2013) further suggested that universities may select African American males for admission based on their ability to compete athletically as opposed to academically. These students often receive athletic scholarships and spend increased time focused on their sport, as opposed to academics, in an effort to maintain those scholarships.

**Research Focus**

The literature reviewed informed the construction of research questions to investigate how the African American and Latino male population perceived the culture and climate, as well as, the academic advisement received at NGSE. More specifically, the research was designed to investigate whether African American males perceived faculty as unbiased to athletes (Benson, 2000; Martin et al., 2010), perceived academic advisement as inclusive of non-academic competing interests of students and perceived the environment created by faculty as a welcoming environment (Pascarella et al., 2004; Clark et al., 2013; Hernandez, 2000; Santos & Reigadas, 2002, Gay 2000).

The researcher attempted to capitalize on the flexibility afforded by pragmatism to design a study that was both practical and well suited to the needs assessment research. A mixed methods design was used to determine which identified contributing factors to lower achievement among African American and Latino males during the undergraduate experience impact students at NGSE similarly. Furthermore, the researcher attempted to identify if critical gaps in students’ perception of academic advisement existed, and whether bias negatively impacted faculty’s perception of African American and Latino students’ ability to succeed at NGSE.
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Conclusion

The literature highlighted in this review provided empirical data that informed the observations of faculty and staff at institutions of higher education. While the available research specifically focusing on Latino males was limited, the research that existed affirmed Gee’s (2008) position that the perceptions of school culture and climate held by the learner (in this study, African American and Latino males at institutions of higher education) were critical components that impacted student achievement (Clark et al., 2013). Further research indicated that student experiences at IHEs were positively impacted by (a) increased informal faculty interactions with students (Hernandez, 2000; Roberston & Mason, 2010), (b) increased expectations of African American and Latino males including student athletes (Benson, 2000; Carodine, Almond & Gratto, 2001) and (c) improved academic advisement for students which take into account the needs of students who balance non-academic competing interests (Pascarella, Pierson, Wolniak, & Terenzini, 2004; Harper, 2006). Specifically, the researcher proposed that faculty who will advise and instruct Latino and African American males should demonstrate investment and belief in their students’ ability to achieve academically. As defined by Gay (2000) and Ladson-Billings (1995), this is one of the key components of culturally responsive pedagogy.

The literature highlighted in this review was restricted to undergraduate experiences, as literature specifically studying academic achievement in graduate schools was limited. However, Gay (2000) argued that issues faced by undergraduate students, including racism and other responsibilities, appear to extend beyond the undergraduate experience. The needs assessment was designed to investigate which, if any, of the underlying factors identified in the literature
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were impacting African American and Latino male students at NGSE. The needs assessment investigated (1) the impact of students’ perception of academic advisement and relationships with faculty (Clark et al., 2013; Santos & Reigadas, 2002; Hernandez, 2000; Martin et al., 2010), (2) faculty members’ expectations of African American and Latino students and potential bias towards student athletes (Benson 2000; Comeaux, 2011), and (3) the impact of non-academic competing interests on the academic achievement of African American and Latino males (Pascarella et al., 2004; Harper 2006).
Chapter 2: Needs Assessment

The literature reviewed identified several potential underlying factors, including race-related bias, bias towards student athletes, student perceptions of academic advisement received, stereotype threat, and the impact of non-academic competing interests on African American and Latino students’ academic achievement. The needs assessment was designed to investigate students’ perception of academic advisement (Martin et al., 2010), relationships with faculty (Clark et al., 2013; Santos & Reigadas, 2002; Hernandez, 2000), low expectations of athletes (Benson, 2000; Comeaux, 2011), bias (Mack et al., 1997; Thomas, 1997), and the impact of non-academic competing interests on the academic achievement of African American and Latino males (Pascarella et al., 2004). Based on the identified factors, the instruments were selected to determine how African American and Latino male students perceived the climate and culture at NGSE and the advisement received, and if implicit bias impacted faculty members’ perception of African American and Latino male students’ ability to achieve.

Context of Study

At the time of the needs assessment study, faculty members at NGSE advised a maximum of 50 students whose teaching placements ranged from K-12 in both charter and district schools. Additionally, students’ range of experience varied from novice to veterans of twenty years. Therefore, students required varied levels of support to complete their chosen program of study at NGSE. Full time faculty members were best positioned to provide advisement to students as they interacted with students frequently, both during in-person sessions at NGSE, and in graduate students’ K-12 classrooms. As such, faculty members were better able to implement student support plans that promoted student success. Despite efforts made by individual faculty advisors in the past, the Latino and African American male student population
continued to demonstrate lower achievement (RSAs below 2.7) at NGSE. Students were dismissed if they were unable to maintain a minimum RSA of 2.7, which resulted in a lower rate of completion for African American and Latino male students. Consequently, incompletion resulted in several outcomes including ineligibility for teaching certification, job loss and/or financial penalties at NGSE.

**Needs Assessment Design**

As a result of the literature reviewed, which identified perception of the academic environment, positive interactions with faculty and culturally responsive practices as critical factors to the achievement of Latino and African American males, the goal of this needs assessment was to determine if a relationship existed between students who earned RSAs below 2.7 and their perceptions of the campus environment and student achievement (Clark et al., 2013; Hernandez, 2000; Gay, 2004; Benson, 2000; Martin, 2000). Additionally, the relationship between student perceptions of the quality of advisement at NGSE and the achievement of African American and Latino males was examined. The study also attempted to determine the extent to which student achievement was impacted by non-academic competing interests, such as family obligations, teaching responsibilities and extracurricular activities.

The research was grounded in pragmatism as this theory situates the research in real-life conditions, so that effective research is viewed as derived from human needs and wants. Pragmatism also describes research as the continuous reconstruction of educational experiences and the outcome of actions and interactions through which knowledge is achieved (Kalolo, 2015). The research is compatible with pragmatism, as the purpose of the research was derived from the needs and desires of African American and Latino males. The researcher aimed to arrive at a reconstruction of the educational experience for African American and Latino males.
that positively impacted their academic achievement and ultimately their potential earning power. Additionally, curriculum at the institution at which the research was undertaken, was designed so that knowledge was acquired through interaction. A pragmatic approach to the research study was most familiar to both administrators and participants. Finally, pragmatism, characterized by a fusion of approaches that meet the needs of an ever-evolving educational environment, provided a basis for the mixed methods research design used in this study (Tashakkori & Creswell, 2007b; Johnson et al., 2007).

A sequential explanatory design was selected to first gather quantitative data via the survey instrument. Focus groups were then designed to help the researcher gather qualitative data that would specifically explain which aspects of academic advisement African American and Latino male students felt were beneficial and could be improved. Further, the qualitative data was designed to identify specific non-academic challenges that African American and Latino male students reported as negative impacts to their academic achievement. The sequential explanatory design was selected to (a) help the researcher understand the complex issue of lower academic achievement amongst African American and Latino male students, (b) generate new ideas for ameliorating this issue and (c) to examine the strengths and weaknesses of past responses, with the aim of generating improvements to academic advisement practices. (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006).

**Needs Assessment Research Questions**

1. What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE?
   a. Are African American male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE?
b. Are Latino male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported perceptions of
   the culture and climate of NGSE?

2. What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with
   academic advising and their academic achievement?
   a. Are African American male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported
      satisfaction of academic advising?
   b. Are Latino male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported satisfaction of
      academic advising?

3. Do faculty members demonstrate bias in their beliefs about African American and Latino
   males’ ability to achieve at NGSE?

4. How do non-academic competing interests influence the academic performance of
   African American and Latino males at NGSE?

**Methods**

**Participants**

At the time of the needs assessment study, NGSE consisted of five operational campuses
and three pre-operational campuses. While NGSE enrolled graduate students pursuing degrees in
education leadership, this sample of respondents was limited to students who were enrolled in
the certification or MAT programs. Students in the MAT were the largest population of students
served by NGSE and the population for whom data was most readily available. Faculty
respondents included faculty from all eight campuses and the graduate students enrolled at the
five operational campuses. There were three targeted groups of respondents for this study:
faculty, African American and Latino male survey respondents throughout the institution and
African American and Latino male focus group participants at NGSE North East, who may or may not have responded to the survey.

**Respondents - Group One**

Faculty members at all NGSE campuses, whether operational or pre-operational, comprised respondent group one. Faculty members associated with pre-operational campuses were included because they were required to provide instruction at operational campuses for a minimum of six months prior to the launch of new campuses. Thus, these faculty members had prior exposure to student advisement at NGSE and were able to adequately participate in the study. Faculty respondents responded to case studies to determine if their predictions of students’ academic ability would vary based on associations made with popular African American, Latino, and Anglo names (Tournaki & Podell, 2005; Santos & Reigadas, 2002; Reid, 2013). Each faculty member who participated read two case studies and responded to three questions, which asked them to predict the name(s) of the students that best fit the conditions of each question (see Appendix D for case studies). This investigation was modeled on the Tournaki and Podell (2005) investigation of bias in relation to teachers’ perceptions of students’ ability. While the target sample was a minimum of twenty respondents, since the survey was open to all faculty members at all campuses, thirty-six faculty members actually participated in the study. There were 27 females and 9 male faculty respondents, 27 of whom identified as White, 3 as African American, 1 as Asian, 2 as Latino and 3 as other.

**Respondents – Group Two**

African American and Latino males enrolled in teacher certification or MAT programs at all NGSE campuses comprised group two. The research team at NGSE identified the names and contact information of students who previously self-identified as African American or Latino.
males to ensure that the instrument was only distributed to members of the targeted population. Quantitative data was collected from these students to determine student perceptions of the culture and climate at NGSE and the student satisfaction with the academic advisement received (Clark et al., 2013; Gay, 2000). Although, the target sample was a minimum of thirty respondents, participation was voluntary and only twenty-five students responded to the survey.

**Respondents - Group Three**

African American and Latino male students at the NGSE North East campus were invited to participate in a focus group, since any intervention that resulted from the study would be limited to the North East campus. The focus group investigated the variable of non-competing academic interests (Pascarella et al., 2004). Given that most students in the study were completing graduate studies, while simultaneously completing the first year of teaching, and were first generation graduate students acclimating to the expectations of graduate school with little external support, the focus group investigated the relationship between students’ academic achievement and their ability to manage their professional and personal responsibilities. The focus group was conducted with four Latino and African American male students to assess their perception of the advisement they were receiving at NGSE North East. Students were asked to discuss their current academic progress, what was being done by the school to impact that progress and how the advisement practices at NGSE helped them to manage both the academic and non-academic tasks. The focus group questions were:

1. Are you satisfied with your academic progress at NGSE?
   a. What if any challenges have you experienced that impact your academic progress (Pascarella et al. 2004)?
2. What is NGSE doing well to help you meet with academic success (Gay, 2004; Santos & Reigadas, 2002; Robertson & Mason, 2010; Hernandez, 2000)?

3. What can NGSE improve upon to help you meet with academic success (Gay, 2004; Santos & Reigadas, 2002; Robertson & Mason, 2010; Hernandez, 2000)?
   a. Which activities should we continue? Do more of?
   b. What are we not doing that we should consider?

Variables

The variables operationalized via the survey instruments included (a) student perceptions of campus climate, (b) student perceptions of academic advisement, (c) student perceptions of cultural responsiveness on the campus, (d) implicit bias of faculty towards students who were athletes during their undergraduate experience, and (e) implicit bias of faculty toward African American and Latino males. These concepts were measured by an online survey using Likert scale questions. The variable of non-academic competing interests was operationalized via open interview questions during the aforementioned focus group.

Table 3

Variables, Definitions, and Measurements Matched to Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Measurement (s)</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement SY 2014-15</td>
<td>Summer 2014, Fall 2014 and current Rubric Score Averages (Spring 2015).</td>
<td>Open Response Item</td>
<td>1. What is the relationship African American and Latino males RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE? 2. What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Perception of Culturally</td>
<td>The degree to which students feel that members of their race are welcomed and accepted in the campus environment.</td>
<td>3 Likert scale items on online survey</td>
<td>1. What is the relationship African American and Latino males RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Collection

Quantitative data in the form of self-administered online surveys via Survey Monkey was collected initially. Additionally, qualitative data via a focus group, were collected and analyzed to better understand student responses to the quantitative data.

### Quantitative Data

**Student surveys.** The survey included three demographic questions which determined campus affiliation, race and gender, which were not included in the quantitative analysis. The quantitative data was gathered via four academic achievement questions which students used to self-report current and term RSAs for Summer 2014, Fall 2014, and Spring 2015 (See Appendix E). Statements with which respondents indicated varying degrees of agreement on a 7 point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsive Practices</th>
<th>climate of NGSE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Perception of Campus Climate</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which students of this race and gender feel welcome by members of the faculty and staff and their peer group. 5 Likert scale items on online survey. 1. What is the correlation between African American and Latino males RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Satisfaction with Academic Advisement</strong></td>
<td>The degree to which students feel that the advisement they receive is effective 8 Likert scale items on online survey. 2. What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implicit Bias of Faculty</strong></td>
<td>Faculty preconceptions about students’ ability to succeed at NGSE based on undergraduate experience and/or implied race. two case studies associated with two 3 item online survey related. 3. What are the perceived beliefs of the faculty and peers about African American and Latino males ability to achieve at NGSE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-academic competing interests</strong></td>
<td>Responsibilities outside of school that compete with the academic demands of students (e.g. sports, family responsibilities, work responsibilities) Focus groups/interviews. 4. How do non-academic competing interests influence the academic performance of African American and Latino males at NGSE?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Likert scale ranging from *strongly agree to strongly disagree* were used to determine student perceptions of culture and climate and student perceptions of academic advisement.

**Perception of culture survey items.** Items adapted from Goodenow’s (1993) eight item questionnaire were used to measure Latino and African American males’ perception of the culture and climate of NGSE (RQ1). Fullan (2007) defines school culture as the unwritten guiding beliefs, norms and values evident in the way members of authority, faculty and staff operate the school. Loukas and Murphy (2007) hypothesized that school culture influences the organizational, instructional and interpersonal atmosphere, or climate, at an institution. This understanding of school culture shaped the development of the questions used to determine students’ perception of culture at NGSE. The first three questions measured by the 7-point Likert scale on the culture and climate survey (see Appendix F) were designed to respond to research question 1 – *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?* (a) *Are African American male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported satisfaction with academic advisement?* (b) *Are Latino male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported satisfaction with academic advising?*

**Perception of climate survey items.** School climate is defined as the characteristics of interactions at school and how those interactions impact students (Hoy et al., 2002; Eliot et al., 2010). As such, climate was viewed as the total environmental quality experienced by students within an institution (Hoy 1990, Heck & Marcoulides 1996, Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2012). Items used to measure students’ perception of the climate at NGSE comprised the last five items on the culture and climate survey and included *NGSE Faculty members demonstrate interest in me and I feel safe sharing my cultural traditions at NGSE* (see Appendix F). These items, in conjunction
with the items related to culture, were designed to respond to research question 1 - *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE?* (a) Are African American male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE? (b) Are Latino male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE? Face validity was established with the research team of the institution.

**Academic advisement items.** Items adapted from Bryant’s (2006) eight item Student Satisfaction Survey – Academic Services Scale was used to investigate research question 2. Students responded to statements on a 7-point Likert scale, used to measure students’ satisfaction with existing academic advisement practices (see Appendix G for full instrument). These items were designed to respond to research question 2 - *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?* (a) Are African American male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported satisfaction of academic advising? (b) Are Latino male students’ RSAs different depending on the reported satisfaction of academic advising? Face validity was established with the research team of the institution.

**Faculty surveys.** Research from Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) and Tournaki and Podell (2005) were used to investigate the potential implicit bias of faculty and respond to research question 3 - *Do faculty members demonstrate bias in their beliefs about African American and Latino males’ ability to achieve at NGSE?* Case studies were designed to describe six one year students at NGSE; faculty were asked to predict which of the students would fit three presented scenarios. All case studies included six students with names selected from a list of popular baby male and female names in 1991, because students at NGSE would be of
comparable age to children born in 1991. Case studies 1 and 3 included at least three students who participated in NCAA Division 1 athletics to determine if faculty demonstrated bias to students who had been athletes during their undergraduate academic experience. Case studies 3 and 4 included three names that were listed as popular female names in 1991. Each of the case studies included two popular African American names, two Caucasian names, and two Latino names. In addition to the names of students, faculty were also presented with the option of “All” or “None” as possible responses. All faculty completed case study 1, while case study 2 was one of three alternate case studies which was randomly assigned to each faculty member by the researcher. Sample items include *Which student’s undergraduate experience will negatively impact his/her performance at NGSE?* Faculty surveys also included three demographic questions which determined race, gender and campus affiliation (see Appendix D for full instrument).

**Qualitative Data**

The researcher convened a focus group to determine how non-academic competing interests impacted Latino and African American males’ completion of academic tasks at NGSE North East. This data was gathered to respond to research question 4 - *How do non-academic competing interests influence the academic performance of African American and Latino males at NGSE?* Participants responded to questions (see Appendix I) during the one-hour focus group.

**Existing Data**

NGSE reports student academic progress three times per academic year by compiling students’ RSAs. Data was gathered from all campuses after reporting was completed to compile data on student academic performance by race, gender, campus and academic standing. NGSE
institutional wide reports were also used to compile demographic data to which student academic performance was correlated. This data was used to identify the RSAs for African American and Latino males which informed responses to research questions 1 – *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE?* and 2, *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?*

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis for quantitative data included descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. Means, ranges, and standard deviations were calculated using Microsoft Excel. Since the sample sizes (excluding the two outliers) for Latino males (n=10) and for African American male (n=13) were too small (less than 30) to expect a normal distribution, Spearman’s correlation was used as this correlation analysis provides a more robust analysis and does not assume that data is normally distributed. Correlations between African American and Latino male students’ RSAs and culture, climate, and academic advisement were analyzed. Data was reported via tables and scatterplots. Focus groups were analyzed using to identify a priori codes, emergent codes and broad themes that reflected participant responses to the questions. The recording was reviewed initially to determine the frequency of a priori codes and to record emergent codes. The recording was then reviewed to identify any codes that were similar to the previously recorded a priori and emergent codes. A third review was completed to identify codes that were infrequently mentioned but were important to the respondents. Broad themes were then identified and recorded.
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Results

**Research question 1.** Student perceptions of the culture and climate of the campus addressed research question 1 - *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE?* There were 11 Latino male student respondents and 14 African American male student respondents to the student survey. Although RSA data was collected for all three terms in academic year 2014-15, the research focused on data for the Fall term. The Summer term RSA is based on fewer assessments than the Fall term, and since the Spring term had not yet closed, the RSAs reported by students did not present an accurate representation of student achievement. Results of the culture and climate survey were analyzed to respond to research question one. Relationships between respondents’ mean RSAs and the mean Likert score for the 8-item campus and culture surveys were analyzed. Each rating on the Likert scale was assigned a number. *Strongly agree* was assigned (1) and each subsequent rating was assigned the successive number so that *strongly disagree* was assigned (7). The mean score for each rating category and each respondents’ ratings were then calculated

The range of RSA scores including the outlier for Latino males in the Fall term was 2.4 to 3.6 with a mean Fall term RSA of $M = 3.02$ with a standard deviation of $SD = 0.42$. Eighty-two percent ($n = 9$) of Latino males self-reported RSAs of 2.7 or greater. One Latino male student who self-reported a RSA of 2.4 selected neutral (4) three times and strongly disagree three times on the culture and climate survey was an outlier. The range of RSA scores excluding the outlier for Latino males in the Fall term remained 2.4 to 3.6, with a mean Fall term RSA of $M = 3.08$, and a standard deviation of 0.37. The range of RSA scores for African American males including the outlier was 2.6 to 3.2 with a mean Fall term RSA of $M = 2.7$ and a standard
deviation of SD = 0.79. Eighty-six percent (n = 12) of African American male respondents self-reported a RSA of 2.7 or greater. One African American student chose not to disclose his RSA and was removed from the data set. The range of RSA scores for African American males, excluding the outlier, was 2.6 to 3.2 with a mean Fall term RSA of M = 2.91 and with a standard deviation of 0.17. A non-parametric t-test, the Mann-Whitney U test, was conducted to determine the statistical significance between the mean RSAs of the Latino and African American male populations U = 44.5, p = 0.2150. The data was not statistically significant at .05 level.

Mean Likert scores gathered from individual Latino males for the campus culture survey ranged from 1 to 7, including the outlier, and 1 to 2.7 excluding the outlier. Mean Likert scores gathered from individual African American males for the campus culture survey ranged from 1 to 4.33, including the outlier, and 1 to 3 excluding the outlier. The overall mean Likert scores for both African American and Latino males consistently indicated positive perceptions of the campus culture. Responses to I feel like a valued member of the NGSE community indicated the highest mean for both African American (2.15) and Latino males (2.4) and greatest dissatisfaction.

Table 4

*Campus Culture Mean Likert Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Including Outliers</th>
<th>Mean without Outliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a valued member of the NGSE community.</td>
<td>2.29 2.82 2.55</td>
<td>2.15 2.4 2.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at NGSE treat me with as much respect as other students.</td>
<td>1.79 2 1.89</td>
<td>1.46 1.5 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at NGSE demonstrate interest in me</td>
<td>1.79 1.91 1.85</td>
<td>1.69 1.4 1.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean Likert scores gathered from individual Latino males for the campus climate survey ranged from 1 to 3.2, including the outlier, and remained at 1 to 3.2 when the outlier was removed from the data set. Mean Likert scores gathered from individual African American males for the campus culture survey ranged from 1 to 3.5, including the outlier, and 1 to 3.5 excluding the outlier. The overall mean Likert scores for both African American and Latino males consistently indicated positive perceptions of the campus culture. Responses to *I feel like safe sharing my cultural traditions at NGSE* indicated the highest mean for both African American (2.53) and Latino males (2.1) and greatest dissatisfaction.

**Table 5**

_Campus Climate Mean Likert Scores_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Including Outliers</th>
<th>Mean without Outliers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow students at NGSE respect my opinions.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel physically safe at NGSE.</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe sharing my cultural traditions at NGSE.</td>
<td><strong>2.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my race are treated with respect at NGSE.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males are treated with respect at NGSE.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All item responses on the culture survey were below a mean average of M = 3.00. The Spearman’s correlation coefficient was then calculated for both African American (r= -0.3204, p=0.285) and Latino males (r= -0.3425, p=0.332). Results were inconclusive as the sample sizes were small and p-values exceeded .05.
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Figure 1. The correlation of the Fall 2014 RSAs of African American males and their mean Likert scores on the culture survey.

Figure 2. The correlation of the Fall 2014 RSAs of Latino males and their mean Likert scores on the culture survey.
**Figure 3.** The correlation of the Fall 2014 RSAs of African American males and their mean Likert scores on the climate survey.

**Figure 4.** The correlation of the Fall 2014 RSAs of Latino males and their mean Likert scores on the climate survey.
Research question 2. Student perceptions of academic advisement addresses research question 2 - What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?

African American males’ mean Likert scores for the academic advisement scale ranged from 1 to 5.625 with and without the outlier. The mean Likert scores of Latino males ranged from 1 to 5.625 with the outlier included, and 1 to 2 with outlier excluded. The Spearman’s rho correlation coefficient for both African American and Latino males was calculated with the outlier excluded. The correlation coefficient for African American males (r=0.0664, p=0.829) and Latino males (r = 0.0978, p=0.788) demonstrated a weak negative correlation. The data was inconclusive as the p value exceed 0.05. The highest mean scores were reported for the survey items: My academic advisors' office hours are convenient for me; My faculty advisor is understanding of my life circumstances; and The advisement I receive from my faculty advisor is effective. These data indicate room for improvement in the academic advisement of African American and Latino males and were investigated during the focus groups.

Table 6

*Academic Advisement Mean Likert Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Advisement</th>
<th>Mean without Outlier</th>
<th>Mean with Outlier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AAM</td>
<td>LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisor clearly communicates his/her office hours.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisors' office hours are convenient for me.</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework at NGSE.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor is understanding of my life circumstances.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor communicates clearly.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor is knowledgeable about NGSE’s policies.</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advisement I receive from my faculty advisor is effective.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The advisement I receive from my faculty advisor is timely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.93</th>
<th>1.82</th>
<th>1.87</th>
<th>1.85</th>
<th>1.30</th>
<th>1.57</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.* Correlation of African American males Fall 2014 RSAs to their mean Likert scores on the academic advisement survey.

*Figure 6.* Correlation of Latino males Fall 2014 RSAs to their mean Likert scores on the academic advisement survey.
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Table 7

Correlation Coefficients, p-values and significant levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Sample Size N</th>
<th>Var #1</th>
<th>Var #2</th>
<th>Spearman's rho Correlation</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig. Level 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA-males</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-0.3204</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-males</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>-0.2289</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-males</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Cult + Clim</td>
<td>-0.2381</td>
<td>0.43341</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-males</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Advisement</td>
<td>0.0664</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA-males</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>-0.1597</td>
<td>0.6023</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-0.3425</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>-0.3104</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Cult + Clim</td>
<td>-0.3272</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Advisement</td>
<td>0.0978</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA-males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>-0.2805</td>
<td>0.4325</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM &amp; LM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-0.2204</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM &amp; LM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>-0.2224</td>
<td>0.3078</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM &amp; LM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Cult + Clim</td>
<td>-0.2268</td>
<td>0.2981</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM &amp; LM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Advisement</td>
<td>0.0081</td>
<td>0.9709</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAM &amp; LM</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>-0.1966</td>
<td>0.3686</td>
<td>Not Sig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research question 3. A total of 28 faculty members responded to case study one. There were 28 selections of the response ‘none’ and 50 selections of the response ‘all’ to the three questions following case study one. Similarly, responses to case study two revealed 36 ‘none’ responses and 53 ‘all’ responses to the three questions following case study two. There was one selection of the popular African American male name in case study one, one selection of both the popular African American male name and one selection of the popular Latino male name in case study two (see Appendix D). The data gathered indicate that the faculty did not demonstrate bias towards African American or Latino males or athletes, in response to research question 3 - Do faculty members demonstrate bias in their beliefs about African American and Latino males’ ability to achieve at NGSE?
Research question 4. Outcomes of the focus group were used to explain and deepen understanding of the responses to the quantitative data; specifically what aspects of academic advisement were students satisfied, as well as gather data in response to research question 4 - How do non-academic competing interests influence the academic performance of African American and Latino males at NGSE? Of the four attendees of the focus group, all indicated that non-academic competing interests impact the completion of academic tasks at NGSE as indicated by the code balancing grad school/work and first generation grad student. Specifically, all of the students were first generation graduate students and indicated that they were “on their own” to get through school. One attendee indicated that he was the only person in his peer group or family to have attained this level of education, and when he struggled he “had no one to ask for help”. Themes that emerged were that African American and Latino male students viewed requesting assistance negatively and were only comfortable doing so with faculty with whom they had built trusting relationships. Additionally, students were pleased with faculty’s efforts to build relationships, but indicated that efforts should begin earlier in the academic year. Students also indicated that prioritization and time management of tasks were a specific challenge. Two of the attendees maintained RSAs above 2.7 while two had not maintained the minimum RSA of 2.7 by the end of the Fall 2015 term. These assertions by students are similar to the outlier in the Latino male group of respondents selecting strongly disagree, one African American male selecting somewhat disagree, 2 selecting a neutral response indicating some dissatisfaction on the student survey item My advisor is understanding of my life circumstances.
Table 8

**Focus Group Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th>Responses/Response Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you satisfied with your academic progress at NGSE?</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What if any challenges have you experienced that impact your academic progress?</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>FIRST GENERATION GRAD STUDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>BALANCING GRAD SCHOOL/WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is NGSE doing well to help you meet with academic success?</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>PROACTIVE ADVISING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>ENFORCER STYLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could NGSE improve to help you meet with academic success?</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>INCREASE LATINO FACULTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>RELATIONSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which activities should we continue? Do more of?</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>CHAT AND CHEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>PROACTIVE ADVISEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are we not doing that we should consider?</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>AFFINITY GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>MANAGE EXPECTATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the sample size was not large enough to determine a causal link in response to RQ1, *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ RSAs and their perceptions of the culture and climate of NGSE?* and RQ2, *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?*, data gathered demonstrated that African American and Latino males’ perception was that the academic advising received directly impacted their RSAs. Specifically, respondents indicated that when faculty reached out to them immediately after missed assessments or absences, they viewed that as a demonstration of caring and appreciated the effort, indicated by the codes proactive advisement and enforcer style. Respondents offered suggestions for improvement including forming affinity groups where the African American and Latino males could create support networks independent of faculty. Additionally, students wanted faculty to support them in helping managers at the school sites to set realistic expectations of male students’ capabilities as first year teachers, so that they were not asked to assume responsibilities better suited for more experienced teachers based solely on their gender.
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Discussion

Data gathered from the online surveys reveal important themes related to the identified variables campus and climate and academic advisement. The data demonstrates that African American and Latino male students feel respected, valued and safe at NGSE (Clark et al., 2013; Gay, 2004). A closer examination of the data revealed that students’ dissatisfaction scores on the campus and culture survey were highest on the questions *I feel like a valued member of the NGSE community* (AAM – 2.15, LM 2.4) and *I feel safe sharing my cultural traditions at NGSE* (AAM – 2.53, LM – 2.1). Although the scores indicate satisfaction with the culture and climate of the institution students indicated a reticence to share cultural norms as the structure of the curriculum did not afford many opportunities. They recommended creating affinity groups where they could spend time informally with other males of African American and Latino descent. These data suggest that students do not feel uncomfortable in the academic environment but would like more opportunities to express their cultural traditions.

Additionally, the data revealed that the respondents were satisfied with most components of the academic advisement received. However, the survey item *My faculty advisor is understanding of my life circumstances* earned the second lowest mean Likert score of 2.1 (with outlier) and 1.4 (without outlier). This data is congruent with literature which identifies poor academic advisement as a contributing factor to lower academic achievement (Benson, 2000).

Quantitative data was skewed by one person’s high Likert mean score, and correlation analyses were inconclusive. However, mean Likert scores on survey items *The advisement I receive from my faculty advisor is effective*, *My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework* earned mean Likert scores of 2 or less, with two African American selecting neutral scores (4). The quantitative data coupled with qualitative data gathered during focus groups,
suggest that students believe that faculty advisors’ positively impact their RSAs in response to research question *What is the relationship between African American and Latino males’ satisfaction with academic advising and their academic achievement?* Additionally, responses to the academic advisement survey demonstrated the greatest dissatisfaction with the questions *My advisor’s office hours are convenient* and *My advisor is knowledgeable of my life circumstances*; each earning a mean Likert score of $M = 2.3$ and $M = 2.1$ respectively. Further, qualitative data gathered during a focus group support a hypothesis that building trusting relationships with African American and Latino males at NGSE could be the key lever to improving the advisement they receive and improving their perception of the campus and climate.

**Limitations**

There were a number of limitations to this study, including the potential bias of instruments, because the participants may have attempted to please the researcher. In the case of the faculty instrument, the researcher is concerned that faculty overwhelmingly selected socially acceptable responses. Additionally, the faculty survey was limited in scope (student differences were limited solely to names) and may not truly represent the beliefs of faculty members. Results were also potentially biased by the institution wide diversity initiative at NGSE, that keeps racial bias at the forefront of discussions, meetings and training sessions.

Additionally, validity and reliability for Goodenow’s (1993) Psychological Sense of School Membership was limited to students in grades 5 – 8. While the researcher in conjunction with the research team identified face validity for use with graduate students, reliability and validity cannot be generalized to the graduate school population. Finally, the sample sizes available in the study were small, therefore, results are not generalizable.
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Conclusion

While these survey data provided a positive view of the climate and culture at NGSE, and may be reflective of the institution’s diversity initiative, the qualitative data provided some insight into the experiences of African American and Latino male students at NGSE. Specifically, the qualitative data highlighted the contributing factor of non-academic competing interests as a barrier to success for the Latino and African American male students at NGSE. This initial study of the data suggested that NGSE should continue its efforts to increase the diversity practices, and should expand advisement to include consideration of students’ backgrounds, life circumstances, and external responsibilities so that students are appropriately supported as they attempt to balance the demands of full time employment, graduate school and life tasks. Additionally, students identified proactive advisement practices and relationship building as positive faculty practices that impacted their academic experiences. As such, the researcher recommended that the institution adopt culturally responsive academic advisement, thus ensuring that students perceive both the affordances and effectivities in the learning environment (Gee, 2008).

Culturally responsive academic advisement, at the conclusion of the needs assessment, was defined as building warm, welcoming relationships to increase knowledge of individual students’ backgrounds and strengths/needs. Ultimately, leveraging that knowledge to support them in meeting high academic expectations and successfully navigating complex systems at institutions of higher education. The argument for culturally responsive academic advisement was predicated on a definition of culture as the shared knowledge in a group which then shapes and guides the way individuals perceive, interpret and interact with the world around them (Campbell, 2002: Marshall, 2000).
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It was hypothesized that culturally responsive academic advisement would create safe and welcoming spaces for all students, especially those from groups traditionally marginalized and underrepresented at IHEs, without alienating members of the dominant group in the community. The researcher posited that leveraging a culturally responsive academic advisement model, that positioned advisors to respond to students’ individual academic and social needs, could positively impact African American and Latino males’ academic achievement.
Chapter 3: Intervention Literature Review

At the time of the study, NGSE North East was selecting and actively training faculty members to provide effective instruction. NGSE operates from a premise of servant leadership and wants all its students to succeed academically (McClellan, 2007). Although faculty members were all required to serve as faculty advisors to graduate students, little to no training was provided to ensure the efficacy of advisement and the establishment of positive relationships between faculty members and students. Utilizing a constructivist approach to help faculty advisors is at the heart of culturally responsive academic advising, which is a new concept derived from the prior needs assessment. The results of the needs assessment indicated that while African American and Latino male students were satisfied with most aspects of the campus culture, climate and academic advisement offered at NGSE, they did not feel as valued as other members of the community nor safe sharing their cultural traditions (RQ 1, p. 25). Additionally, they felt that faculty members were not knowledgeable of their life circumstances and, therefore, did not consider non-academic competing interests during advisement (RQ 4, p.26). According to research conducted by Pascarella et al. (2004) and Clark et al. (2013), this is a significant deterrent to the persistence rates of African American and Latino students at institutions of higher education. Further, these results were aligned to Gee’s (2008) assertions that the opportunity to learn could be impacted by learners’ perception of the offerings in an educational environment.

Positive relationships with faculty and effective academic advisement have been cited as contributing factors to the retention, persistence and academic achievement of African American and Latino males at institutions of higher education (Hernandez, 2000; Robertson & Mason, 2010). Conversely, faculty members lack of awareness of students’ culture and poor academic
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advisement have been identified as contributing factors to poor academic achievement and lack of persistence at institutions of higher education by both African American and Latino male students (Clark et al. 2013; Benson, 2000; Hernandez, 2002). Improved academic advisement, inclusive of relationship building strategies, referral services and academic monitoring has positively correlated with academic gains and retention for African American and Latino students at institutions of higher education (Kolenovic, Linderman, & Karp, 2013). Thus, culturally responsive academic advising has been operationalized as building warm, welcoming relationships to increase knowledge of individual students’ backgrounds, strengths and needs; in addition to leveraging that knowledge to support them in meeting high academic expectations, and successfully navigating complex systems at institutions of higher education. Given the findings of the needs assessment study, indicating that students at NGSE North East were primarily novice teachers, while transitioning to teaching while managing graduate school, the intervention literature review focused on the factors shown by research, to help improve the academic achievement of African American and Latino males at IHEs. The chief objective being to help design an intervention to improve the academic achievement of African American and Latino males at NGSE North East.

Culturally responsive academic advisement incorporated principles of servant leadership and culturally responsive teaching (Powers & Moore, 2004; Gay, 2000). Gay’s (2000) argument that culturally responsive pedagogy both acknowledges and legitimizes the impact of cultural legacies on students’ ability to learn, creates a bridge between curriculum and students’ sociocultural experiences, and is inclusive of a variety of strategies to meet the needs of learners with a variety of learning styles, underpinned the development of culturally responsive academic advisement.
Building on Gay’s (2000) argument and the self-reports of focus group respondents, the researcher proposed that in order to effectively meet the needs of a diverse student body, advisors must ensure that the academic environment is a safe space in which students from minority groups, within IHEs, are equipped with the tools necessary for success and support that takes into account their unique needs. All the while maintaining high expectations and displaying belief in their ability to succeed. The overarching principle of servant leadership—that to effectively lead, one must have the desire to help others—is essential to successful implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement. The characteristics of servant leadership—listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of others, and building community, were used to define culturally responsive academic advisement practices (Powers & Moore, 2004). The researcher hypothesized that culturally responsive academic advising would result in 85% – 90% of African American and Latino males selecting agree and strongly agree to advisement questions and 85% - 90% of these populations earning a minimum RSA of 2.7. The goals of the intervention, aligned with the key principle of pragmatism and solving real world problems, are designed to increase the academic achievement of African American and Latino males.

**Review of Literature**

**Importance of Faculty-Student Interactions**

Bean and Eaton (2000) proposed that students have a variety of psychological responses to the campus environment which often affect academic achievement. Clark et al. (2013) expanded this proposition to determine the barriers to educational achievement amongst Latino males. The researchers found that several social constructs, including the environment of
institutions, impacted the outcomes of Latino males’ persistence in, and completion of, undergraduate degree programs.

Clark et al. (2013) also found that Latino males were heavily influenced by school personnel’s lack of knowledge about obstacles faced by the aspiring Latino student. Hernandez (2000) further highlighted the importance of school personnel on the persistence and achievement of Latino students. Hernandez’s (2000) qualitative study of recent college graduates revealed that positive relationships with faculty, staff, and other people on campus were contributing factors to the persistence of Latino college students. Participants in Hernandez’s (2000) study identified one-on-one relationships, as well as connections with individual professors, as key factors to their persistence in college. Lundberg and Schreiner (2004) found that high quality student–faculty interactions were the strongest predictor of learning among Mexican, Puerto Rican, and other Hispanic students. In comparison with White students, Hispanics worked harder to meet faculty expectations, which enhanced their learning.

Johnson, Wasserman, Yildirim and Yonai (2014) reported that students’ level of stress was directly impacted by the degree of comfort students experienced during academic interactions. They further proposed that meaningful faculty-student interactions could positively impact the persistence of students of color in higher education. Santos and Reigadas (2002) further confirmed the finding that positive interactions with faculty and staff positively impacts student achievement. These findings were similar to those of Robertson and Mason (2010), who found that one of the contributing factors to the academic success of African American males at a predominantly White university, in the South, was collegial faculty/student relations. Reid (2013) additionally reported that African American male students who reported greater satisfaction with informal faculty interactions demonstrated greater academic achievement.
The Power of Mentoring and Advising

Santos and Reigadas (2002) found that faculty-student relationships that were formalized into mentoring relationships yielded positive results for students at risk of non-completion of their undergraduate degrees. Santos and Reigadas (2002) found that most of the 32 students who participated in a faculty mentoring program at California State University, designed to decrease the dropout rate, reported an increase in their ability to adjust both socially and personally to college due to the emotional support received from the mentors.

The impact of mentors was further punctuated by Noy and Ray’s (2012) study of graduate students’ perceptions of their advisors. The researchers investigated the correlation between the perception of graduate students and the race and gender of the graduate students. The six prevalent characteristics of advisors were identified as affective, instrumental, intellectual, available, respectful, and exploitative. Affective advisors were characterized as providers of emotional support in students’ academic and personal lives, while instrumental advisors acted as guides through the academic process. Intellectual advisors were defined as advisors who limited themselves to providing academic feedback. Advisors were characterized as available based on students’ perceptions of their accessibility and respectful advisors were those who interacted with students as equals as opposed to defaulting to hierarchical roles. Exploitative advisors were viewed as advisors who subjected students to subservience and exploited the power of their positions to place unrealistic amounts of work and demands on graduate students’ time. The researchers found that in general, students of color in the study identified a strong need for instrumental advisors, advisors who provide students with the academic skills to survive in the discipline. Further, African American males described faculty advisors to whom they were assigned as less respectful and less affective. These findings
demonstrate that mentoring can positively impact the progress of African American and Latino males. As such additional research was conducted to identify effective mentoring strategies.

**Effective Mentoring and Advisement**

Kram (1993) identified two categories of mentoring, formal and informal, and identified behaviors that are beneficial to the mentoring relations as both career oriented and psychosocial. Career oriented mentorship addresses the mentee’s professional development and success within an organization or field, while psychosocial mentorship addresses the mentee’s personal development as an individual. Kram (1993) proposed that both career oriented and psychosocial behaviors are critical to the mentoring relationship. Young and Perrewe (2000) proposed that mentoring relationships are influenced by the perceptions of the exchange between the mentor and the individual being mentored (protégé). The researchers found that protégés reported increased satisfaction with the mentoring relationship when the support they received met their expectations, and that protégés placed a higher premium on social support (encouragement and friendly personal discussions) than did mentors. As such the researchers proposed that successful mentoring relationships are predicated on respect and trust and a clear understanding of the expected outcomes of each member of the dyad. Dawson and Watson (2007) codified the best practices in mentoring as occurring in three stages, (a) the hierarchical years, (b) the junior/senior colleague years, and (c) the trusted sage years. The authors propose that best practices for both mentor and protégé exist in each stage. They specifically identified nine best practices, which were largely focused on forming and maintaining a trusting and respectful relationship, marked by clear expectations and boundaries.

Rawlins and Rawlins (2005) posited that effective student advisement is achieved when the advisor cares for students and has a desire to serve them, as these core beliefs and
motivations will drive the advisors’ perceptions of the students and focus the advisement on the development of those students. Shultz, Colton and Colton (2001) leveraged the power of mentoring and the role of the academic advisor to develop an intervention to address the persistence of students of color at Kutztown University. The program, called the Adventor program, combined the technical support germane to academic advisement with the social support often evident in mentoring relationships to create proactive interventions. The advisors in the program held students accountable for attendance at weekly advisory sessions, during which students could focus on academic, social, and emotional issues with a faculty member who encouraged, helped and supported them through the academic process. Faculty members additionally extended academic advisement to include academic monitoring, tracking students down in dorm rooms or classes to ensure compliance, as well as goal setting and monitoring. The relationships that faculty fostered with students created an environment of trust and allowed faculty to intervene quickly and successfully, particularly when students encountered obstacles during the academic year. Self-evaluations of the program yielded satisfactory ratings from 88% of students and 91% of faculty and yielded a higher rate of return than students in the general population.

McClellan (2007) demonstrated, in his characterization of academic advisement as servant leadership, how the practical applications in programs like the Adventor Program at Kutztown University were related to academic advisors’ perception of their roles. McClellan (2007) applied the principles of Powers and Moore’s (2004) classifications of the characteristics of servant leaders to the role of academic advisors. Power and Moore (2004) characterized servant leadership as inclusive of both inner characteristics and commitments, and outer characteristics and practices. Inner characteristics and commitments are defined as evidence of a
deep and abiding will to serve others, coupled with a love for students. Powers and Moore (2004) list the characteristics in this category as building community, commitment to the growth of people, foresight, conceptualization and awareness. The researchers posited that the inner characteristics or commitments are the foundation upon which the outer characteristics and practices are based. The outer characteristics are defined as listening and empathy, healing (defined as holistic personal growth), persuasion, and stewardship.

**Intervention Model**

As a result of the needs assessment and relevant literature (McClellan, 2007; Powers & Moore, 2004; Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2001; Kolnevic, Linderman & Karp, 2013; Gary, Kling & Dodd, 2004), culturally responsive academic advisement was implemented and evaluated with the goal of increasing the academic achievement of African American and Latino male students’ and the perception of academic advisement at the institution (Bowes, 2016; McClellan, 2007; Powers & Moore, 2004). The intervention research questions are below:

1. In what ways does culturally responsive academic advisement support the academic achievement of African American and Latino males?
2. To what extent did culturally responsive academic advisement contribute to African American and Latino males meeting and exceeding academic achievement benchmarks?
3. What is the relationship between faculty members' reported implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement and African American and Latino males’ perception of culturally responsive academic advisement?

Specifically, the planned intervention aimed to improve faculty advisors’ ability to listen with empathy, build relationships with students to determine how to best honor their sociocultural experiences and to improve the institutional environment to meet students’ needs.
CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Additional aims were designed to help students set and meet short and long-term goals, address nonacademic competing interests during advising and become fluent with program requirements (Bowes, 2016; McClellan, 2007; Gay 2000; Powers & Moore, 2004). The researcher hypothesized that equipping advisors with key components of culturally responsive academic advisement would better help African American and Latino male students to meet the academic requirements of the institution (Bowes, 2016; Reid, 2013; Robertson & Mason, 2010).

The proposed intervention was developed to improve the academic advisement provided to Black and Latino male students; however, the practices subsumed under the auspices of culturally responsive academic advisement, were hypothesized to be helpful for all students. Five professional development sessions were designed to improve faculty members’ ability to listen with empathy, increase faculty members’ knowledge of program requirements, increase awareness of generalized communication patterns of African American and Latino males, identify challenges that might impact first-generation college graduates and marginalized members of the campus community, and use foresight and conceptualization in their daily practice to help students successfully navigate challenges. Students participated in two explicit training sessions to improve upon time and stress management skills, as well as encourage self-advocacy (Addus & Khan, 2007; George, Dixon, Stansal, Gelb, & Pheri, 2008).
Conclusion

The literature reviewed revealed the importance of key elements of cultural responsiveness in academic advising, specifically relationship building and trust in the faculty-student relationship, the maintenance of high expectations during advisement and mentorship at institutions of higher education (Rawlins & Rawlins, 2005; Santos & Reigadas, 2002; Noy & Ray, 2012; Johnson et al., 2014; Young & Perrewe, 2000). Additionally, the literature highlighted that relationship building helped faculty expand their practice to identify and ameliorate the silent complicity that fosters ‘oppressive cultural, organizational, and social policies and practices’ that contribute to the lower academic achievement of Latino and African American males (Crethar, Torres Rivera, & Nash, 2008). The literature reviewed aligned to students’ indication on the needs assessment, that advisors could work to understand their unique needs and make them feel more valued. Culturally responsive academic advisement, as defined by me, is building and leveraging warm, welcoming and trusting relationships to positively impact students’ (especially historically marginalized and underserved students) academic experiences and achievement. It was implemented to address the identified needs of African American and Latino males at NGSE. The goal of the implementation was to increase the academic achievement of this population, without alienating the rest of the student population.

While the available literature was limited to undergraduate settings, the findings were valuable to faculty who seek to improve the academic experience for historically marginalized and underrepresented students. This intervention was designed to improve the African American and Latino male students’ perception of academic advisement at NGSE and to improve the academic achievement of African American and Latino male graduate students at the institution.
Chapter 4: Intervention Method

The literature reviewed and the outcomes of the needs assessment (Bowes, 2016) informed the design of the intervention. The intervention was designed to:

1. gather data on African American and Latino males’ perception of culturally responsive academic advisement,

2. determine whether culturally responsive academic advisement supported the academic achievement of African American males, and

3. determine faculty advisors’ fidelity implementing culturally responsive academic advisement.

To that end, the intervention included five faculty professional development sessions, to familiarize faculty with key components of culturally responsive academic advisement and two student training sessions to improve the time management skills of students in support of obtaining the three outcomes specified above. Data was gathered using a sequential explanatory mixed methods design (Creswell, 2009). This research design was selected to allow the researcher to gather quantitative data to determine the perceptions of culturally responsive academic advisement and academic achievement of African American and Latino males fully enrolled at NGSE at the end of the Summer, Fall and Spring terms. Perceptions of culturally responsive academic advisement were gathered using the institutional survey administered once per term. Perceptions of advisement were administered via four questions, using a 6-point Likert scale, to determine which aspects of culturally responsive academic advisement were reported as most influential by African American and Latino males collectively and within each group. Academic achievement data was gathered from the institution’s servers at the end of each term to determine the individual and mean RSAs of African American and Latino males. These data
were used to respond to research question one (\textit{In what ways does culturally responsive academic advisement support African American and Latino males’ academic achievement?}), and two (\textit{To what extent did culturally responsive academic advisement contribute to African American and Latino males’ achieving and exceeding academic benchmarks?}). After the quantitative data was analyzed at the end of each term, the researcher used total population sampling to invite all African American and Latino males enrolled at NGSE North East to participate in focus groups. Responses from the focus group were used to help the researcher understand which aspects of culturally responsive academic advisement students perceived as influential on their academic achievement.

Since pragmatism was the foundational worldview of this research, the sequential explanatory design was well suited because it allowed the researcher to use the research methods that best fit the research goal. Additionally, the methodology valued subjective and objective knowledge (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). This design choice also aligned well with pragmatism, as the purpose of the research was to find an answer to the real-world problem of lower achievement of African American and Latino males (Kalolo, 2015). Further, the sequential explanatory mixed methodology helped the researcher to triangulate the data collection methods, by intentionally comparing and contrasting the quantitative data with the qualitative data, and to construct knowledge through corroboration and for validity purposes (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

The intervention site was NGSE North East. At the time of the study there was a total of 205 students enrolled in one certification preparation and two degree bearing programs. There was a total of 6 full time faculty members, including the researcher, who provided instruction and faculty advisement. There was also a total of 24 enrolled African American and Latino males
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at the start of the study, 15 African American, and 9 Latino males. Two students, 1 Latino and 1 African American, withdrew at the end of the Fall term, and two African American students were dismissed at the end of the Fall term. There were 20 enrolled African American and Latino males at the end of the Spring term, 12 African American, and 8 Latino.

Professional Development Sessions

The five professional development sessions explicitly trained advisors to better serve all students, with an emphasis on African American and Latino males, as they indicated a need for increased attention to their non-academic responsibilities, feeling valued and safe sharing cultural traditions (Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2001; Kolenovic, Linderman & Karp, 2013). Two sessions were provided by a psychologist, two provided by the researcher and one provided by the Director of Operations. The goal of the sessions was to enhance faculty advisors’ communication skills, cultural, competence and knowledge of the state’s certification requirements. These trainings were aligned to the culturally responsive academic advisement tenets of building relationships, demonstrating empathy, increasing cultural awareness, and support. Trainings were designed using Ericsson, Krampe and Tesch-Romer’s (1993) principles of deliberate practice, so that readings were assigned prior to the session, 10% – 15% of time was spent reviewing key points and concepts, 10% - 20% of time was spent with the facilitator modeling application of the key points in the context of the institution, 40% - 50% of the time was spent with participants practicing the strategies, receiving feedback and practicing again, while implementing feedback. The final 10% - 15% of time was spent debriefing the experiences and creating action steps for future implementation.

Staff participated in two training sessions with an external provider in September 2016 and October, 2016. Each of the two-hour sessions explicitly focused on listening with empathy
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and improving listening and communication skills. Sessions were facilitated by a professional psychologist who explicitly taught faculty advisors how to use active and reflective listening to assess and identify students’ needs, employ summarizing, confronting and referral skills, and increase advisors’ awareness of cultural differences in communication (Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2001; Gay, 2000; Powers & Moore, 2004). Specifically, the psychologist shared the rationale and the techniques for building trusting relationships with African American and Latino male, students who identified as middle aged, students whose cultural norms prioritize self-reliance, struggle with prioritizing and completing tasks, and who face demanding life challenges. These factors were identified by African American and Latino male students during the needs assessment. Faculty were allowed multiple opportunities to practice applying the strategies and were provided feedback by the psychologist. Additionally, faculty presented specific challenges they were experiencing with supporting students while the psychologist helped them to identify solutions. Similar trainings were conducted in the previous academic year. Since three of the faculty were returning and three were new these trainings, it served as a refresher for the three returning faculty members and as an introduction to the three new faculty members.

Faculty advisors also participated in two one-hour training sessions with the researcher, to highlight the importance of, and offer strategies for, relationship building with students. These trainings were held in early September and mid-October 2016. As part of existing practice, and the institution’s diversity initiative, a monthly conversation amongst faculty on topics of race, class and culture is held. Topics covered prior to September 2016 were disproportionality of discipline amongst African American and Latino males, financial pressures that could impact students from lower socio-economic backgrounds and the impact of faculty’s implicit bias on students. As such the researcher chose to focus the two trainings included in the intervention on
relationship building, with and support of, African American and Latino males. Faculty members read and discussed Gay (2000), Shultz, Colton & Colton (2004) and Young Perrewe (2000) to identify the importance of relationship building in the advisement of historically marginalized and underrepresented students, and best practices in relationship building, mentorship and culturally responsive practices. The impacts of stereotype threat on college students, the pressures faced by first generation college graduates, the microaggressions faced by African American and Latino males at IHEs and members of the LGBTQ community, and certainly the awareness of the life challenges experienced by adult learners, were highlighted as factors of which faculty should be aware of as a part of the relationship building process. In session two, the researcher then outlined concrete ways that faculty could use to get to know students, especially those from historically marginalized and underrepresented backgrounds. These recommendations were gathered from previous implementations of relationship building that have allowed faculty members to identify students’ strengths and needs in previous years. Faculty were then allowed time to plan a minimum of three relationship building opportunities. Faculty specifically used this time to schedule frequent informal conversations throughout the academic year, chat and chews – meals with small groups of students, and one-on-one check ins during observation visits to students’ classrooms, and one-on-one check ins via video conference. Faculty also read and discussed the impact of proactive advisement in the second session. Based on the readings, faculty were encouraged to initiate contact with students who failed to meet academic or attendance expectations with an offer of support, immediately after the initial occurrence (Kolnevic, Linderman, & Karp, 2013). This planned activity provided explicit action steps to meet the support tenet of culturally responsive academic advisement.
Faculty advisors also participated in one training session on the requirements of the SDOE certification process. At the time of the study approximately 60% of enrolled students used coursework at NGSE to fulfill state certification requirements for acquisition of a teaching license by the State Department of Education (SDOE). According to the SDOE (2015), certification requirements in the state had been recently revised and changes will take effect over a three-year period. Thus, knowledge of certification requirements was critical for faculty advisors to acquire so that they could better support students who sought certification. A one-page summary of the changes that were scheduled to take effect in each of the three years was provided as a resource for use during advisement (Gary, Kling & Dodd, 2004; Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2004).

As a part of the researcher’s existing professional practice, faculty advisors’ implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement was monitored during weekly one-on-one check-ins and supervisory observations. During weekly check-ins, faculty advisors worked with the researcher weekly to identify students of concern (students with RSAs below 2.7), determine the source of the students’ challenges, create feasible action plans to be shared with student, and evaluated the efficacy of those action plans. Although, the research focus was African American and Latino male students, the weekly check-ins focused on all students of concern regardless of race, ethnicity or gender.
Implementing culturally responsive academic advising. As a result of the aforementioned professional development sessions, faculty advisors were required to strengthen relationships with students by participating in monthly informal interactions. Informal interactions included socials and advisory sessions (Shultz, Colton, & Colton, 2001). Interactions that were used to build relationships with students included observation debriefs, socials organized by the teacher advisory council, and intentional mingling with students prior to class sessions. Prior experience, supported by research, indicated that African American and Latino students were more inclined to seek out support from faculty members with whom they had built trusting relationships (Hernandez, 2000; Noy & Ray, 2012; Bowes, 2016). These relationships helped faculty members to get to know students, especially those members of historically marginalized and underrepresented groups. Faculty were tasked with gathering data that could be used to overtly demonstrate respect for and validation of the backgrounds of historically marginalized and underrepresented students, while identifying any non-academic competing
interests for which students were responsible (Gay, 200; Pascarella et al., 2004). Faculty members were also accountable to building awareness of the impacts of potential barriers to success, and work to create appropriate and timely interventions (Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2001; Kolenovic, Linderman & Karp, 2013). One example of cultural barriers to success, that was identified from prior experiences with students, was the general reluctance of African American and Latino males to seek out assistance when challenges arose. Another example of cultural barriers, which manifested, was first generation graduate students’ challenges with management of non-academic competing interests (Bowes, 2016). Actions performed by the academic advisors to intervene included, but were not limited to (a) referring students to community agencies, (b) working with partner organizations to create a support network for students, (c) explicitly teaching students project and time management skills that helped students to manage academic and non-academic tasks, (d) tutoring, (e) advocating for students within the institution or at placement sites, and (f) empowering students to advocate on their own behalf. This was an additive process for advisors and addressed three of the key tenets of culturally responsive academic advising – support, advocacy and empowerment.

Additionally, faculty advisors were asked to identify and incorporate students’ long term and short-term goals into advisement (Young & Perrewe, 2000). This practice, a shift in mindset for faculty advisors, was in keeping with the principles of foresight and conceptualization in servant leadership and is indicative of the empowerment tenet of culturally responsive academic advisement (Powers & Moore, 2004; McClellan, 2007) Advisors administered an initial survey to all students to identify long and short term goals, and they subsequently incorporated achievement of those goals during advisory sessions throughout the year to help students connect their current practices and academic standings with acquisition of their short and long term goals.
One example was a first-generation African American male graduate student, who identified a terminal degree as his long-term goal. This student had not made the connection between strong academic performance and the application process for further studies. Advisement was then delivered through the lens of maintaining strong grades in his current program of study, which would make him competitive in his future graduate school application process, while still managing his other non-academic competing interests.

Faculty advisors reviewed student academic standings in weekly meetings with me to identify students who were struggling, and outlined action steps to help those students to earn RSAs of 2.7. Approved action steps included meetings (in-person or via video conference) with students, development of action plans jointly with the student, enlisting the assistance of managers (instructional leaders or Teach For America personnel) to support students with timely and accurate completion of assessments, and provision of alternatives such as leaves of absence or withdrawal, as was appropriate when non-academic competing interests made enrollment challenging. While this practice was implemented with all students, historical achievement data indicated that African American and Latino males failed to meet the standards of academic achievement at higher rates than students in other demographics. Additionally, historical data also revealed that African American and Latino male students were less likely to proactively seek out support, hence this practice was a key tenet of culturally responsive academic advisement – support with academic and non-academic challenges.

Student training sessions. The curriculum was expanded to include life skills sessions to help students overcome identified barriers to success such as time management, stress and self-advocacy as supported by literature and identified by African American and Latino males during the needs assessment (Addus & Khan, 2007; George et al., 2008). Faculty delivered two life
skills training sessions focusing on time management and life skills. On-going support was provided by individual faculty advisors during office hours. The time management and student advocacy sessions targeted project planning, creating and using unified calendars, using daily task lists and effectively communicating when deadlines were in danger of being missed. Historical faculty anecdotal data indicated that African American and Latino students were generally faced with non-academic challenges that impeded academic achievement. Sessions were open to all students; however, the sessions were recommended for all students (regardless of race or gender), who demonstrated challenges related to time and project management. This training was aligned to the culturally responsive academic advisement tenets of empowerment and support with academic and non-academic challenges. Culturally responsive academic advisement was implemented at the beginning of the academic year. The researcher hypothesized that growth would be incremental throughout the academic year so that by the end of the academic year,
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Ongoing: Academic Year 2016-17
Culturally Responsive Academic Advisement:
- Monthly monitoring of student scores and submissions.
- Contacting and/or meeting with students in danger of failing monthly to help each plan for success.

**September ’16**
- Faculty Training: Increase listening, summarizing and confrontation skills (Pt 1);
- importance of relationship building w/students
- Student Training: increase time management and advocacy skills (Pt 1)
- African American and Latino Male Focus Group
- Faculty Group Interview

**October and November ‘16**
- Faculty Training: improve communication skills;
- increase knowledge of certification process;
- importance of relationship building w/students
- Student Training: increase time management and advocacy skills (Pt 2)
- African American and Latino Male Focus Group
- Faculty Group Interview

Figure 7. The intervention timeline outlining activities scheduled for academic year 2016-17
The intervention used a mixed methods paradigm, specifically a sequential explanatory design, to evaluate the perception and influence of culturally responsive academic advisement. This design was selected as the researcher wanted to get a more complete understanding of the efficacy of culturally responsive academic advisement from the target audience. The sequential explanatory design afforded the researcher the opportunity to both gather quantitative data and gather perspectives on the advisement model directly from the participants. Specifically, the research was designed to determine in what ways, and to what extent, culturally responsive advisement at NGSE North East supported the academic achievement of African American and Latino males.

Implementation of the intervention commenced at the start of the Summer, 2016 term and concluded at the close of the Spring, 2017 term. As such, quantitative data was gathered via online surveys to determine students’ perceptions of advisors’ ability to build relationships with them, support their academic achievement, demonstrate empathy, and consider their non-academic responsibilities at the end of the Summer, Fall, and Spring terms. Data was gathered from all students and disaggregated to determine the progression of African American and Latino males’ perceptions of academic advisement separately, and collectively, with the goal of 85%-90% of each population selecting agree or strongly agree to advisement items. Student achievement data was also gathered for the Summer, Fall and Spring terms, and disaggregated by race and gender to determine the percentage of African American males earned the minimum RSA (2.7) in each term. RSAs and perceptions of academic advisement data were used to respond to research question 1 - To what extent did culturally responsive academic advisement contribute to African American and Latino males’ achieving and exceeding academic
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*benchmarks*. Academic achievement data was gathered from all students at the end of the Summer, Fall and Spring terms and disaggregated to determine the academic achievement of African American and Latino males separately and collectively. Academic achievement was determined by achievement of an RSA of 2.7 or greater. This data, coupled with qualitative data gathered via focus groups, facilitated a response to research question 2 - *In what ways does culturally responsive academic advisement support African American and Latino males’ academic achievement*. Further, professionalism scores are used by the institution to determine students’ level of engagement in their academic studies. The researcher used the professionalism data to triangulate the achievement data and data describing student perceptions of culturally responsive academic advisement, to determine if low student engagement, as determined by professionalism scores, was a mitigating factor to academic achievement. Professionalism data were gathered at the end of the Spring term and used to determine the correlation between students’ professionalism scores and RSAs.

After quantitative data was collected and analyzed, total population sampling was used to gather qualitative data via focus groups at the end of the Summer and Fall terms. This sampling method was selected as the population of African American and Latino males is a small subset of the larger student body, and the researcher wanted to gather data from as many members of this population as possible. Qualitative data gathered from the focus groups allowed the researcher to hear directly from the participants about which aspects they felt were being implemented efficiently, and the converse. These data coupled with the quantitative data gathered allowed the researcher to respond to research question 2 - *In what ways does culturally responsive academic advisement support African American and Latino males’ academic achievement*. The data was also used to identify areas of strength and growths in implementation of culturally responsive
academic advisement. The researcher, in collaboration with faculty, used identified strengths and
growths to create actionable improvements to implementation at the end of the Summer and Fall
terms. This practice was focused on improving students’ achievement in keeping with servant
leadership, and it allowed the researcher to increase knowledge by engaging in the research
process, in keeping with pragmatism and increased students’ opportunity to learn in keeping with
Gee’s (2008) social constructivist theory (Kalolo, 2015; McClellan, 2007).

Qualitative data was also gathered from faculty via group interviews to identify faculty’s
perceptions of their implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement. Faculty group
interviews occurred at the end of the Summer and Fall terms. These data were compared to
student responses during focus groups, to determine if the faculty’s perception of implementation
of the tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement, matched students’ perceptions. In
keeping with pragmatism, these data were then used to create actionable improvements to
faculty’s implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement.

Participants

All full time enrolled students and full-time faculty advisors employed at the NGSE
North East campus, at the time of the study, participated in the study. There was a total of 24
enrolled African American and Latino males and 5 faculty members (not including the
researcher) at the time of the study. Faculty members’ experience ranged from one to nine years.
Four faculty members identified as Black females, one as a White female, and one as a White
male. There was a total of 24 African American and Latino students (15 African American, 9
Latino) across all three programs of study at the beginning of this study – Summer term 2016.
There were 20 remaining students at end of the study: 12 African American and 8 Latino.
Approval was granted by the current administration of NGSE North East to incorporate the
culturally responsive academic advisement trainings and activities into the job descriptions of all faculty advisors at NGSE North East to ensure implementation. Further, a schedule of the professional developments and informal events to increase interactions and build relationships between faculty and students was added to the 2016-17 academic calendar.

**Projected Outcomes**

The intervention was expected to result in African American and Latino male student respondents selecting *agree or strongly agree* on survey items related to student satisfaction with culturally responsive academic advisement received at NGSE North East at a rate of 80 - 85% of end of the Fall term, and 85 - 90% at the end of the Spring term. Additionally, it was expected that at least 85% of African American and Latino males enrolled at NGSE North East would complete the Fall term with a minimum RSA of 2.7, and 90% at the end of the Spring term. These targets aligned to the institutional goal of 90% of students completing their programs of study in good academic standing (earning an RSA of 2.7 or higher) by the end of Spring 2017.
Data Collection

Quantitative data was gathered at the end of the Summer (mid-September), Fall (January) and Spring (June) terms to determine African American and Latino males’ perception of the three tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement (relationship building, support with academic and non-academic responsibilities, and demonstrating empathy) that were aligned with the faculty professional development and needs assessment, their achievement at NGSE North East and their levels of engagement in the academic program, as measured by professionalism scores. Survey responses and RSAs (student achievement) was gathered and analyzed at the end of each academic term in the 2016-17 academic year. Professionalism scores were collected at the end of the Fall and Spring terms as professionalism scores were not mandatory for all programs during the Summer term.

After the quantitative data was collected and analyzed and results recorded at the end of the Summer and Fall terms, qualitative data was gathered from African American and Latino males during focus groups. These data allowed the researcher to hear directly from African American and Latino male students about how culturally responsive academic advisement impacted their academic achievement and how they viewed the efficacy of the advisement. Qualitative data was not gathered at the end of the Spring term.

Qualitative data was also gathered to determine faculty advisors’ fidelity of implementation of the defined culturally responsive advisements tenets – support with academic and non-academic responsibilities, relationship building and demonstrating empathy. Total population sampling was used as the population of faculty advisors (excluding the researcher) was 5. As such, the researcher wanted to capture all perspectives to gain a more complete understanding of the faculty advisors’ perception of implementation of the advisement model.
Student Perception of Advisement

An institutional survey is administered to each student at the end of each academic term at all NGSE campuses. The researcher was granted approval to add four items to assess students’ perception of advisement practices to the survey administered to students at the NGSE North East campus for academic year 2016-17. Survey items were measured on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). Data was gathered from the surveys administered at the end of the Summer 2016, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 terms. Survey items assessed the culturally responsive academic advisement tenets support with academic and non-academic responsibilities, demonstrate empathy and build relationships. Items to which students responded were:

1. My faculty advisor considers my non-academic responsibilities during advisement.
2. My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me.
3. My faculty advisor demonstrates empathy when I experience a challenge.
4. My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework.

The researcher invited all African American and Latino males enrolled at NGSE North East to attend focus groups at the end of the Summer, 2016 and Fall, 2016 terms. Invitations were sent via email to all enrolled students who identified as African American or Latino males. The total number of enrolled students varied from 20 – 24 throughout the academic year. The principal investigator facilitated each focus group. Focus groups were conducted in-person and via the video conference application Zoom. All focus groups were recorded via video. In keeping with the research design, items one and four were designed to help the researcher understand which tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement, specifically what participants perceived as
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effective and how their perceptions of the deficits with advisement aligned to the advisement model.

Focus group questions were:

1. What was effective about the academic advisement you received at NGSE North East this year?
2. What specific actions did your academic advisor take that helped you to be successful at NGSE this year?
3. What impact did the academic advisement you received have on your academic progress?
4. What could your NGSE North East academic advisor have done to improve your experience at NGSE?

Student Achievement

Academic achievement data as measured by students’ RSAs was retrieved from the NGSE servers at the end of the Summer, Fall and Spring academic terms and disaggregated by race and gender. After the data was analyzed and recorded, qualitative data was gathered using items two and three of the focus group questions to determine to which, if any, culturally responsive academic advisement tenets students saw as contributing to their academic success. Professionalism scores were gathered at the end of the Fall and Spring terms to triangulate academic achievement data with student engagement.

Faculty Perception of Fidelity of Implementation

The researcher facilitated group interviews including 5 faculty members (excluding the researcher) who implemented the intervention at NGSE North East. Group interviews occurred during faculty meetings at the end of the Summer 2016 and Fall 2016 terms and lasted approximately 45 minutes. The data gathered was used to determine faculty’s fidelity of
implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement. The researcher took notes in a shared Google document as faculty responded to the questions below, allowing for respondent verification. Faculty were able to review the researcher’s notes and add clarification or correct misconceptions. Member checking helps to ensure qualitative validity as participants are offered the opportunity to verify their responses and/or make corrections, if warranted (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006).

Group interview questions were:

1. Which of the intervention activities do you feel you implemented with the most integrity? Why?
2. Which of the intervention activities do you feel you implemented with the least integrity? Why?
3. Which of the activities do you feel were most beneficial to the African American and Latino males on your roster? Explain.
4. What could the researcher have done to improve your implementation of the activities?

Data Analysis.

Quantitative and qualitative data were collected for both the Summer and Fall terms. Quantitative data was solely collected at the end of the Spring term. Data analysis was conducted sequentially at the end of the Summer and Fall academic terms, meaning quantitative data was collected, analyzed and reported using descriptive statistics. After the quantitative analysis was completed, qualitative data was analyzed using classical content analysis, in keeping with the constructivist theoretical perspective of the study (Kohlbacher, 2006).

Quantitative data was analyzed by assigning each rating on the institutional survey a number. On the 6-point Likert scale strongly disagree was assigned (1) and each subsequent
rating was assigned the successive number, with *strongly agree* being assigned (6). Descriptive statistics were used to determine the mean and standard deviation of responses. The mean score for each rating item and each respondents’ ratings were calculated using Excel. Results were grouped into the categories African American males and Latino males. The percentage of participants in each category who selected agree or strongly agree was also calculated using Excel. The correlation of student achievement as measured by RSAs, and student engagement as measured by professionalism scores, were determined using Excel.

Qualitative data from the focus groups was analyzed using a priori codes, related to the tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement (Gay, 2000; Powers & Moore, 2004; Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2004), and emergent codes using exact language from participants’ responses. The researcher conducted two focus groups at the end of the Summer term and two focus groups at the end of the Fall term. The researcher used responses collected from different students during different focus groups and from different respondents to triangulate the data collected (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2006). The recordings were then analyzed, first by looking for and recording words related to a priori codes that were repeated throughout the focus groups, then for synonyms of words related to a priori codes that were repeated. A priori codes were related to the tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement, as supported by the research questions and literature. Next the researcher recorded phrases and words that were repeated but were not related to a priori codes. The researched then recoded synonyms of the words and phrases repeated throughout the focus groups. Finally, the researcher reviewed the codes to ensure that responses were not represented by more than one code and made revisions as was necessary (Kohlbacher, 2006; Stemler, 2001). Codes were then examined to see how they related to each other and could be combined to create themes. Themes were then examined to determine
relevance to the research questions. A final check was completed to ensure that codes were
appropriately assigned to categories, and to identify any categories that should be merged or
split. After verifying and revising themes, themes were analyzed for differences and similarities
in order to construct both a descriptive and explanatory framework regarding students’
perception of culturally responsive academic advisement and its role in their academic success
(sample included in Appendix M).

Classical content analysis was also conducted with data gathered from faculty interviews.
Data was then examined to identify common themes in the student and faculty data as well as
themes unique to each group of respondents. The comparison of these data was used to
determine if similarities existed between students’ perceptions of culturally responsive academic
advisement and faculty implementation of the advisement model.
### Table 10

**Summary Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Data Collection Tool</th>
<th>Short Term (October 2016)</th>
<th>Intermediate (January 2017)</th>
<th>Long Term (June 2017)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Perception of Advisement and Achievement</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative Data: Survey using 6-point Likert scale administered at the end of Summer, Fall and Spring terms Qualitative Data: Focus groups administered at the end of Summer and Fall terms.</td>
<td>75% of African American and Latino male students who complete the survey will select agree or strongly agree on survey items academic advisement.</td>
<td>80% of African American and Latino male students who complete the survey will select agree or strongly agree on survey items academic advisement.</td>
<td>85% of African American and Latino male students who complete the survey will select agree or strongly agree on survey items academic advisement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Achievement</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative Data: NGSE student achievement data gathered at the end of Summer, Fall and Spring terms Qualitative Data: Focus groups administered at the end of Summer and Fall terms.</td>
<td>80% of African American and Latino males will complete the Summer term with a minimum RSA of 2.7.</td>
<td>85% of African American and Latino males enrolled at NGSE North East will complete Fall 2016 with a minimum RSA of 2.7.</td>
<td>85% - 90% of African American and Latino male students will complete all programs of study at NGSE with a minimum RSA of 2.7 at the end of AY 2016-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ 3: What is the relationship between faculty members' reported implementation of culturally responsive advisement and African American and Latino males' perception of culturally responsive academic advisement?</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative data gathered at the end of the Summer and Fall terms. Students - focus group Faculty - group interviews.</td>
<td>75% of faculty members at NGSE North East will report: increased use of empathic listening, summarizing, confronting and active listening during advisement, increased awareness of students non-academic competing interests,</td>
<td>80% of faculty members at NGSE North East will report: increased use of empathic listening, summarizing, confronting and active listening during advisement, increased awareness of students non-academic competing interests,</td>
<td>85% - 90% of faculty members at NGSE North East will report: increased use of empathic listening, summarizing, confronting and active listening during advisement, increased awareness of students non-academic competing interests,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>increased knowledge of certification requirements</th>
<th>increased knowledge of certification requirements</th>
<th>increased knowledge of certification requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>increased efforts to build trusting relationships with students</td>
<td>increased efforts to build trusting relationships with students</td>
<td>increased efforts to build trusting relationships with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The goal of the intervention was to increase the number of African American and Latino males who met academic benchmarks, thereby decreasing the number of African American and Latino males who faced academic dismissal or were placed on probation, by implementing a culturally responsive academic advisement model. The intervention was designed in response to historical data which revealed that African American and Latino males were achieving at lower rates than their white and female counterparts. Additionally, the response was to needs assessment data in which African American and Latino males identified faculty support, which they perceived as successful. African American and Latino male students were historically and disproportionately placed on academic probation at the institution, which put them at risk of dismissal. At the time of the intervention, dismissal from any program of study at NGSE often resulted in job loss and/or loss of eligibility for teaching certification in the state, consequently, likely impeding the earning potential of this population of students. Also, needs assessment data suggested a relationship between African American and Latino male students’ time management skills and academic achievement at the institution (Cemaloglu & Filiz, 2010). Historical data, supported by research, indicated that first generation African American and Latino students managed more non-academic competing interests than students in other demographics (Pascarella et al., 2004). As such, culturally responsive academic advisement was implemented to provide African American and Latino males at NGSE North East support to overcome the identified barriers to achievement of the required RSA of 2.7. The researcher hypothesizes that implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement could increase completion rates amongst African American and Latino males at institutions of higher education.
Contextual Issues at the Intervention Site

The campus at which the study was undertaken underwent significant changes in the 2016-17 academic year that impacted implementation of the intervention. First, the structure of the in-person sessions was changed from two classes per month, to weekly classes for a six-week period, followed by a two-week break, and that followed by weekly classes for another six weeks. Secondly, the assessment structure changed from singular assessments, to approximately monthly, to a cumulative mid-term and finally, again an approximation, four stand-alone assessments. Thirdly, three new faculty members were added to the team. Subsequently, a new program of study was made available to students. The changes required adjustments that proved to be time consuming. For example, on-boarding new staff, while adjusting to the new structure of in-person sessions and assessment. This proved to be time consuming for both new and veteran faculty. As such, research question 3 was used to identify the fidelity with which faculty advisors’ self-reported their own fidelity in implementing culturally responsive academic advisement practices (Dusenbury et al., 2003).

Process of Implementation

Student perception of academic advisement. Professional developments with all five faculty members (excluding researcher) were implemented in September, October and November, 2016. Professional developments with students were implemented in September and October, 2016. Faculty advisors were allotted time during the Summer sessions in June and July to meet with students in small groups. Faculty advisors met with researcher weekly as part of regular practice to review student progress, discuss their implementation of the model, and identify solutions to challenges and shifts in practice that were necessary. African American and
Latino males’ satisfaction with student advisement was gathered using the institutional survey. Four items were added to the institutional survey to determine students’ perception of culturally responsive academic advising. Further, qualitative data was gathered from African American and Latino male students during focus groups to determine which aspects of culturally responsive academic advisement students agreed were effective. This data was used to respond to research question 1 - *To what extent did culturally responsive academic advisement contribute to African American and Latino males’ achieving and exceeding academic benchmarks?*

**Student achievement data.** Faculty advisors monitored student academic performance weekly with researcher. Areas of identification and review included students of concern, implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement, in addition to areas of strength. Areas of growth were also identified as was concrete action steps that would lead to student success. Data was gathered regularly from the NGSE servers to determine the percentage of African American and Latino male students who were meeting the 2.7 RSA requirement throughout the Summer 2016, Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 terms. At the end of the term, quantitative and qualitative data was gathered to determine students’ perception of the relationship between culturally responsive academic advisement and their academic success. This data was used to respond to research question 2 - *In what ways does culturally responsive academic advisement support African American and Latino males’ academic achievement?*

**Correlation of student engagement and student achievement.** The correlation between African American and Latino males’ engagement and their achievement at NGSE North East was determined using RSA data and professionalism scores. Professionalism scores at NGSE were determined by gathering data on students’ attendance, punctuality, preparedness for sessions, participation during sessions and timely submissions of assignments. This data was
gathered at the end of the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 terms. This data was used to further investigate student achievement to determine if, and to what extent, student engagement impacted student achievement at the institution.

**Faculty perception of implementation.** Qualitative data was gathered from faculty advisors in the form of group interviews at the end of the Summer and Fall terms and compared to student responses from focus groups. The data was used to determine faculty advisors’ fidelity of implementation of the defined culturally responsive advisement practices, relationship building, empathy, and support with academic and non-academic responsibilities. The data gathered was used to respond to research question 3 - *What, if any, similarities exist between faculty members’ reported implementation of culturally responsive advisement and African American and Latino males’ perception of culturally responsive academic advisement?*

**Research Question 1**

To what extent did culturally responsive academic advisement contribute to African American and Latino males’ achieving and exceeding academic benchmarks?

**Student perceptions of academic advisement.** A total of 11 African American males and 7 Latino males responded to the advisement questions at the end of the Summer term; at the end of the Fall term there were 8 African American and 8 Latino male respondents, and 10 African American males and 7 Latino males at the end of the Spring term. Data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel software to determine the percentage of African American males and the percentage of Latino males who selected agree or strongly agree on the advisement items on the institutional survey. The mean percentage of African American and Latino males who selected agree or strongly agree was then calculated. Data was disaggregated to determine mean scores
and standard deviations for each of the four items for African American and Latino male students’ (Kohlbacher, 2006).

**Summer 2016 survey results.** These data were gathered at the beginning of October as the summer term ends mid-September. African American males demonstrated a 100% selection of agree and strongly agree and Latino male students demonstrated a 63% selection of agree or strongly agree on advisement related institutional survey items. As such, African American males exceeded the benchmark of 75%, while Latino males did not meet the benchmark. Mean Likert scores gathered from individual Latino males, on the advisement questions, ranged from 1 to 6. Mean Likert scores gathered for African American males ranged from 4 to 6. Responses to survey item *My faculty advisor demonstrates empathy when I experience a challenge* indicated the greatest satisfaction, demonstrated by a mean Likert score of 5.5. Conversely, responses to survey item *My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me* resulted in a mean Likert score of 5.0, indicating less satisfaction. When the outlier was removed from the data set, the mean Likert score increased to 5.2. As seen in the mean for each survey item did not fall below a 3.0, revealing African American and Latino male respondents’ satisfaction with culturally responsive academic advisement in Summer 2016.

**Fall 2016 survey results.** These data were collected at the beginning of February as the Fall term ends in January. A total of 7 African American males and 6 Latino males responded to the advisement items on the Fall institutional survey. Similar to the Summer responses, 100% of African American males selected agree or strongly agree in response to advisement items. However, Latino males selection of agree or strongly agree increased to 86%, resulting in both demographics exceeding the benchmark of 80% of African American and Latino males selecting agree or strongly agree to these survey items. Mean Likert scores gathered for African American
males ranged from 5.25 to 6, while Latino male respondents mean Likert scores ranged from 4 to 6. Response to survey item *My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework* earned the highest mean score (5.7) for both African American and Latino males. Similar to responses on the first survey administered at the end of the summer term, the item *My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me*, earned the lowest mean Likert score (5.2) on the second institutional survey administered at the end of the Fall term. Mean scores for all items increased overall for every item amongst Latino males, and in three items for African American males. Growth ranged from 0.1 to 0.4, with the greatest gains demonstrated amongst Latino males.

*Spring 2016 survey results.* A total of 10 African American males and 7 Latino males responded to the advisement items on the Spring institutional survey. All African American males selected agree or strongly agree in response to items *My faculty advisor demonstrates empathy when I experience a challenge* and *My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework*. African American males selected agree or strongly agree at a rate of 90% on item *My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me*, and 80% on item *My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me*. Resulting in an average of 90% of African American males selecting agree or strongly agree on all items, therefore, exceeding the benchmark of 85%.

Conversely, Latino males’ selection of agree or strongly agree increased to 100%, exceeding the benchmark of 85%. Mean Likert scores gathered for African American males ranged from 5.4 to 5.7, while Latino male respondents’ mean Likert scores ranged from 5.8 to 6. Response to survey item *My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework* earned the highest mean score for African American males (5.7) and *My faculty advisor makes
an effort to get to know me earned the highest mean score for Latino males (6.0). Mean scores for all items decreased overall, for every item amongst African American males. Decreases ranged from 0.1 to 0.4, with the greatest decreases demonstrated on survey item My faculty advisor considers my non-academic responsibilities during advisement (see Table 11). Conversely, mean scores increased across all four items for Latino males. Growth ranged from 0.4 – 1.3, with the greatest increases realized item My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me (see table 12). Although mean scores decreased for African American males, raw scores indicated that African American males exclusively selected somewhat agree, agree and strongly agree to all survey items. Similarly, responses by Latino males indicated the exclusive selection of agree and strongly agree on all survey items. These data indicate satisfaction with culturally responsive academic advisement by members of both groups, and met the benchmarks for the perception of culturally responsive academic advisement set at the commencement of the study.

Table 11

African American Males Academic Advisement Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer SA/A</th>
<th>Fall SA/A</th>
<th>Winter SA/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor considers my non-academic responsibilities during advisement.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor demonstrates empathy when I experience a challenge.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me.</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer SA/A</th>
<th>Fall SA/A</th>
<th>Winter SA/A</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor considers my non-academic responsibilities during advisement.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor demonstrates empathy when I experience a challenge.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic achievement of African American and Latino males. RSA data was gathered for the African American and Latino males enrolled at NGSE at the conclusion of the Summer, Fall and Spring terms. Formulas in Microsoft Excel were used to determine mean RSA scores, the range of scores, and the percentage of students who earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 for African American and Latino males for each term.

Summer 2016 achievement data. There were 14 African American and 9 Latino males enrolled at NGSE North East at the end of the Summer 2016 term. Mean RSA scores gathered for African American males for Summer 2016 was 2.8 and 2.7 for Latino males. Thus, 86% of African American males earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 at the end of the Summer 2016, and 89% of Latino males earned a minimum RSA of 2.7. As such each demographic exceeded the benchmark of 80% of African American and Latino males, ending the Summer term with a minimum RSA of 2.7.

Fall 2016 achievement data. At the end of the Fall 2016 term, 15 African American and 9 Latino males were enrolled at NGSE North East. Mean RSA scores gathered for African American males for Fall 2016 was 2.5 and 2.8 for Latino males. African Americans earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 at a rate of 47% in Fall 2016, and 89% of Latino males earned a minimum
RSA of 2.7. This outcome indicates that Latino males exceeded the benchmark of 85%, while African American males did not meet the benchmark. It is further noted that faculty members used anecdotal notes to cite non-academic competing interests, as a significant factor on the academic achievement of six of the nine students who did not earn the minimum RSA of 2.7. Additionally, using low engagement as determined by professionalism scores, as a negative factor on the academic achievement of three of the nine students who did not earn the minimum RSA of 2.7. Two of the nine students were dismissed and two withdrew from the institution.

**Spring 2017 achievement data.** At the close of the Spring 2017 term, there were 12 African American and 8 Latino males enrolled at NGSE North East. Mean RSA scores gathered for African American males for Spring 2017 was 2.9 and 3.2 for Latino males. African Americans earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 at a rate of 92%, and Latino males earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 at a rate of 88%. Similar to the Fall 2016 term, the two students (1 African American and 1 Latino male) that failed to earn the minimum RSA of 2.7 struggled to manage non-academic competing interests. One of the two students were a student who had been placed on probation at the end of the Fall term and was dismissed at the end of the Spring term. The other was on probation at the end of the Spring term. As such African American males met and/or exceeded the benchmark set at 85% - 90%, while Latino males simply met the benchmark.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean RSA</td>
<td>% Earning</td>
<td>Mean RSA</td>
<td>% Earning</td>
<td>Mean RSA</td>
<td>% Earning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino males</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to focus group questions. Focus groups were convened in January and April and conducted both in-person and via video conference. All focus groups were recorded using Zoom software. The researcher reviewed the recordings first to identify broad themes and categories in the data and recorded those notes. This was followed by a review of the recordings to be sure that all broad themes were recorded. The researcher then created a table in which the broad categories were listed. with another review of the recordings to identify the number of times themes and categories were mentioned. The final review was to determine if the theme was consistent with the number of participants, and the relationships between categories and themes. The researcher used a priori codes, specifically, relationship building, considers non-academic competing interests, demonstrates empathy and proactive advisement. Emergent codes used were cares about me/invested in my success, considers my goals, decreased anxiety/stress, pushed to mastery, decrease faculty caseloads, increase Latino faculty, increase male staff, consider needs of first generation graduate students, scheduling affinity groups, manage expectations (school context), case conceptualization and schedule chat and chews earlier (Saldana, 2013).

There were six participants in January and six participants in April. Five participants in January earned an RSA of 2.7 and six participants in April had earned an RSA of 2.7. The most dominant categories reported by students were relationship building and demonstrates empathy, cares about me/invested in my success, and pushed to mastery. Students overwhelmingly remarked that the warmth and positivity of faculty advisors and the fact that advisors made the effort to get to know them made them feel welcome and cared about at the institution (Bowes, 2016; Clark et al, 2013; Robertson and Mason, 2010). The second most dominant category was pushed to mastery, which was related to cares about me invested/in my success. Participants
indicated that when they were unsuccessful on an assignment, faculty advisors were accessible and willing to work with them to ensure that they both understood and completed the assessment so that they were able to meet expectations. Participants indicated that this level of investment in their success pushed them to mastery (Shultz, Colton & Colton, 2001; Rawlins & Rawlins, 2005). All participants reported feeling welcomed and supported in the institution’s environment and felt that advisors had worked to build relationships with each of them and were invested in their success (Bowes, 2016).

Several themes emerged from the qualitative data to support culturally responsive academic advisement. First, demonstrations of empathy and relationship building supported students towards academic success, and resulted in students feeling valued at the institution (Bowes, 2016). One student remarked that when he was ill and could not attend class, his faculty advisor encouraged him to focus on his health first. He stated ‘she checked on me more than some members of my family did. Secondly, students felt supported when faculty members proactively supported them during both academic and non-academic challenges and provided guidance towards the achievement of long and short-term goals and considering non-academic competing interests (Pascarella et al., 2004). A student remarked that when he suffered with a concussion his faculty advisor was caring and supportive and structured his due dates, so that they were manageable for him while he recovered. Finally, students were empowered to succeed at the institution when faculty advisors held them accountable to high expectations and supported them via resubmissions and preemptive guidance on assessments. Another student remarked that his advisor worked with him prior to the assignment to understand the rubric, so that he could aim for the best possible score which would help him achieve a strong GPA and position him for admission to doctoral programs. Themes that emerged that suggest improvement for
implementation of the model were diversity in staffing, to increase male and Latino faculty members. One student remarked that, “All the staff are women, it would be nice to have a male role model that I could see doing this work.” Diversity in approaches to advocacy, to include helping schools to base expectations of students on experience and ability, as opposed to gender and race, was also a critical theme that emerged. Finally, the recommendation to begin relationship building earlier and more often throughout the academic year, to facilitate increased support with non-academic competing interests was made.

Table 14

Focus Group Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Items</th>
<th>January Responses</th>
<th></th>
<th>April Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response Codes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Response Codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was effective about the academic advisement you received at NGSE North East this year? What specific actions did your academic advisor take that helped you to be successful at NGSE this year?</td>
<td>6 Demonstrates Empathy/Relationship Building</td>
<td>4 Demonstrates Empathy/Relationship Building</td>
<td>6 Cares About Me/Invested In My Success</td>
<td>6 Cares About Me/Invested In My Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Considers My Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Consider Non-Academic Competing Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Proactive Advisement (Accessibility, Navigating Coursework Framing Feedback Positively)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Proactive Advising – (Accessibility, Navigating Coursework, Flexibility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What impact did the academic advisement you received have on your academic progress?</td>
<td>3 Decreased Anxiety/Stress</td>
<td>2 Decreased Anxiety/Stress</td>
<td>5 Pushed to Mastery (Guidance/Resubmissions)</td>
<td>4 Pushed to Mastery (Guidance/Resubmissions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Decrease faculty case loads</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase male staff members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Increase African American and Latino male faculty.</td>
<td>2 Increase African American Latino male faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Scheduling of Affinity Groups</td>
<td>2 Scheduling of Affinity Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Manage expectations (school context)</td>
<td>1 Schedule Chat and Chews Earlier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The data gathered seems to support a conclusion that relationship building, demonstrating empathy and supporting students with academic and non-academic responsibilities, support African American and Latino males’ achievement at NGSE. Further, students’ qualitative reports that faculty advisors’ high expectations coupled with support to meet those expectations seem to support a conclusion that culturally responsive academic advisement supported students’ academic achievement. Finally, historical data demonstrates that this is the highest rate of African American and Latino male students completing the academic year, with a minimum RSA of 2.7.

Research Question 2

In what ways does culturally responsive academic advisement support African American and Latino males’ academic achievement?

Student responses to survey item, *My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework*, is suggestive of students’ positive perception of cultural responsive academic advisement’s impact on their academic achievement. African American males consistently selected strongly agree and agree to survey item, *My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework* with a resulting in a mean of 5.8, over the academic year (see Figure 7). Although the mean Likert score for this survey item was lower (4.9) for Latino males in the Summer term, selection of strongly agree or agree increased steadily throughout the academic year, increasing by 0.9 points by the end of the Spring term (see Figure 8). Responses to focus
group items, What specific actions did your academic advisor take that helped you to be successful at NGSE this year? and What impact did the academic advisement you received have on your academic progress? indicate positive perceptions of the impact of culturally responsive academic advisement on student achievement. Themes related supporting culturally responsive academic advisement, that emerged from the qualitative data, suggest that students associate the following tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement with their academic achievement - relationship building, support with academic and non-academic responsibilities, demonstrating empathy, high expectations and empowerment. Although causation cannot be established, these data seem to indicate the tenets specifically supporting student achievement.

![Figure 8: Mean Likert scores of African American male perception of academic advisement by survey item, by term.](image-url)
Research Question 3
Faculty members participated in two group interviews, conducted in January and April respectively. The researcher did not record group interviews but recorded broad themes with faculty on chart paper and in Google docs so that faculty could confirm the researcher’s notes. The researcher then used a priori codes, specifically, relationship building, non-academic competing interests, listening with empathy, goal setting and proactive advisement. Emergent codes, taken directly from respondents’ answers to questions, were increased training, balance caseload, balance workload, and consider learning curve (Kolache, 2006).
Faculty members reported implementing all aspects of the intervention, thus self-reporting strict adherence to the planned intervention. The researcher was also able to use the existing practice of weekly check ins with faculty members to informally measure adherence. Faculty also self-reported their efficacy of implementation. Self-reports were varied, so that faculty reported the greatest efficacy with listening and with empathy; and the least efficacy with awareness of non-academic competing interests. Faculty members cited formal training by a psychologist for their self-reported efficacy with listening, with empathy and cited structured relationship building activities, like chat and chews, for efficacy with relationship building. Conversely, participants cited acclimation to the role of faculty advisor and limited available time as reasons for their lower self-reporting of awareness of non-academic competing interests and proactive advisement. Faculty self-reporting of lower efficacy with non-academic competing interests were aligned to students’ lower sores on survey item *My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me.* Faculty stated that the relationships they had built did not become strong early enough in the term, therefore, they were not aware of the non-academic competing interests that students who were not successful were attempting to balance. Some examples include faculty finding out in February that two students who struggled academically were driving Uber to supplement income, one was pledging a fraternity, one was focused on buying and moving into a new home, and another was writing Individualized Educational Plans, which was a new skill for him. Faculty suggestions for improvement of implementation include improved scheduling of relationship building activities, so that they happen more frequently and earlier in the Fall academic term, fewer simultaneous curricular and structural changes, and increased trainings in goal setting with students. Faculty self-reporting of lower fidelity of implementation, as it related
to non-academic competing interests, is suggestive of a relationship to African American males’ lower achievement scores in the Fall 2016 term.

Table 15

*Group Interview Responses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>n=5</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>n=5</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which intervention activities did you implement with the most integrity?</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Listening w/Empathy</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Listening w/Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which intervention activities did you implement with the least integrity?</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Proactive Advisement</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Non-Academic Competing Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>Proactive Advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which activities do you feel were most beneficial to the African American and Latino males on your roster?</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Listening w/Empathy</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Listening w/Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Proactive Advisement</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Non-Academic Competing Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Proactive Advisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What could the researcher have done to improve your implementation of the activities?</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>increased training</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>increased training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>balance caseload</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>balance caseload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>balance workload</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>balance workload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>consider learning curve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fidelity of implementation also assessed participant engagement in culturally responsive academic advisement (Dusenbury et al., 2003). Existing data, professionalism scores, which measure participants’ level of engagement in activities that would lead to academic success was gathered from the NGSE servers. Participant engagement is defined as meeting the expectations of professionalism as outlined below. Faculty advisors score students in five categories each term on a rubric scale from 0 - 4, to arrive at an overall score. 0 is defined as lacking, 1 is defined as attempting, 2 as foundational, 3 as proficient, and 4 as exemplary.

The professionalism categories are:

1. Attendance – score assigned based on attendance at in-person sessions;
2. Timeliness – score assigned based on punctuality at in-person sessions;
3. Preparation – score assigned based on completion of all online work assigned prior an in-person session;
4. Follow-through – score assigned based on timely submission of assessments and responses to communications with faculty; and

5. Engagement – score assigned based on participation during in-person sessions.

Professionalism data gathered and analyzed using Spearman’s correlation revealed a positive correlation between engagement and academic achievement. This data suggests that low engagement in the academic advisement activities correlate with lower RSAs, (r =0.7209, p = 0.0179). Since the institution’s resubmission policies at the time of the study allowed students to resubmit assessments without penalty and did not penalize students for late submissions or excessive absences, it was important to determine the relationship between student engagement and student achievement to triangulate the data gathered on student perceptions of culturally responsive academic advisement and student achievement.

![Figure 10](image-url)  
*Figure 10. Correlation of Fall 2016 professionalism scores and the Fall 2016 end of term RSAs earned by African American and Latino males. Fall Data was selected as enrollment was at the maximum (n=24)*

99
**RESULTS**

### Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Short Term Outcome</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcome</th>
<th>Long term Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Perception of Advisement and Achievement RQ 1: <em>To what extent did culturally responsive academic advisement contribute to African American and Latino males’ achieving and exceeding academic benchmarks?</em></td>
<td>87.5% of African American and Latino males earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 at the end of the Summer 2016 term.</td>
<td>68% of African American and Latino males earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 at the end of the Fall 2016 term.</td>
<td>90% of African American and Latino males earned a minimum RSA of 2.7 at the end of the Spring 2017 term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement RQ 2: <em>In what ways does culturally responsive academic advisement support African American and Latino males’ academic achievement?</em></td>
<td>100% of African American males and 88% of Latino males selected agree or strongly agree in response survey item <em>My advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework.</em> 6/6 focus group respondents indicated satisfaction with cultural responsive academic advisement.</td>
<td>100% of African American males and 86% of Latino males selected agree or strongly agree in response survey item <em>My advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework.</em> 6/6 focus group respondents indicated satisfaction with cultural responsive academic advisement.</td>
<td>90% of African American males and 100% of Latino males selected agree or strongly agree in response survey item <em>My advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ 3: <em>What if, any similarities existed between faculty members’ reported implementation of culturally responsive advisement and African American and Latino males’ perception of culturally responsive academic advisement?</em></td>
<td>100% of faculty members at NGSE North East reported:</td>
<td>100% of faculty members at NGSE North East reported:</td>
<td>80% of faculty reported increased awareness of students non-academic competing interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• increased use of empathic listening, summarizing, confronting and active listening during advisement;</td>
<td>• increased use of empathic listening, summarizing, confronting and active listening during advisement;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• increased knowledge of certification requirements;</td>
<td>• increased knowledge of certification requirements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• increased efforts to build trusting relationships with students</td>
<td>• increased efforts to build trusting relationships with students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20% of faculty reported increased awareness of students non-academic competing interests.</td>
<td>80% of faculty reported increased awareness of students non-academic competing interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results Conclusion

The researcher hypothesized that implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement would increase African American and Latino male students’ perception of culturally responsive academic advisement and positively impact their academic achievement. Increases were realized on all advisement items by Latino males, throughout the academic year, and Latino males consistently met the achievement benchmark, set at a rate of 88 – 89%. African American males’ Likert scores, on all academic advisement, ranged from 5.4 – 6 throughout the academic year, indicating a positive perception of culturally responsive academic advisement. While African American males exceeded the achievement benchmarks set in the Summer and Spring terms, achievement rates fell below the benchmark of 85% to 47% in the Fall term. Despite, the poor performance in the Fall term, 92% of African American males were able to meet the benchmark at the end of the Spring term. Thus, the quantitative data gathered seems to support the hypothesis that implementation of culturally responsive academic advising would support African American and Latino males’ academic achievement. Additionally, faculty responded positively to the implementation of culturally responsive academic advisement. This data supports the continued implementation and evaluation of culturally responsive academic advisement.

Culturally responsive academic advisement’s definition has been clarified through this intervention. Culturally responsive academic advising is defined as an advisement model through which intentional efforts are made to ensure that all students, especially members of historically marginalized or underrepresented groups, feel welcome, are supported academically and are empowered to navigate the higher education system successfully. Successful implementation is
CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

predicated on building and leveraging warm, welcoming relationships to increase knowledge of individual students’ strengths and needs to effectively support them in meeting high academic expectations, navigating complex systems at institutions of higher education, and managing non-academic competing interests. The tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement are relationship building, empathy, advocacy, cultural awareness, high expectations, empowerment and support which can be simplified with the acronym REACHES.

Table 17

*Culturally Responsive Academic Advisement Framework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenet</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Suggested Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Build and maintain positive relationships with students based on respectful curiosity about and awareness of students’ culture.</td>
<td>- Expand definition of culture to include ethnicity, religion, sexuality, class, race, ability, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Be aware that culture is enacted differently by each individual. Avoid cultural over generalizations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify students’ short and long-term goals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Become aware of students’ non-academic competing interests;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Create safe spaces in which diversity is celebrated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Share appropriate information about yourself;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Interact informally with students when opportunities arise;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Make it clear via actions and language that you are invested every students’ success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrate empathy especially when students are faced with challenges.</td>
<td>- Acknowledge and validate students’ feelings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use open-ended probing questions, statements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use key questions – where, when, how, what, who; never ask why;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Use scaling and miracle questions to help student prioritize challenges;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Avoid judgment and assumptions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Help students to create their own solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>Advocate for students to effect change within biased systems. Advocate on behalf of students when the power dynamic exceeds their locus of control.</td>
<td>- Consider challenges traditionally faced by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- first generation graduate students,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- historically underserved students,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- non-traditional students,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- traditionally marginalized and/or underrepresented members of society;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider stereotype threat;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consider challenges that are context specific.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Increase your cultural awareness</td>
<td>- Take steps to learn about your students’ cultures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify and monitor your own biases;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Monitor bias embedded in curriculum/institutional norms;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Find ways to respectfully and appropriately integrate students’ culture into sessions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Invite, learn from and take action from student and peer feedback on your practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17 continued

**Culturally Responsive Academic Advisement Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenet</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Suggested Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Expectations</strong></td>
<td>Maintain high expectations for all students</td>
<td>- Maintain high standards of excellence for students despite school context, undergraduate IHE, SES, race, etc.;&lt;br&gt;- Invest students in the standard of excellence;&lt;br&gt;- Differentiate support so that all students are pushed to mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong></td>
<td>Empower students to succeed</td>
<td>- Determine students’ level of proficiency with self-advocacy, time management strategies and life skills;&lt;br&gt;- Identify ways to help students build proficiency where gaps exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
<td>Support students with academic and non-academic challenges</td>
<td>- Stay abreast of student progress in all enrolled courses&lt;br&gt;- Engage in proactive advisement:&lt;br&gt;  ~ Initiate communications with students,&lt;br&gt;  ~ Offer convenient (time/location) office hours,&lt;br&gt;  ~ Offer tutoring,&lt;br&gt;  ~ Work with internal and external partners to create a network of academic support for students;&lt;br&gt;- Be aware of potential challenges students may face;&lt;br&gt;- Mental health, family responsibilities, work responsibilities, financial challenges, etc.;&lt;br&gt;- Help students to leverage their own support network;&lt;br&gt;- Compile for referral, a list of community resources;&lt;br&gt;- Help students to create their own best solutions;&lt;br&gt;- Avoid advice giving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11.** This visual representation of culturally responsive academic advisement is the American Sign Language representation for help. The use of this symbol is intentionally indicative of a culture of inclusivity. The acronym R.E.A.C.H.E.S. symbolizes each of the seven tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement. The tenets are relationship building, empathy, advocacy, cultural awareness, high expectations, empowerment and support.
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Discussion

Research question one sought to determine the impact of culturally responsive academic advisement on the academic achievement of African American and Latino males. Benchmarks, in the form of percentage of students earning a 2.7, were set at 80% at the end of the Summer 2016 term, 85% at the end of the Fall 2016 term, and 90% at the end of the Spring term. The benchmark was met and exceeded by African American and Latino males collectively and by sub group at the end of the Summer 2016 term. The benchmark was met and exceeded by Latino males at the end of the Fall 2016 term, but not met by African American males, thus not met collectively. Faculty revealed that non-academic competing interests were a factor in the lower academic achievement of African American males. The Fall outcomes to research question one was related to Pascarella et al.’s (2004) assertion that non-academic competing interests negatively impact students’ academic experience. At the end of the Spring term 88% of Latino males met the RSA benchmark of 2.7, while 92% of African American males met the benchmark. Therefore, at the end of the Spring term, the benchmark was met collectively at a rate of 90%.

Research question two was answered by quantitative data collected via survey results and qualitative data gathered using focus group questions. 93 – 95% of African American and Latino male students selected agree or strongly agree in response to advisement item, My advisor helps me to be successful with coursework, over the course of the academic year. Additionally, 6/6 respondents to focus group questions indicating, satisfaction with tenets of culturally responsive academic advisement; more specifically, relationship building, support with academic and non-academic responsibilities, demonstrating empathy, empowerment and maintaining high expectations. This suggests that students are satisfied with culturally responsive academic
advisement which correlates with Noy and Ray’s (2012) findings that students of color demonstrated a preference for advisors who provided emotional support and acted as guides through the academic process.

Research question three was answered via self-reporting by faculty. 100% of faculty reported increased use of empathic listening. While faculty reported increased awareness of students’ non-academic competing interests, they acknowledged that more could be done to increase awareness of students’ non-academic competing interests. Specifically, they expressed dissatisfaction with their ability to provide all students with the emotional support to effectively balance academic and non-academic interests (Santos & Reigadas, 2002; Noy & Ray, 2012).

Student responses in focus groups and consistent selection of somewhat agree, agree and strongly agree on survey items suggested that listening with empathy when students are faced with challenges was successful as reported by students. Additionally, the correlation data between engagement and RSAs indicated that students who demonstrated high engagement in in-person sessions with faculty, demonstrated greater academic achievement. While causal links cannot be made between engagement and achievement, this data is helpful in understanding the importance of engagement at the institution. Finally, students selected agree and strongly agree most often in response to survey item My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework. Qualitative data identified that students were most satisfied with the relationships they had created with faculty advisors and faculty advisors’ investment in their success. This data is similar to Clark et al.’s (2013) and Robertson and Mason’s (2010) findings that a welcoming environment and emotional support offered by collegial faculty is correlated to the academic success of African American and Latino male students.
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Recommendations

Recommendations for practice. It is recommended that faculty advisors at NGSE North East continue to implement culturally responsive academic advisement. Specifically, it is recommended that faculty advisors make an effort to build positive relationships with their students early in the academic year, so that students are less reticent to seek assistance when challenges arise. It is also recommended that faculty work to demonstrate empathy when students are faced with challenges; furthermore, demonstrating investment in students’ success by holding them to high expectations, while helping them to be successful academically through support and advocacy.

Faculty’s findings that 67% of students who did not meet the RSA of 2.7 in the Fall term, and 100% in the Spring, were faced with challenging non-academic competing interests, punctuated Pascarella et al.’s (2004) findings that non-academic competing interests can negatively impact student achievement. It is, therefore, recommended that faculty continue to build trusting relationships with students early in the academic term, so that they are better able to identify non-academic competing interests and supports to help students successfully navigate the demands of graduate school while balancing external responsibilities early in students’ academic careers. It is also recommended that administrators work to hire diverse staff. One student remarked, during the focus group, that having a male that looks like him on staff would provide a role model. Something, he stated, he does not see often in his professional settings.

It is recommended that administrators who intend to implement culturally responsive academic advisement work to balance the faculty workloads, so that adequate time can be allotted to advisement. It is also recommended that administrators limit the number of new initiatives during implementation, so that faculty are able to devote adequate time and attention
to learning and applying the principles of culturally responsive academic advisement. Further, administrators who intend to use the advisement model are encouraged to create opportunities for faculty members to get to know students early in the academic year, so that trusting relationships can begin to form quickly. Finally, it is recommended that administrators evaluate the faculty advisors’ efficacy of implementation.

**Recommendations for research.** It is recommended that further studies be conducted to determine the degree to which faculty advisors can mitigate the impacts of non-academic competing interests on students’ academic success. It is further recommended that culturally responsive academic advisement be investigated with a larger sample population, to draw statistically valid conclusions regarding the correlation of culturally academic advisement, and the academic achievement of African American and Latino males at NGSE. Finally, the efficacy of implementation of the culturally academic advisement should be evaluated.

**Limitations**

Limitations of this study include the small sample size, impacts of confounding variables including the shift to weekly classes, a new assessment structure, three new faculty members and the addition of a new program of study. Further, there was not a strategic plan in place to evaluate the faculty’s efficacy delivering culturally responsive academic advisement. The number of enrolled African American and Latino students at the NGSE North East campus was 22 at the time of the study. Of the 22 enrolled students, there were 18 respondents during the first round of quantitative data gathering and 13 respondents in the second round. Additionally, of the 22 enrolled, only six students participated in each of the focus groups. Further although all faculty members were enthusiastic participants, the sample size for faculty was five, as the researcher, who was also a faculty advisor, could not participate in the study.
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The confounding variables of program structure, the learning curve of novice faculty and acclimation to a new program of study, limited the amount of attention faculty could devote to implementation of key components of the intervention. This is evidenced by students’ consistent selection of lower satisfaction scores to the survey item, *My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me*. This is further punctuated by faculty members self-reporting lower fidelity with proactive advisement and goal setting in both group interviews. Finally, an evaluation of faculty advisor efficacy was not included in this study. As such data is not available to determine faculty efficacy with each of the tenets.

**Conclusion**

The findings of this study showed that students responded positively to culturally responsive academic advisement. Although causal links cannot be made between student achievement and culturally responsive academic advisement, the mean average of Likert scores on the institutional survey, from the overall student body was 5.2, and all participants in focus groups were pleased with culturally responsive academic advisement. Faculty members were invested in the practice and requested additional supports to improve their ability to address non-academic competing interests. The combination of high expectations and support to meet those expectations was well received by all participants, especially students who were first generation graduate students. Although faculty advisors did not mention it during group interviews, the researcher noted that faculty advisors often advocated on behalf of their graduate students, both at NGSE and at graduate students’ placement sites. As such, the researcher has amended the definition of culturally responsive academic advising to include advocacy.

Culturally responsive academic advisement is a model that can be implemented in a variety of academic settings to meet the student support needs of diverse populations. While the
model is beneficial to all students, it is most beneficial to members of the academic community who have been traditionally underrepresented and marginalized in academic settings. This model is designed to shift the mindset and practice of faculty advisors, so that they think critically about common strengths and needs that may exist within subgroups of diverse student bodies, and work to bridge any gaps that may exist between students’ lived experiences, and the environment and expectations of the institution. Culturally responsive academic advising could positively impact the retention and persistence rates of historically underrepresented and marginalized students, thus impacting the earning potential of members of these populations. The model allows implementers the latitude to identify and use strategies that align with the tenets of the framework. This approach is feasible in the context of the institution and beneficial to the most vulnerable members of the student body, while benefitting the entire student body. Culturally responsive academic advisement honors the students’ abilities, while creating supports that meet the broader needs of subgroups of students within the student body. While this study was limited to African American and Latino males, the flexibility of the model made the tenets applicable to various subgroups of students who share common values, beliefs and practices and, therefore, require differentiated support within academic institutions.
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## Appendix A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Row (Mod#: Row#)</th>
<th>(4) Exemplary</th>
<th>(3) Proficient</th>
<th>(2) Foundational</th>
<th>(1) Attempting</th>
<th>(0) Lacking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBS-102: 1 Classroom Culture</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Classroom Culture indicators is exemplary</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Classroom Culture indicators is proficient</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Classroom Culture indicators is foundational</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher is attempting to apply Classroom Culture indicators</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Classroom Culture indicators is lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS-102: 2 Teaching Cycle</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Teaching Cycle indicators is exemplary</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Teaching Cycle indicators is proficient</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Teaching Cycle indicators is foundational</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher is attempting to apply Teaching Cycle indicators</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Teaching Cycle indicators is lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS-102: 3 Content</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Content indicators is exemplary</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Content indicators is proficient</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Content indicators is foundational</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher is attempting to apply Content indicators</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Content indicators is lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBS-102: 4 Self and Other People</td>
<td>on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Self and Other People indicators is exemplary</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Self and Other People indicators is proficient</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Self and Other People indicators is foundational</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher is attempting to apply Self and Other People indicators</td>
<td>a. Based on the indicators assessed, the teacher’s application of Self and Other People indicators is lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWITCH ROW OBS-102: The teacher will demonstrate application of the NGSE GSE Elements of Effective Instruction in her classroom</td>
<td>a. Overall, the teacher’s application of the NGSE GSE Elements of Effective Instruction is exemplary</td>
<td>a. Overall, the teacher’s application of the NGSE GSE Elements of Effective Instruction is proficient</td>
<td>a. Overall, the teacher’s application of the NGSE GSE Elements of Effective Instruction is foundational</td>
<td>a. Overall, the teacher is attempting to demonstrate application of the NGSE GSE Elements of Effective Instruction</td>
<td>a. Overall, the teacher’s application of the NGSE GSE Elements of Effective Instruction is lacking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Sample rubric from NGSE.
Appendix B

Needs Assessment Faculty Assent and Informed Consent

Title: Examining the impact of the perceptions of campus culture on the achievement of African American and Latino males.

Principal Investigator: Nichelle Bowes

Date: April 14, 2015

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH STUDY:

The purpose of this research study is to determine whether the African American and Latino males’ perceptions of the campus culture at RGSE correlate to their academic achievement. It is anticipated that a maximum of 30 students and 20 faculty members (a total of 50 participants) will participate in this study.

PROCEDURES:

Faculty

There will be one component of this study for faculty. Faculty will be asked to complete one survey.

Time required: The estimated completion time for each survey is 15 minutes.

RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:

The survey includes several questions related to faculty predictors of success and may cause some discomfort.
BENEFITS:
Potential benefits are an increased understanding of how to improve the practices at institutions of higher education to better support African American and Latino male students. It is believed that an increase in culturally responsive practices will positively impact the student achievement of African American and Latino males.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You choose whether to participate and you will indicate below whether you agree to take part in the study. If you decide not to participate, there are no penalties, and you will not lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled. You can stop participation in the study at any time, without any penalty or loss of benefits. If you want to withdraw from the study, please contact Nichelle Bowes via email at nbowes1@jhu.edu.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Any study records that identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation will be reviewed by faculty responsible for making sure that research is conducted according to the approved guidelines, including members of the Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records.
All recordings and measures will be examined by the Principal Investigator and research affiliates only (including those entities described above). No identifiable information will be included in any reports of the research published or provided to school administration. A participant number will be assigned to all surveys and achievement scores. Surveys will be collected in electronic and paper format. Electronic surveys will be administered via a Survey Gizmo account. If you are unable to complete the surveys electronically, paper copies will be provided. In both electronic and paper format, these data will not include identifiable information. All research data including paper surveys and video recordings will be secured in a secure file cabinet. Electronic data will be stored on the PI’s computer, which is password protected. Any original recordings or electronic files will be erased, and paper documents shredded, ten years after collection. Only group data will be included in publication; no individual achievement data will ever be published.

**COMPENSATION:**
You will not receive any payment or other compensation for participating in this study.

**IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:**
You can ask questions about this research study at any time during the study by contacting Nichelle Bowes via email nbowes1@jhu.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please call the Homewood Institutional Review Board at Johns Hopkins University at (410) 516-6580.
ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE/PASSIVE CONSENT WHAT PROCEEDING TO THIS SURVEY MEANS:

By completing this survey or questionnaire, you are consenting to be in this research study. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. Proceeding to the survey does not mean that you have waived any legal rights you would otherwise have as a participant in a research study.
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Student Assent and Informed Consent

Title: Examining the impact of the perceptions of campus culture on the achievement of African American and Latino males.

Principal Investigator: Nichelle Bowes

Date: April 14, 2015

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH STUDY:
The purpose of this research study is to determine whether African American and Latino males’ perception of the campus culture at NGSE correlates to their academic achievement. It is anticipated that a maximum of 30 students and 20 faculty members (a total of 50 participants) will participate in this study.

PROCEDURES:

Students

There will be three components of this study for students:

1. Students will be asked to complete two surveys.
   a. School Culture Survey
   b. Student Satisfaction Survey

2. Students will be asked to disclose their RSAs for the past three terms

3. Students may be asked to participate in a brief audio taped group interview.
CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Time required: The estimated completion time for each survey is 15 minutes. If students are selected to participate in a group interview, the interview is expected to last approximately 30 minutes.

RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:
The survey includes several questions related to student perceptions of the campus culture, including questions related to race and gender which may be uncomfortable.

BENEFITS:
Potential benefits are an increased understanding of how to improve the practices at institutions of higher education to better support African American and Latino male students. It is believed that an increase in culturally responsive practices will positively impact the student achievement of African American and Latino males.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND RIGHT TO WITHDRAW:
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You choose whether to participate and you will indicate below whether you agree to take part in the study. If you decide not to participate, there are no penalties, and you will not lose any benefits to which you would otherwise be entitled. You can stop participation in the study at any time, without any penalty or loss of benefits. If you want to withdraw from the study, please contact Nichelle Bowes via email at nbowes1@jhu.edu.
CONFIDENTIALITY:

Any study records that identify you will be kept confidential to the extent possible by law. The records from your participation will be reviewed by faculty responsible for making sure that research is conducted according to the approved guidelines, including members of the Johns Hopkins University Homewood Institutional Review Board and officials from government agencies such as the Office for Human Research Protections. (All of these people are required to keep your identity confidential.) Otherwise, records that identify you will be available only to people working on the study, unless you give permission for other people to see the records. All recordings and measures will be examined by the Principal Investigator and research affiliates only (including those entities described above). No identifiable information will be included in any reports of the research published or provided to school administration. A participant number will be assigned to all surveys and achievement scores. Surveys will be collected in electronic and paper format. Electronic surveys will be administered via a Survey Gizmo account. If you are unable to complete the surveys electronically, paper copies will be provided. In both electronic and paper format, these data will not include identifiable information. All research data including paper surveys and video recordings will be secured in a locked file cabinet. Electronic data will be stored on the PI’s computer, which is password protected. Any original recordings or electronic files will be erased and paper documents shredded, ten years after collection. Only group data will be included in publication; no individual achievement data will ever be published.
CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

**COMPENSATION:**
You will not receive any payment or other compensation for participating in this study.

**IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS:**
You can ask questions about this research study at any time during the study by contacting Nichelle Bowes via email nbowes1@jhu.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or feel that you have not been treated fairly, please call the Homewood Institutional Review Board at Johns Hopkins University at (410) 516-6580.

**ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE/PASSIVE CONSENT WHAT PROCEEDING TO THIS SURVEY MEANS:**
By completing this survey or questionnaire, you are consenting to be in this research study. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. Proceeding to the survey does not mean that you have waived any legal rights you would otherwise have as a participant in a research study.
Appendix D

Faculty Survey

Please circle the identity marker that best identifies the campus at which you provide instruction, your race and gender.

RGSE Campus: (NYC, Newark, NOLA, Houston, Chicago, Delaware, Philadelphia, Tennessee, Denver)
Gender: (Male/Female)
Race: (African American, Asian, Caucasian, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Other)

Please complete Case Study 1. Please complete one of the following three case studies. Place an X in the box corresponding with the name of the student that you predict will best fit the conditions of the question on the left.

Case Study 1

Leroy, Brad, Juan, Emilio, Tyrone, and Brett are all first year teachers and year one RGSE students in your class. Tyrone Brad and Juan each attended National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) division 1 colleges on full athletic scholarships and were stars of their respective collegiate teams. Tyrone, Brett and Emilio all attended liberal arts colleges and were actively involved in their respective fraternities. All six of the students are friendly, participate well during in-person sessions and respond well to feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Leroy</th>
<th>Brad</th>
<th>Juan</th>
<th>Emilio</th>
<th>Tyrone</th>
<th>Brett</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To whom will the faculty advisor likely provide additional support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which students will likely complete RGSE’s program of study successfully?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which student’s undergraduate experience will negatively impact his/her performance at RGSE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please complete one of the following three case studies. Place an X in the box corresponding with the name of the student that you predict will best fit the conditions of the question on the left.

Case Study 2
Rasheed, Geoffrey, Jose, Carlos, Hakim, and Brendan are all first year teachers and year one RGSE students in your class. Each student was actively involved in extracurricular activities during their undergraduate academic careers. All six of the students are friendly, participate well during in-person sessions and respond well to feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To whom will the faculty advisor likely provide additional support?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Rasheed</th>
<th>Geoffrey</th>
<th>Jose</th>
<th>Carlos</th>
<th>Hakim</th>
<th>Brendan</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which students will likely complete RGSE’s program of study successfully?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which student’s undergraduate experience will negatively impact his/her performance at RGSE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study 3
Kareem, Chadwick, Joaquin, Milagros, Ebony, and Jill are all first year teachers and year one RGSE students in your class. Each attended National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division 1 colleges on full athletic scholarships and was a former star of their respective collegiate teams. All six of the students are friendly, participate well during in-person sessions and respond well to feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To whom will the faculty advisor likely provide additional support?</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Kareem</th>
<th>Chadwick</th>
<th>Joaquin</th>
<th>Milagros</th>
<th>Ebony</th>
<th>Jill</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which students will likely complete RGSE’s program of study successfully?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which student’s undergraduate experience will negatively impact his/her performance at RGSE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study 4

Jamal, Ethan, Angel, Luisa, Kenya, and Meredith are all first year teachers and year one RGSE students in your class. Each student was actively involved in extracurricular activities during their undergraduate academic careers. All six of the students are friendly, participate well during in-person sessions and respond well to feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Jamal</th>
<th>Ethan</th>
<th>Angel</th>
<th>Luisa</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Meredith</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To whom will the faculty advisor likely provide additional support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which students will likely complete RGSE’s program of study successfully?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which student’s undergraduate experience will negatively impact his/her performance at RGSE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Student Perceptions of School Culture Survey

Questions adapted from the Psychological Sense of School Membership (Goodenow, 1993) survey.

*Please circle the identity marker that best identifies the campus at which you provide instruction, your race and gender.*

NGSE Campus  (NYC, North East, NOLA, Houston, Chicago)

Gender  (Male/Female)

Race  (African American, Asian, Caucasian, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Other)

*Please write in your RSA for each indicated term.*

Term RSA  Summer 2014 _________  Fall 2014 _______  Spring 2015

Overall RSA _______

*Please respond to the questions below by circling the number which corresponds most with your response.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a valued member of the NGSE community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at NGSE treat me with as much respect as other students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at NGSE demonstrate interest in me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow students at NGSE respect my opinions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel physically safe at NGSE.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe sharing my cultural traditions at NGSE.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Column</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of my race are treated with respect at NGSE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males are treated with respect at NGSE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Student Satisfaction Survey - Academic Services Scale

Questions adapted from Bryant's (2006) Academic Advising and Counseling Effectiveness and

Please respond to the questions below by circling the number which corresponds most with your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisor clearly communicates his/her office hours.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisors' office hours are convenient for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework at NGSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor is understanding of my life circumstances.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor communicates clearly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor is knowledgeable about institution’s policies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advisement I receive from my faculty advisor is effective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advisement I receive from my faculty advisor is timely.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would be willing to participate in a follow up interview □ Yes □ No

If yes, please provide the email address at which you would like to be contacted to schedule the interview ____________@____________.____
Appendix G

Student Perception of Advisement Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor considers my non-academic responsibilities during advisement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor makes an effort to get to know me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor demonstrates empathy when I experience a challenge.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My faculty advisor helps me to be successful with my coursework.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Focus Group Items

1. What was effective about the academic advisement you received at NGSE North East this year?

2. What impact did the academic advisement you received have on your academic progress?

3. What specific actions did your academic advisor take that helped you to be successful at NGSE this year?

4. What could your NGSE North East academic advisor have done to improve your experience at NGSE?
Appendix I

Faculty Interview Survey Items

1. Which of the intervention activities do you feel you implemented with the least integrity? Why?

2. Which of the intervention activities do you feel you implemented with the most integrity? Why?

3. Which of the activities do you feel were most beneficial to the African American and Latino males on your roster? Explain.

4. What could the researcher have done to improve your implementation of the activities?
Appendix J

Needs Assessment Student Survey Mean Likert Scores

Table 18

African American and Latino males’ perception of faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Items</th>
<th>Mean Likert Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a valued member of the RGSE community</td>
<td>2.285714286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at RGSE treat me with as much respect</td>
<td>1.785714286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members at RGSE demonstrate interest in me</td>
<td>1.785714286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Needs Assessment Faculty Survey Results

Figure 13. Gender of respondents to faculty survey on needs assessment.

Figure 14. Correlation between campus culture mean Likert scores and African American male respondents’ RSAs.
Figure 15. Frequency of faculty selection of student names to case study 1 questions.

Figure 16. Frequency of faculty selection of student names to case study 2 questions.
## Appendix L

### Coding Focus Group Responses

#### Themes

- African American and Latino male students perceived faculty as caring and invested in their success because faculty pushed them to succeed and were intentional about interacting positively with them.
- Students felt supported even when challenges arose because faculty advisors were flexible and reached out to offer assistance (proactive advisement).
- Faculty advisors support academically and in navigating academic challenges were integral to students’ ability to meet academic expectations.
- Students requested that faculty nuance advocacy and relationship building and work to increase the diversity of the staff.

#### Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrates Empathy</th>
<th>Invested in me</th>
<th>Pushed me to mastery</th>
<th>Scheduling Affinity groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Is accommodating</td>
<td>- Asks me what I need</td>
<td>- Gives me extra help</td>
<td>- Ask students what works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is accessible</td>
<td>- Is behind me academically</td>
<td>- Helps me get better grade</td>
<td>- Schedule on Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provides solutions</td>
<td>- Is behind me professionally</td>
<td>- Pushes me to where she knows I could be</td>
<td>Increase Latino and African American male faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is flexible</td>
<td>- Is invested in my success'</td>
<td>- Gives advice on assessments</td>
<td>Increase knowledge of various schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Points out what I did well</td>
<td>Consider my goals</td>
<td>- Previews assessments with me</td>
<td>- School has biased view of my abilities based on race/gender vs. experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Listens to me</td>
<td>- Talks to me about my Ph. D. aspirations</td>
<td>- Helps me to be effective in my classroom</td>
<td>- Help me to understand my school context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is available</td>
<td>- Points out what I did well</td>
<td>- Helps to decrease my stress and anxiety</td>
<td>- Schedule chat and check ins earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relationship building</td>
<td>- Makes sure I plan effectively</td>
<td>- Advisor focuses on growth</td>
<td>Decrease faculty case loads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gives me space to share</td>
<td>- Cares about me</td>
<td>- Gives me a second chance</td>
<td>- Less inclined to ask for help if I feel that I am being a burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feel comfortable talking to her</td>
<td>- Takes my calls</td>
<td>- Gives me hope – positive feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Felt supported</td>
<td>- Goes above and beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is patient and welcoming</td>
<td>- Never felt ostracized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is down to earth</td>
<td>- Gives words of wisdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gets to know me better</td>
<td>- Works with what I do to make me better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One-on-one check ins</td>
<td>- Thinks about me as a person first, then the academics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Makes time to meet with me</td>
<td>- Considers my goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers non-academic competing interests</td>
<td>- Talks to me about my Ph. D. aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Understands my challenges</td>
<td>- Points out what I did well</td>
<td>- Pros to me to where she knows I could be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helps me to plan based on what is going on my life</td>
<td>- Makes sure I plan effectively</td>
<td>- Gives me extra help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Helped me plan my time in chunks</td>
<td>- Cares about me</td>
<td>- Helps me get better grade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

141
# Initial Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1: What was effective about the advisement you received?</th>
<th>Question 2: What specific actions did your academic advisor take that helped you be successful?</th>
<th>Question 3: What impact has academic advisement have on your academic achievement?</th>
<th>Question 4: What could your advisor have done to improve your experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Is accommodating  
• Gives me space to share  
• Feel comfortable talking to her  
• Helps me to plan based on what is going on my life  
• Felt supported  
• Is patient and welcoming  
• Is down to earth  
• Gets to know me better  
• Points out what I did well  
• Listens to me  
• Is available  
• Is accessible  
• Provides solutions  
• Is flexible  
• Helped me plan my time in chunks  
• One-on-one check ins  
• Makes time to meet with me  
• Understands my challenges | • Is invested in my success’  
• Clear concise answers when I am confused  
• Gives me good feedback  
• Helps me with time Talks to me about my Ph. D. aspirations  
• Checks on me if I miss an assignment  
• Makes sure I plan effectively  
• Takes my calls  
• Goes above and beyond  
• Asks me what I need  
• Is behind me academically  
• Is behind me professionally  
• Never felt ostracized  
• Gives words of wisdom  
• Gives me a second chance  
• Gives me hope – positive feedback  
• Works with what I do to make me better | • Previews assessments with me  
• Helps me to be effective in my classroom  
• Gives me extra help  
• Helps me get better grade  
• Gives advice on assessments  
• Pushes me to where she knows I could be | Scheduling Affinity groups  
• Ask students what works  
• Schedule on Saturdays after class  
Increase Latino and African American male faculty  
Increase knowledge of various schools  
• School has biased view of my abilities based on race/gender vs. experience  
• Help me to understand my school context  
• Schedule chat and chews earlier  
Decrease faculty case loads  
• Less inclined to ask for help if I feel that I am being a burden |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Thinks about me as a person first, then the academics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Advisor focuses on growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NICHELLE-KYLE EDGHILL BOWES

107 Amherst St., Unit B, East Orange, NJ 07018    Mobile: 973.592.5670    E-mail: dr.n.bowes@gmail.com

PERSONAL INFORMATION
Date of Birth: April 3, 1971    Place of Birth: Georgetown, Guyana    Citizenship: United States

EDUCATION

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD       Ed. D. Counseling       12/2017

Rutgers University, Newark, NJ       MPA w/Principal’s Certification       5/2010

Kean University, Union NJ       MA - Counselor Education       5/2008

SUNY - Binghamton University, Vestal NY       Bachelor of Arts in English & Psychology       5/1993

CERTIFICATIONS

Principal       New Jersey Department of Education       5/2010

School Counselor       New Jersey Department of Education       5/2010

Elementary School Teacher       New Jersey Department of Education       6/1996

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE

Relay Graduate School of Education, Newark, NJ

Associate Dean       (7/16 – present)

• Set and execute programmatic and instructional vision for Relay Newark
• Create and maintain strategic external partnerships
• Coordinate communications with school partners and shared services in the Relay National office.
• Co-lead programming and faculty as a member of the Newark Dean’s Office.
• Co-create policies and systems to ensure the effective functioning of the Newark campus.
• Manage and report student academic performance to internal and external partners
• Lead, manage and develop a team of full-time professors, adjuncts and external graders to the realization of exemplary instruction and effective program management.
• Teach and advise graduate students in a variety of programs.

Assistant Dean of Students       (08/13 – 6/16)

• Provide instruction and academic advisement to graduate students;
• Grade assessments, synthesize performance data, track cohort progress, and identify gaps in graduate student understanding;
• Perform student academic progress checks, including gathering and analyzing performance data from the course platform, notifying graduate students as well as the Dean, Instructional Fellows, and school leaders about students’ standing and progress in the program;
• Support full time and part time faculty members by coordinating communication and observing their instruction to provide support and feedback;

Instructional Fellow       (08/12 – 7/13)

• Assist Relay Assistant Professors in the instruction of general pedagogy sessions
• Evaluate and provide feedback to graduate students on Relay assignments;
• Observe graduate students in their classrooms, and provide specific, actionable feedback to lead to...
best teaching practices;
- Collaborate with fellow faculty members to develop, revise, and implement quality curriculum;
- Serve as the primary academic advisor to 50 graduate students regarding progress in the Relay program;
- Hold routine office hours to support graduate students with specific questions and host remediation sessions;

Dionne Warwick Institute, East Orange, NJ

Literacy Coordinator (09/10 – 6/12)
- Monitor implementation of school’s literacy program
- Analyze performance data to determine areas of improvement
- Design/facilitate professional development to improve teacher and student performance
- Provide in-class professional development and support to teaching staff
- Provide demonstration teaching of the best literacy practices
- Monitor school-wide reading campaign
- Meet regularly with administrators to report and discuss the progress of literacy program
- Manage purchases, distribution and stock taking of literacy resources
- Facilitate the implementation of literacy Safety Net for students

Master Teacher/Teacher Tutor (09/07-06/10)
- Provide in-class professional development and support to teaching staff
- Implement Winsor-Sonday, a safety-net program, to increase student achievement
- Design and facilitate workshops and training sessions
- Create literacy pacing calendars
- Mentor non-tenured teachers

Lead Teacher (03/05 – 6/07)
- Provide data-driven instruction to 4th and 5th grade population
- Support and train the 4th and 5th grade teaching team
- Conduct conferences, develop assessments and employ diagnostics to determine student aptitude and need for curriculum revision
- Design effective instructional strategies and implement best practices through regular group workshops
- Analyze curriculum texts, data and computer software to incorporate lesson plans
- 75 – 95% NJASK passing rates among students in classes individually taught

Instructor, Safety-Net Program (06/05 – 6/12)
- Teach Language Arts, Reading, Writing and Math in afterschool, Saturday and summer school program for 4th and 5th graders at high risk of failing NJASK
- Support student achievement which resulted in scores increasing by an average of 20 points
- Report to program results and contribute to the selection of instructional materials

Breakfast Program Coordinator (9/06 – 6/12)
- Handle daily meal service and timely dismissal to class for approximately 200 students in grades K-5
- Delegate responsibilities, approve schedules and authorize payroll for staff of 10
- Supervise and evaluate staff performance
- Maintain order, ensure safety and security
- Provide alternate room arrangements when cafeteria is unavailable
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Far Bound, The Teaching Apprenticeship, New York, NY (08/01 - 08/02)

08/02) Program Director

- Admitted 20 apprentice teachers in grant-funded, alternate route certification program with annual operating budget of $50-60K
- Oversaw staff of 20 Lead Teachers, conducted quarterly progress reviews; raised overall satisfaction and productivity 40%
- Designed and facilitated week-long orientation and bi-weekly peer support group meetings/seminars
- Established and maintained strategic agency partnerships and excellent community relations with various constituencies;
- Composed training materials, consulted with school Principles and conducted site visits for all participants
- Tracked apprentice eligibility for Americorp grants, ensured full compliance with funding regulations
- Co-taught 2, weekly, credit-bearing Masters-level education courses

The New Teacher Project, Brooklyn, NY (05/01 - 08/01)

Fellow Advisor Coordinator

- Recruited, trained and managed team of 15 Fellow Advisors ultimately responsible for 300 Fellows
- Assisted with the design and implementation of Fellow Advisor training program and curriculum;
- Communicated and interacted with district personnel, university officials, and Board of Education staff;

Kean University, Union, NJ (08/00 - 05/01)

Graduate Assistant, Passport Program, Academic Support Services

- Individually advised approximately 20 first and second year students qualified for or at risk of academic probation;
- Developed and led weekly skill-building workshops and support group sessions;
- Instructed a freshman seminar to assist students in the transition to college
- Closely monitored student progress and recommended tutoring or study strategies, as needed
- Referred special needs participants to disability services or helped advocate for customized accommodations with faculty
- 75% of students progressed successfully through college.

Public Schools #13 and #18, Paterson NJ (09/95 - 06/00)

Teacher

- Instructed 4th through 8th grade students while actively using cooperative learning principles in class activities
- Generated and executed lesson plans based on curriculum standards;
- Maintained current documentation of reports, assessments, attendance, conferences, and communication with parents.

SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROJECTS

School Professional Development Committee (6/09 – 06/12)

- Elected to a three-year term by colleagues to plan professional development for the school.

Females Uplifted Through Real-Life Experiences (F.U.T.U.R.E.), Program Coordinator (9/07 – 06/10)

- Administer annual school program budget of $1,500; doubled resources to total $3,000 through fundraising efforts
- Recruit and identify 35 student participants and match each with an adult mentor from staff, teachers and other volunteers

Reading Campaign Kick-off, Co-Coordinator (9/07-06/10)

- Launch literacy initiative with day-long event involving students, administration, staff, teachers and parents
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National Honor Society, Coordinator
- Establish and manage a chapter of the National Elementary Honor Society

Professional Affiliations
New Jersey Education Association, Member 2005 - 2012
Teach for America, Alumna 1997 – present

Presentations
Using Data to Drive Instruction East Orange, NJ February, 2012
Reading Conferences in the Classroom East Orange, NJ November, 2012
Question Answer Relationships East Orange, NJ January, 2012
Elaboration in Writing East Orange, NJ December 2010
Engaging Everybody Atlantic City, NJ April 2013
Teaching by Taste: Checking For Understanding Atlantic City, NJ April 2013
Creating Positive Culture East Orange, NJ September 2015
Creating Positive Culture Newark, NJ November 2016
Culturally Responsive Academic Advising New York, NY August 2017